

Farmers Views on Greater Production

At the meeting of the Patriotic and Production campaign held in Lindsay recently, Mr. J. L. Laidley, of Oshawa, representing the Emily Farmers' Club, read a paper on behalf of the club, which was in effect a reply to the action of the Government as expressed by the Government speakers in urging farmers to increase their production. A full report of the paper was sent to Farm and Dairy, with a request that we should publish it. Lack of space makes it impossible for us to do so, but herewith we publish its essential features. The local papers reported that Mr. Laidley's remarks were frequently heartily applauded. The most significant feature of this paper, in our opinion, lies in the fact that it shows that the members of the Emily Farmers' Club are awakening to the importance of social and economic factors in our national life as they relate to the farmer. Many other farmers' clubs are beginning to discuss the same problems, Mr. Laidley speaks in part as follows:

The Farmers' Class.—We as agriculturists have listened with keen interest to your appeal on behalf of increased production. We perceive it to be a policy worthy of being vigorously pursued until the highest possible efficiency has been attained. We assure you that the agriculturists of the Dominion see the responsibility resting upon them, and accept it as an opportunity to rise as a man, assume our responsibility, and acquit ourselves as men worthy of the industry which we represent. We also believe that the agriculturist, individually, working for his own selfish interests, is not rendering his best service to the state or best promoting his own moral and spiritual welfare. For me to produce two bushels instead of one would benefit me, but here and now I submit a question vital to every agriculturist. If every farmer in the Dominion during the past ten years had produced two bushels instead of one, thereby doubling production, necessarily calling for increased effort and expense, and had marketed it under the system which has been in vogue during the past ten years, would the farmers as a whole, be better or worse off financially? We say that they would be no better off. Let us go a step further. While increased production has failed to bring any increased profit to the farmers, it has created a great wave of prosperity. As this wave has swept over Canada from shore to shore, it has set in motion the wheels and spindles in the great manufacturing centres, which in turn has created employment for the transportation companies, and for all the great commercial centres of the world through the distribution of the increased production of our farms. Prosperity, wealth and luxuries are created by the farmers' industry, and everybody is enjoying this prosperity except farmers themselves. This is what is driving our sons and daughters to the cities and undermining our national existence.

Equity and Justice Needed.—In view of the facts stated, we are justified in saying that the institute and all the educational campaigns have failed, and always will fail, until we adopt a system of equity and justice that will give adequate financial compensation to the people on the land. Until this is granted agriculturists are justified in viewing institutes and all agricultural education as a mere ghost behind a veil. When we raise the curtain we see the phantom animated and actuated by three great world forces: The political, manufacturing, and commercial inter-

ests. These are systematically united and are working harmoniously together for the promotion of national prosperity, but utterly ignoring their duty toward us and our industry. We ask you, gentlemen, to appeal to the Government to enact laws to further our interests and protect us from the injustices we are being subjected to.

The Price of Hogs.—Let us view some things of the past and present. Does the price received for hogs since 10th October last warrant us to increase production? And in all due respect we ask Mr. J. W. Flavelle if any manufactured article hung so weak in the balance to-day, would there not be a prompt demand for curtailment of the output of that article? Then, in a parallel case, why does he call to farmers for increased production?

Permit us to ask if it would not be impossible to invent a new make of separator without infringing on the rights of the separators on the market? Would it not also be impossible to buy these rights without first signing an agreement not to cut prices on the separators? Is not this the reason that farmers are paying from \$75 to \$90 for a machine which, we think, would yield a fair profit to the manufacturer at \$25 f.o.b. at the factory? Do not interfere with the manufacturer, but keep on howling increased production along the lines of dairying. Showing "Respect" For Farmers

We believe that J. W. Flavelle, as a member of the Manufacturers' Association, is aware that there is to be held in Toronto in the near future a World's Conference of the Chambers of Trade and Commerce, attended by delegates representing art, sciences, natural resources, and the manufacturing and commercial industries of the world. The Canadian Council of Agriculture, representing the organized farmers of Canada, applied to the Secretary of the Chambers of Trade and Commerce in London, England, asking for the privilege of sending a representative to this proposed conference in Toronto. We received a curt refusal. So the United Farmers of Canada are to be represented by the Right Honorable Sir John A. Macdonald. We take it for granted that this refusal is their way of showing their respect for the farmers.

Where Otities Score.—We are all aware of the vast multitude of unemployed to be fed this winter in the cities and towns. We are also aware that free books are provided for many of the city schools; and we also know that manufacturers and wholesalers add a percentage to the selling price of every article which they handle to cover or meet what they call uncontrollable expense. Consequently, the result is every time we buy a commodity that comes from a wholesaler or factory, we are helping to pay for public conveniences in cities to provide their children with free books, and worst of all, feed a vast multitude of unemployed either too proud or too lazy to work on our farms to-day. This is not all. These manufacturers and wholesalers set the price for our products and fix it so low that after we have paid the heavy toll which they levy upon us to provide conveniences for them, there is nothing left to provide necessary equipment and conveniences on our farms and homes. Then they bark at people for leaving the farm for the city. We are then told we have much to learn and we are anxious to learn, but we propose that a few of the agricultural expert theorists read a farm in our neighborhood and practice what they preach, under the difficulties which the majority of farmers are laboring to-day, and then give us an annual financial statement.



The survival of the fittest

TRIED in the furnace of competition and subjected to the test of years of practical use on nearly 2,000,000 farms the world over, the De Laval has proved its overwhelming superiority to all other cream separators.

Twenty years ago there were as many makes of factory as of farm separators, but for the past ten years the De Laval has had this field almost to itself, 98 per cent of the cream-separators in use by creamerymen and market milk dealers to-day being of the De Laval make.

It has taken the inexperienced farmer a little longer to sort the true from the untrue, the wheat from the chaff, in the maze of confictory catalog and local dealer separator claims, but year by year the ever-increasing proportion of farm separator buyers is reaching the same conclusion as the creameryman—that the De Laval is the only cream separator they can afford to buy or use.

Many other cream separators have come into the limelight of publicity for a few short months or a few short years, claiming to be "as good as" or "cheaper" than the De Laval, but their users have sooner or later found them lacking in some one respect or another, and even where a few have seemingly done well their users have come to learn that the De Laval was a still better machine.

The unit or the less fit cannot possibly survive for long in separators or anything else. Think of all the separators you used to see advertised so extravagantly in your favorite farm papers. Where are they now? Why do you seldom, if at all, see their names mentioned? Simply because the fittest must survive and the others must fall out of the race.

The De Laval has triumphed over all other separators, and its supremacy is now almost as firmly established in farm as in factory separators because its separating system, design and construction are essentially different from and superior to other separators.

A De Laval catalog to be had for the asking explains and illustrates these differences. A De Laval machine, to be had on test or trial from the nearest local De Laval agent, does no better still. If you don't know the nearest local agent, simply write the nearest De Laval main office as below.

De Laval Dairy Supply Co., Ltd.
MONTREAL PETERBORO WINNIPEG VANCOUVER
50,000 BRANCHES AND LOCAL AGENCIES THE WORLD OVER

Say "I saw your ad. in Farm and Dairy" when you write Advertisers. Then you get full benefit of our absolute Guarantee.