

besides material benefit that has probably escaped the majority of my readers, namely, that these beautifying improvements not only increase the value of the farm, but they also increase the value of the man. Who has not noticed the difference in the man who has a love for the beautiful, the good and the pure, and the man who is lacking these qualities. Who has not himself experienced the elevating emotion when he thinks of beautiful things, or when he views some neatly and trimly kept lawn?

When using this spiritual faculty, we are practicing practical idealism, and who has not experienced the joy derived from it and the incentive to do better in the future? Practical idealism can and should be practiced on the farm far more than it is. It should be used in the stable, in the milk-house, in the kitchen, and, in fact, at every work that comes to our hand. We should first imagine in our mind how a thing should be done, and what a job should look like before we attempt to do it, and when we have pictured in our mind how it should be, then let us work as near to that ideal as it is possible, and success will be ours in whatever we undertake.

Bruce Co., Ont.

A. E. WAHN.

### The Wool Question and a Revenue Tariff.

Editor "The Farmer's Advocate":

In your comments on my letter in "The Farmer's Advocate" of Sept. 8th, you ask if I have essayed to compute the staggering cost to the United States of fostering its woollen industry? Let me say I do not hold up the United States woollen tariff as a model for Canada in any other respect than its principle of giving protection to the wool-grower, as well as to the wool manufacturer. The framers of that tariff went to excess in the degree of protection given to both, and the result is that the industry is handicapped by the needlessly high cost of certain classes of wool which will never be largely grown in that country. That mistake will not be made under the more moderate tariff ideas prevailing in Canada.

Now, as to your question: The woollen industry of Great Britain was built up by a series of radical protective measures extending over a period of seven hundred years, and in the United States the same industry has been the subject of various experiments in tariff legislation for about one hundred years, but in neither case has any well-known economist attempted to assess the cost of these developments. The attempt would be vain, for the reason that protective duties were never confined to wool and woollens alone, but were imposed, also, on other commodities to which these items were directly or indirectly related; and to try to estimate separately the cost of promoting each would be a hopeless work.

What I can state is this, that both Great Britain and the United States set about the task of developing their woollen and other textile industries as a measure necessary to achieve their industrial independence, and if such independence was necessary to those countries, it is even more necessary to a country with the rigorous winters of Canada. We ought to be able to feed as well as to clothe ourselves from our own resources, whether the cost be much or little, if we are to stand on our own feet as a nation. It required two wars—that of 1812 and the Civil War—to bring this home to the people of the United States, and the history of the wool industry of that country is the history of its industrial emancipation from the world.

Your question can best be answered by a statement of the achievements of these industries in the last half century, since the adoption of their national policy. The introduction of the census report of the United States for 1905 makes some instructive statements. It says: "In the grouping of industries by the census bureau, textiles rank third, according to value of products, the group of 'food and kindred products' being first, and 'iron and steel and their products' second." It goes on to state that, when the clothing branch is added, "the number of wage-earners in the textile and allied industries are far in excess of any other group. They reported the impressive number of 1,156,305 hands, which is but little below the combined number employed in 'food and kindred products' and 'iron and steel and their products.'" The capital employed in the United States textile industries in 1905 was \$1,343,324,605, and the increase in the short period from 1900 to 1905 was over \$300,000,000. The annual value of the products of these industries in 1905 was \$1,215,036,792. The million-and-a-half hundred thousand hands employed in these trades have three or four million others in families depending on them, not to speak of the host of people employed in the dyestuff and chemical trades, mill supplies and machinery trades dependent on the textile industries—and all these people are fed by farmers. Can you compute the staggering cost to the United States farmers who produce perishable stuff, if these industries were wiped out?

You say I ignore "the fundamental fact that wool is non-revenue producing in so far as it is

protective." I am sorry if what I have said seemed to bear this construction. In my last letter I said the purpose of a protective tariff was to check the inflow of goods in order to create industries within the protected zone. That is its purpose, and customs revenue from a particular line of goods is reduced according to the extent to which foreign imports are curtailed, and home industries substituted.

