

FOUNDED 1866

ors' Sale

RM

state of the late JAMES  
of Tp. of Brock,  
ario, will receive  
nders until

R 27th, 1910,

for the sale of that ex-  
onsisting of E. ½ lot 7  
ot 8, Con. 6.

OF BROCK.

200 acres, more or less, is  
the Village of Sunderland,  
acres are under cultiva-  
ing of pasture and a few  
ne soil is clay loam, of ex-  
e property there is a hand-  
ence, heated by furnace,  
beautifully situated. The  
ructure, 75 x 108 feet, with  
one of the best in Brock,  
driving-shed and a large  
e. There is a fine orchard  
ums, cherries and grapes,  
cidental to a good garden,  
o wells and a never-failing  
At the barn, water is  
hich is also used for power  
of the farm will be pleased  
ers over the property.

000 must accompany each  
d faith, said cheque to be  
accepted. Possession to  
e 1st of October, and full  
November. The highest or  
rily be accepted.

or sale and particulars,  
by whom all tenders will

ING, Manilla, Ont.

INK RAILWAY  
SYSTEM

TES TO

ONTO

Ontario, account of

National  
tion

one Fare, August  
h, from all stations  
of Cornwall and  
nit, Tuesday, Sept.  
l train service from  
on certain dates.

information from:  
RUNK AGENT.

K MEN

re wanting  
f Poultry,  
or for Ad-  
y our spe-  
ched plates.

CLEAN  
ONGER  
SONABLE

our wants.

RTS  
AVING  
ANY  
CANADA

College

ablished school will be  
is upon request.

nd Shorthand College  
ntario.

J. W. WESTERVELT,  
RINCIPAL.

S Thoroughly pro-  
ected in all com-  
tries. EGBERTON  
S. Patent Attorney,  
RONTON. Booklet on  
on request.

# The Farmer's Advocate

## and Home Magazine

"Persevere and  
Succeed."

Established  
1866.

REGISTERED IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE COPYRIGHT ACT OF 1875.

Vol. XLV.

LONDON, ONTARIO, SEPTEMBER 8, 1910

No. 937

### EDITORIAL.

A Western correspondent ventures the opinion that ninety per cent. of the farmers on the Canadian prairies lose from \$5.00 to \$50.00 every year because of carelessness during the threshing season. It is largely a preventable waste.

"The feeding of much grain to hogs is what raises the question as to their profit. Ninety-nine per cent. of the farms of Eastern Ontario will grow both alfalfa and roots; so, the natural conditions for success being fulfilled, it remains for us to do the rest." This bit of sound sense, from a Glengarry correspondent, is worth salting down well for thorough winter digestion. Hogs pay if handled rightly. But, to quote again, "A good deal depends on the feed, and a good deal more on the feeder."

The approach of silo-filling reminds us of another among the numerous modern changes in farm practice. It used to be supposed by many that the silo should be filled with green corn, untouched with frost. Experience has demonstrated that the richest, sweetest and best silage is made from strong-growing corn, well eared and well matured. A frost on the standing corn does no serious harm (except to check ripening), if the silo is filled within a reasonable time afterwards. If the corn becomes too dry, a little water may be introduced when cutting. Rather than ensile immature corn, it is better to take chances of a frost, allowing the grain on the ears to approach as nearly as may be to the glazing stage. It is nourishment we want, not swill.

The attempt to make industries profitable by protection reminds one of the effort to produce fuel from peat. The latter can be done, but hitherto it has usually been found that it required more heat or energy to express the excess moisture from the peat than could afterwards be recovered by burning the resultant fuel. The net result is, therefore, a loss of energy. The peat problem may be solved by utilizing the natural energy of the sun, which costs us nothing, but tariff protection, as a settled policy, is, always has been, and always will be a losing game. Somebody benefits, but somebody else pays, and the toll on the consumer aggregates a larger sum than the gain to the protected interest. Protectionism can never be logically defended, except as a temporary expedient, and in most cases a doubtful expedient at that.

Flies about stock are a dreadful pest. Fly repellants and destroyers, though helpful, are not entirely satisfactory. Why not screen doors and windows in the stables? By darkening them before the stock go in, then letting the animals enter through some suspended cloth or greenery to brush off the insects, and immediately closing the screen door when the cattle are in, the fly pest could surely be mitigated, especially if some means were used to destroy those which enter. Increased comfort and thrift of the animals and attendants, plus protection of milk from bacterial contamination, are among the benefits that might be expected from this inexpensive expedient. There was a time when screens were unknown in houses, and we fought for our victuals with the flies. History, we predict, will repeat itself in the stables. In fact, the plan has been tried, we are told, with satisfactory results.

