

and they are reduced to the horrors of starvation. Why? Because they do not practice mixed farming. Their land is as fertile as ours and their climate as productive of growth; we have the statements of Agricultural Missionaries from these countries that were a system of farming, similar to ours, established there, famine would become a matter of history only. Do we not, then, owe much to the system of mixed farming, inaugurated in this country by our pioneer forefathers?

Mixed Farming tends toward a decrease in the cost of production of food supplies. No two crops require exactly the same food materials from the soil, nor do they take their supply of food from the same soil stratum. During the process of cultivation, and by the action of fertilizers, plant foods are being constantly restored to the soil in the requisite condition for *absorption* by plants. If one crop, only be sown, year after year, it utilizes only its own particular foods in the stratum in which it feeds, and all others are lost. Also, to produce a sufficient supply of available food for this crop, it is often necessary to increase the amount of cultivation and the amount of fertilizer applied to the land. On the other hand, if a number of crops be sown in succession, while one is removing certain foods from a certain stratum, natural agents are building up other foods, which will be required by the following crops, in that and in other strata; less cultivation and less fertilizer are required than in the case of a single crop grown year after year. From these statements, it may readily be seen that, in the case of specialized farming, much waste necessarily ensues, while in the case of mixed farming, the waste is reduced to a minimum. Waste, in any form, means lessening of efficiency and a

consequent increase in the cost of production. Therefore, by applying a system of mixed farming to our agriculture, we do much to accomplish that, the correspondent of which, in the manufacturing world, occupies the attention of the highest salaried experts, namely, the increase of efficiency and the decrease of the cost of production.

Mixed farming in Ontario is not, however, without its disadvantages. It is, in reality, a combination of several distinct businesses and the farmer must be an expert in each business in order to attain the highest degree of success. This is practically an impossibility and, as a consequence, on the average Ontario farm, some branch of the business is neglected or, at least, improperly managed, and the success of the whole lessened accordingly. Mixed farming does not readily lend itself to the advancement of rural co-operation. It is very difficult to operate successfully a Co-operative Association which deals with more than one class of commodity. A rural section must, therefore, organize several societies in order that its products may be marketed and its supplies purchased co-operatively. This is, perhaps, the most difficult circumstance against which the rural Co-operative Movement has to contend.

The possibilities of mixed farming in Ontario are great, but there are many difficulties to be overcome before it will attain its proper degree of prominence among the industries of the Province.

As was stated previously, the pioneers of this Province were necessarily mixed farmers, but as the country developed, towns and cities sprang up with surprising rapidity, and other industries grew accordingly—manufacturing, the development of natural resources, the professions. For a time,