

The Farmer's Advocate

and Home Magazine

"Persevere and
Succeed."

Established
1866.

REGISTERED IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE COPYRIGHT ACT OF 1875.

Vol. XLIV.

LONDON, ONTARIO, APRIL 1, 1909

No. 862

EDITORIAL.

Speakers Who Have Made Good.

True worth is in being, not seeming;
In doing, each day that goes by,
Some little good, not in the dreaming
Of great things to do by and by.

This little gem of verse was suggested last week by Sandy Fraser's good-natured homily upon those well-informed but gumptionless young farmers who seem to have succeeded in divorcing theory from practice. They may be found in every community, and are usually much heard of, for one discreditable representative of an agricultural training is far more widely advertised than a worthy and successful one.

The worst kind of unpracticing professors are those who allow themselves to be set up as lights to their fellow men. It is a bad sign when an Institute lecturer cannot draw a good audience in his own township. Humanity instinctively discounts the instructor who does not practice what he preaches. The sermon may be orthodox and inspiring, but it gives one a sort of cheated sensation to learn that the mentor expects his hearer to do not as he does, but as he says. They naturally conclude that advice which is impractical for number one must be of doubtful value for numbers two and three.

The main thing that is fresh about most agricultural instruction is the individuality of the instructor, and the experience upon the strength of which he is supposed to speak. When that is discovered to be lacking, or in any way below par, the whole philosophy falls flat, like a punctured balloon.

And yet there are plenty of men with presumption enough to tell others how to do what they have failed to do themselves. We have all heard fine addresses on eradication of weeds by men whose own farms would make stamping-grounds for an economic botanist; beautifully-reasoned arguments on maintaining soil fertility by those whose own farming was better described as soil-mining than field husbandry; talks on stock-judging by lecturers whose own cattle were walking hat-racks; and dedicated sermonettes about keeping boys on the farm by men whose own sons manipulate the electric current on city street cars or adorn business or professional offices on a down-town street. Then there is the ornithologist, who undertakes to lecture farmers on clover-seed production or breeding domestic animals, at the risk of converting himself into a laughing-stock by impractical answers to pointed questions; also, the girl graduate in short skirts, who sedately informs married women with families how to feed and care for the baby.

So it goes. The benefit of the Institute or agricultural-extension work is not infrequently marred by those who are content to do the teaching—for a neat salary—leaving others to put it into practice. That the services of such men and women should be available, we cannot avoid. That they should be employed, reflects on the judgment of the executive officers who send them out.

Beyond question, it is difficult to find enough speakers of the right kind. Many of the best farmers are not the best talkers; while some who are fairly proficient in both capacities, are disinclined to leave home on lecture tours. But if a good delegate cannot be sent to each locality every year, send one in two years. Hard-headed farmers and farmers' wives have a right to demand that a speaker deputed to occupy their time shall be thoroughly informed on the subjects

treated, that he eschew other topics, and that the lecturer's address be backed up by reasonably successful practice on his own farm.

A Good Automobile Bill.

The need of more stringent regulations to insure the safe use of country roads by the farmers who built and have chief need to use them, is recognized by the introduction of several new bills into the Ontario Legislature this year to amend the Automobile Act. D. C. Ross, M. P. P., of Middlesex Co., stands sponsor for a bill which would make any violation of the law relating to this traffic punishable by a fine of \$50, or a week's imprisonment for the first offence, a fine of \$100 or a month's imprisonment for a second offence, and imprisonment, without option, for all subsequent violations. It would also forbid any automobile running or standing on the highway between 6 a. m. and 9 p. m. at night on Saturdays, and between 6 a. m. and 3 p. m. on Sundays.

A somewhat more thorough bill, incorporating the very commendable and effective feature of impounding of the cars in the case of a third offence, has been introduced by Major Jas. J. Craig, M. P. P., for East Wellington. This bill proposes to amend the present Act, by inserting a clause to provide that a county council may pass a by-law forbidding any motor vehicle to be operated upon any public highway, in any municipality within the county, except in towns, on Saturday and on Sunday. It further specifies that when the driver of a motor vehicle is convicted of a third offence whereby personal injury is sustained, the offender shall be imprisoned for not less than 30 days, without the option of a fine, and that the motor vehicle in which he was driving shall be impounded for not less than three months. Another amendment proposed by the bill would forbid a motor vehicle from passing within fifteen feet of a street car which is stopping for the purpose of taking on or letting off passengers.