### The Unmuzzled Press.

A free people should guard zealously the disinterested independence of its press. The regular reading of any paper, no matter how shallow, prejudiced and illogical it may be, moulds one's opinions more subtly than he would suppose. Particularly is this so in the case of papers trusted as independent, but really perverted to the furtherance of ulterior purposes. A biased journal, openly pledged to support a party or a cause through good report or evil is bad enough, but it is admirable and respectable compared to those serpentine publications professing one cause, but insidiously serving another. Prostitution of the press to the promotion of corrupt political and business ends, has been the bane of journalism, public honor and freedom in many cases across the line. Dozens and scores of papers have been started or purchased by corporations, to be used ostensibly as independent or as straightforward party newspapers and magazines, but really to chloroform public opinion at critical junctures, preventing, or at least ameliorating, public outcry against nefarious grabs, steals, and other irregularities. These purposes are served with consummate skill, the corporation or political organ often feigning a mild protest as a cloak against public suspicion of its true ownership and motives. Many a man reads such a paper long after it has changed hands, without realizing that its policy, while assumed to be the same, is actually switched straight about. He wakes up some time when a nefarious project has been lobbied through the Legislature or Parliament, but if he thinks to support another paper, perhaps he finds it also has been acquired by the same or another equally obnoxious corporation. So, what is he to read?

And not only those papers owned outright by designing interests, but others financed as bona-fide business propositions, are frequently subjected to insidious attack. More or less thinly-veiled threats of withdrawing advertising patronage, unless such and such a policy be adopted, are met with by every publisher, and yielded to by many. Even in matters of business policy, attempt is sometimes made by threats of boycott to prevent papers from carrying certain lines of advertising manifestly of advantage to the public.

The canker of corporation control for ulterior purposes has not eaten into Canadian journalism to nearly the same extent as across the line. Many of our newspapers, and most of our agricultural journals and magazines, voice honest convictions. There are, however, exceptions, and signs are not wanting of an attempt to warp, blind and twist Canadian public opinion in the same underhanded way so common in the neighboring Republic. It behooves Canadian readers, if they value their manhood, their freedom and their rights, to spurn all such sheets, when recognized, as they would a viper.

It is not our desire to pose as the only disinterested agricultural journal in Canada. We rejoice in the fact that there are several, but one thing is certain, there is none more absolutely free from political, corporation or other sinister influence, because none can be. "The Farmer's Advocate" is the organ of no clique, faction or interest. It studiously seeks to maintain that detached point of view which alone enables one to draw fair and impartial conclusions. We ask no one to agree with us, save in so far as our published opinions and reasonings commend themselves to his judgment, but this, at least, we claim without fear of contradiction, that the utterances of this journal are the frank expressions of honest men, whose aim ever is to discern and espouse the true interests of the agricultural community in so far, but only in so far, as those interests coincide with the public weal.

### Something from Nothing.

Little new ground is covered in Mr. Biggar's last two contributions on the farmer and the wool tariff, the one letter in our issue of August 18th, and the other this week. The sincerity of the writer's views we see no reason to doubt. The information he incidentally supplies as to trade statistics and manufacturing processes is appreciated. His preliminary enunciation of cardinal economic and fiscal principles is sound. Unfortunately, he gets far away from them in his subsequent argument. Look, he says, in effect; see what we can make out of nothing! We will increase the price of wool by a liberal import duty; increase proportionately the price of tops by a larger duty on these, and the price of cloth by a still larger duty on this commodity. Thus we shall build up in Canada a vast worsted industry which will not cost the consumer anything to speak of, which will afford work for thousands of hands, and an expansive home market for all kinds of farm produce. Meantime, the national exchequer will benefit by the higher duties collected on imports of woollen goods. Very seductive, isn't it? And about as substantial as a conjurer's dream.

Noting that, of the hundred million dollars Federal revenue collected in the last fiscal year, about sixty millions was from duties on imports, Mr. Biggar asks how this proportion could be otherwise raised, save by the improbable method of direct taxation, and argues that, since neither political party seriously proposes free trade, and since necessities of revenue will increase, therefore, the tariff will likely be raised, rather than lowered. Why, then, he plausibly asks, should not the Canadian farmer share with other classes in the protection thus incidentally afforded?

In the first place, he ignores the fundamental fact that a tariff is non-revenue-producing, in so far as it is protective. Raise a tariff, and you check imports. Beyond a certain very moderate figure, the checking of imports more than offsets the higher rate of duty. Thus, the more effectually a tariff stimulates domestic production, the less national revenue it produces. The consumer still pays the duty in most cases, but, instead of producing revenue, it makes fat profits for the producer, or else is sacrificed as an economic loss, for the privilege of nurturing an exotic industry. Raise the scale of woollen duties, as Mr. Biggar suggests, and we would increase taxation, while decreasing revenue.

There is right now a strong sentiment forming, and particularly manifested in Western Canada, in favor of pronounced tariff reduction. Such reduction, which Eastern farmers can enforce by lending the strength of unanimity, would be far more valuable than the pelf that might be gained by clamoring for an illusory share of high tariff benefits, and getting hold, as they would be bound to do, of the short end of the stick.

That the home market absorbs a much larger share of the Canadian farmer's produce than the export market, is certainly true, and yet, as has been often pointed out, the prices ruling in the export market very largely regulate the prices obtaining here for most of our staple products, such as wheat, cheese, cattle, hogs, etc. There are local exceptions, but such is the rule. As we cannot regulate the foreign prices of our staple agricultural products, it follows that the Canadian farmer can be little advantaged by import tariffs on his lines of production, save in the case of those not raised in sufficient quantities to supply the home demand, and not at all times on these.

That a protective tariff on a certain article does not always of necessity raise the price of that article within the protected area, we grant.