

though to a less extent. The export of raw material should be discouraged all over Canada. The United States are exhausting their resources with amazing rapidity, so that now they want to get a chance to do the same with Canada. What will Canada become if she exhausts her fertility as fast as the Yankees have done theirs. They have developed their country with amazing rapidity, but at a tremendous waste of resources. It is better to make haste slowly, as Canada has hitherto been doing. The only real wealth of a country is the product of its soil and waters, and it is the duty of the Government to conserve this for the benefit of the people.

We are told that reciprocity will not injure our factories; but if our millers have to pay a higher price for their wheat, and our papermakers a higher price for their pulpwood, and our various wood-working factories the same, will not enterprise in those lines be restricted, and the employment of men curtailed, and the growth of our home market retarded? In short, our cities will be handicapped, and the country places not benefited, except, perhaps, in certain bean and potato growing districts, as these crops are not much harder on the soil than animal products. It might be a different story if our finished products were getting the big price, instead of our raw material. The same law applies to horses; they are finished products. But reciprocists tell us we are only exchanging a distant market in the West for as good a one near-by in the big American cities. But they fail to consider the difference which the electrical and automobile industry will soon have on the demand for horse power. The horse is doomed to a great, if not entire, supersession in the cities, and the first to feel the change will be the big ones of the United States. The electric car displaced many horses in the past, but we did not notice the effect much because of the rapid development of our cities and the opening up of new districts in the West. But there is a limit to this, and the automobile industry will hit us a harder blow than the electric car ever did.

Beekeeping is rapidly becoming a thriving industry in Canada, but the free admission of honey and a tariff on sugar will seriously handicap the former in competition. It is an infant industry, which should have been protected, and produces the most wholesome and health-giving sweet of all. It has none of the deleterious effects of sugar, and if the consumption of the latter was displaced by honey, the strength of the race would be appreciably increased.

J. H. BURNS.

### Reply to a Stand-patter.

Editor "The Farmer's Advocate":

In your edition of April 6th I was somewhat amused at an epistle from the pen of Wm. Ellis. He says that he cannot endorse your stand on reciprocity. He also says that, because reciprocity is not directed by necessity, it should not be advocated, or words to that effect; in other words, he would leave well enough alone. And, because that is not your stand, he can't endorse it.

Now, Mr. Editor, it seems to me that, for a leading farm journal, such as "The Farmer's Advocate," to preach, "Let well enough alone," would be very much against the general trend of its advice, for it certainly isn't the policy of up-to-date farmers to ever let well enough alone. If such a policy had dominated our ancestors all down the ages, we would be many years behind the times.

"Leave well enough alone" is a stock argument of the Tories; and they say, too, that the farmers are prosperous. If such arguments are to carry weight, the Provincial Government ought to stop paying out good money for experiments at the Agricultural Colleges, and, instead of buying more land, they ought to sell some. Also, if we ought to leave well enough alone, why are they spending hundreds of thousands in order to bring electricity to the towns and cities and farms of Ontario? We have been getting along splendidly without it, and it is not a necessity, so why not leave well enough alone? That is, if we are to practice what we preach.

Where is the up-to-date farmer or manufacturer who would not make an experiment if he was reasonably sure he could make, say \$600, instead of \$500, more especially when such an experiment wouldn't cost him one cent to try; and if it failed, would cost practically nothing, either?

Does Mr. Ellis still use a quill pen, or is it a fountain pen? Does he use a horse-drawn wagon, or, perchance, a motor car? Does he have a horse and buggy, or, perchance, a motor car?

While driving through the country, I have seen some farms with old log barns, some with scrub cattle, and a one-furrowed plow, and all of which were well enough alone, but the owners have left well enough alone, and on these farms that those who live on them live well enough alone, live, or is it only when up-to-date farms they live? If it is only when they live, all we can say is that the old practice what they are now preaching.

It is safe to say that the leave-well-enough-alone argument, along with nearly all the other

arguments against reciprocity, serve the same purpose that a cowbell used to do at a charivari, namely, to make a noise.

In conclusion, Mr. Ellis advises Mr. McMillan and his like to emigrate to the States; and, he might have added, the way many another of Canada's good sons have already done.

Dufferin Co., Ont.

X. Y. Z.

### Should Farmers' Sons Leave the Farm?

Editor "The Farmer's Advocate":

So many articles have been written on the reasons of the boy leaving the farm, that to add anything might seem useless. But "Farmer's Son" states the case in as terse and concise a form as any that has been written in your paper, when he says that the only outlook for many a farmer's son is to work till the decease of his parents before he can have anything he can call his own.

Often times this is only too true; the father considers he has a right to the boy's work till the son decides to marry. Now, what self-respecting young man will stand this sort of treatment? How can any father expect, if he is in a position to pay his son wages, that the son will work heartily for him for his board, clothes and spending money? He should consider how he would enjoy this kind of treatment if the tables were turned, and he were the boy.