The final section of the bill would place it in the hands of the Provincial Secretary to suspend or revoke a license at any time for a violation of a provision of the Act or any amendment thereto, and would also provide for the keeping of a complete record, by the Provincial Secretary, of all convictions registered against an offender in any or all parts of the Province.

While this bill will by some be deemed drastic, it is, after all, not unreasonable. The farmers of this Province have built the roads, and have a moral right to the safe use of them. Automobile traffic, as we have it to-day, is a menace to such use, especially by women and children, and entails a severe economic and social hardship upon dwellers in rural districts. Most of the trouble is caused by harum-scarum drivers, from whom it is difficult to compel compliance with reason or law. Perhaps the greatest difficulty is in securing apprehension, identification, definite evidence and conviction. For this reason, the penalties for violation should be severe. As fines are mere pin-pricks to many offenders, imprisonment and impounding of machines is called for. "The Farmer's Advocate" is pleased to note the favorable attitude toward this phase of the bill by the Premier and Provincial Secretary.

Against the privilege of closing the highways to automobile traffic on certain days of the week, opposition will chiefly range itself. But this, too, in our opinion, is a justifiable and beneficent proposal, for, no matter how thoroughly we try to regulate the traffic by law, there will still remain a degree of danger to women and children,

and even to men driving fractious horses unaccustomed to cars. No doubt, in time, motor-cars will become an every-day familiarity, but at present there should be at least one or two days of the week when horses may be driven, free of danger from gasoline wagons. Cities regulate all kinds of traffic on their streets at corners where accidents are liable to occur, and even forbid the use of certain streets to heavy traffic for protection of the paving. Is not the safety of human limb and life in the country at least as important as the welfare of the pavements on a city boulevard? Prince Edward Island prohibits the running of autos on its roads altogether. Nova Scotia has passed a law enabling municipalities to forbid them on certain days. This, in its working out, entailed needless inconvenience, because all municipalities did not select the same days. The Craig bill avoids this by designating two particular days, leaving the remaining five free to the sane and proper use of public highways by motorists all over the Province. This bill should pass.

Compulsory Eight-hour Day.

Labor legislation appears to be the order of the day. As if it were not enough that Alphonse Verville should have reintroduced into the Dominion House of Commons his perennial bill, to force upon contractors, manufacturers, employers and workmen an eight-hour day on all Government work, we now have still a more radical proposition introduced into the Ontario Legislature by A. E. Fripp, M. P. P. for West Ottawa, undertaking to restrict the working day to eight hours in all cases, except emergency, caused by fire, flood, or danger to life or property. Exception is specified in the case of domestic service and farm labor, to neither of which is the bill intended to apply. Not content with limiting the hours of a standard day of labor, the framer of the bill further undertakes to set a minimum wage of 25 cents per hour, irrespective of what is earned overtime. It further provides that no boy under fourteen years, and no girl under twenty-one, shall be allowed to work longer than eight hours each day. A penalty of \$100 is provided for infraction of the bill by employers. Clauses relating to Provincial Government work provide for the voiding of any contract in which the conditions of the bill are violated.

The very radical character of Mr. Fripp's bill places it beyond the probability of early enactment. Mr. Verville's bill, in the Dominion House, being a somewhat less drastic, though perhaps not less far-reaching, measure, stands more chance of winning favor. It seeks to provide that:

"Every contract to which the Government of Canada is a party, which may involve the employment of laborers, workmen or mechanics, shall contain a stipulation that no laborer, workman or mechanic in the employ of the contractor or sub-contractor, or other persons doing or contracting to do the whole or a part of the work contemplated by the contract, shall be permitted or required to work more than eight hours in any one calendar day, except in cases of extraordinary emergency caused by fire, flood, or danger to life or property."

"This Act shall apply to work undertaken by the Government of Canada by day labor."

While this bill would apply only to Dominion Government contracts, it is regarded as certain that, if passed, it would prove but the thin edge of a wedge introduced by the Labor Unions to bring about, possibly to compel later by law, the general adoption of an eight-hour day in all urban industries. One result of this would be to draw labor from the farm, and eventually to effect a corresponding reduction in the hours of