"Farmer's Son" says he has received \$200 per year for four years, yet, at twenty-five, he confesses, he has almost nothing. If his father permitted him to have a horse and buggy, as most fathers do, surely he could not have managed very closely, if he has saved almost nothing. Most "Farmer's Advocate" readers will doubt that, if he were receiving \$80 to \$150 per month, if \$310 per year would suffice for expenses.



Canadian Farmer.—"Why, Mr. Gridale, that's a splendid fit. I don't think I ever saw the beat of it."

"Farmer's Son" will find, also, that, to compare the wages or salary of the mechanic or professional man with the wages (and what a difference there is between \$500 in wages and \$500 in salary) of a man on the farm, he will have to go more deeply into figures of house rent, or real estate values, prices of board or foodstuffs, taxes, etc., as they are found in the city. The amount saved is of greater importance than the salary received.

"Dugald" tells of a farmer whom he thinks would be an exception to the rule if he were properly approached on the subject of wages to his son. There are many such, and in justice to them, the writer can relate his experience with one of this class. When nearly twenty-one years of age, I became dissatisfied, and insisted upon my father giving me a share in the proceeds of the farm, or else I would go out into the world, and make my fortune there. He was not willing, and my mother he said, "I do not think he will do this, for I never received anything until I was twenty-seven." Mother's reply was, "You are satisfied with this manner of life, and to this he could make no reply. He refused to work until he told me his father offered me one-third of all money he made, and I must keep up one-third of the expenses of the house, and I must keep up one-third of the expenses of the house, and I must keep up one-third of the expenses of the house."

within one week father told mother it would have paid him to have given me a share before, as I took so much greater interest in the work. This was six years ago, and, though we do not farm extensively, I have saved some money every year, and now he is willing to help me buy a farm.

Having my own money has taught me many things. I have learned the value of money, because it was earned by my own labor, and have been contented with a "penny to lend, a penny to spend, and a penny to bring home to my wife."

To "Farmer's Son" I would say, stick to the farm, with such opportunities as you have. Will the life of an engineer, with its grime and smoke, roar, and monotony, make up for the possibilities of the farmer of to-day? "Farmer's Son" cannot hope to start in where his father is leaving off, neither will he for many years be able to stand with his hand on the throttle of a "flyer." Life offers opportunities to "Farmer's Son," for which gold will be no compensation.

CLAUDE C. WANNAMAKER.

Prince Edward Co.

### Well-satisfied Farmer's Son.

Editor "The Farmer's Advocate":

I cannot fall in line with the "Farmer's Son," of Dufferin Co., Ont., "Farm vs. Railroad Life." I am an only son, the same as he; three years his senior. I think the young man competent enough to demand the wage mentioned for firing on the railroad, would command considerable in advance of \$250 a year on the farm. I am personally acquainted with three young men who left the farm and went firing on the railroad. Two of them are back working on the farm. The social position of a farmer's son would be considered better, surrounded by better environment. Our young friend does not make any allowance in his comparison for the privilege he enjoys of home life.

We have a good road horse, doing little or no farm work (no exception in our neighborhood), at the disposal of our family of four; also two good buggies, to suit the season. I have never known the evening I could not have a horse.

Now, what would these privileges mean to the boy off the farm? It would cost him hundreds of dollars per year. I cannot say I like the statement of our friend, of having received a stated wage since he was twenty-one. The son's money (and each member of the family) should be derived from a share in the farm. As soon as I knew the value of money, I received a small share from the cows, which was increased as I grew older, till the produce of the whole farm was included. At present, after our help-mates in the house have had their

share, father and I share up. I have the farm books to keep, and care for the floating cash. Consequently, if at times we are a little short of cash, I know the reason why.

A CONTENTED FARMER'S SON.

Perth Co., Ont.

J. R. Hutchinson, B.S.A., of Slate River Valley, proprietor and manager of the "Valley Farm," who owns 1,500 acres in the Thunder Bay District of New Ontario, has taken a contract to grow seed peas, 220 acres for W. P. Myles, seed merchant, of Wellington, Ontario. Mr. Myles supplies the seed, which will require 640 bushels, and agrees to pay \$1.40 per bushel, f.o.b. at Slate River Crossing. This section is free from the pea bug, hence it is chosen as an ideal place to grow seed peas. He expects a yield of 25 or 30 bushels per acre. Another interesting feature in relation to agriculture in New Ontario, is that we are immune from the ravages of the potato bug, and no section of the Province of Ontario produces better yields of potatoes. William Wilson, who has farmed for fourteen years near Port Arthur, made this statement to me in reference to his crops during this period: "The yield was from 350 bushels to 450 bushels, except one year, when it was only 250 bushels."

Thunder Bay District, Ont. R. A. BURRIS.