To my mind, the creation of home industries is the only justification of a tariff. A purely revenue tariff is indefensible from any point of view. In order to see this matter in a clear light, let us suppose that the seven million people of Canada were suddenly bereft of a fiscal system, customs houses and all, and were put to work to devise, out of whole cloth, some means of raising money to carry on Government. In order that the products of Canada may not be affected one way or the other, suppose the Government decides that it will not raise money by direct taxation on land or capital, but will impose a purely revenue tariff on articles imported, but of a kind not produced in Canada—say, bananas, oranges, lemons, pineapples, jute, manila and sisal fibre, cotton, ivory, silk, diamonds, India rubber, and other foreign products. There being no question of home manufactures or home production to complicate the problem, is it not plain that both the cost of maintaining the machinery of the customs department and the amount of the duties collected will have to be paid by the people who import and consume the foreign goods? It is, then, only a question whether it is cheaper to raise that money by building customs houses and maintaining the expensive machinery of the customs service, or employing tax collectors, and collecting the money direct from the people. The direct method would not only be cheaper, but would be more equitable, because, under the revenue tariff, only those who used diamonds, ivory, India rubber and pineapples, etc., would contribute the revenue; whereas, by general taxation, all would pay according to their means. Of all methods of raising money, surely a tariff for revenue would be the most clumsy, costly and unjust, even if it were not open to abuse by partisan politicians. Whether the creation of home industries is designed, or is only incidental to a tariff, the existence of such industries is the only justification for such a method of raising public money. It is by increasing the number of people employed in putting into use the raw materials of a country, whether these raw materials consist of soil and sunshine, or minerals from the earth, fish from the sea, or forests and water-powers, that the circle of opportunity widens

moderately protectionist country, and the former a high-protectionist country. In some lines of industry the United States and Germany have left Great Britain far behind.

The word "protection" is a misleading term, as an expression of a policy of industrial self-development. A customs tariff is not the whole of such a policy, and if the Canadian nation decides that it ought to produce out of its own resources such things as are necessary to feed and clothe its people, and give them shelter, it should not weakly halt at the question whether each feature of such a policy will be profitable in itself. If a series of storms should delay a farmer's spring work till late in May, he would not hesitate to pay such a sum for help and horses and implements as would seem extravagant under ordinary circumstances. He knows that the extra cost of help will be a wise outlay if he can get in the season's crop by rushing his work.

The woollen and cotton industries of Great Britain are considered marvellous achievements. How was the woollen industry planted there? When Edward III. came to the throne in 1327, England was already producing the best wool of Europe, but nearly all of it was shipped raw to Flanders—as we are shipping ours raw to the United States—and the Flemings were selling it back as finished cloth, and becoming wealthy by the industry. Edward brought over colonies of Flemings to England, and then, to secure the home market, imposed tariffs on the finished fabrics and prohibited the export of raw wool, just as the Ontario Government prohibited the export of saw-logs to the United States, and as the Quebec Government is now prohibiting the export of pulp-wood from Crown lands. This you see transcended the idea of customs tariff, but it laid the foundation of Britain's primacy in the world's woollen industry. There was a big outcry in England by those whose business was temporarily disturbed, and thousands of Flemish sellers were murdered, but the next generation hailed King Edward as England's greatest patriot, and the advent of the Flemings gave a splendid moral leaven to the British character.

E. B. BIGGAR.

## HORSES

### Horse-breeding Scheme for Great Britain.

Great Britain has been considerably disturbed over the insufficient supply of army horses within her territory, and, as a consequence, has been devoting time and energy to a study of the situation, with the hope of finding a feasible solution. The commission which has been employed at this task recently announced the promise of a substantial sum to encourage horse-breeding. The main provisions of the scheme for the contemplated expenditure are:

To have an Advisory Committee for Horse-breeding (on which the Royal Commission should be represented).

To pay a substantial sum in premiums to owners of approved stallions, and to encourage the latter to travel the country.

To encourage the keeping of suitable brood mares by farmers and small holders, and, with this object, enlist the assistance of persons locally interested in horse-breeding, including masters of foxhounds and harriers, and the secretaries of hunt clubs.

Free nominations to be given for the service of the best young mares of smaller tenant-farmers by premium stallions.

To assist owners of stallions to purchase a better class of horse than is now found in rural districts.

There is food for much thought in this horse-breeding plan. Here is Great Britain, the original home and the fountainhead of Thoroughbreds, and, consequently, the hunter and army types of horses, for Europe, Canada, Australia, United States, and practically the world, planning to spend large sums of money, and to pass laws for the encouragement of horse-breeding. The breed or type does not matter; it is the breed or type which Britain stands most in need of. In all parts of



Marchioness of Drummond (23028).

Clydesdale filly. First-prize three-year-old and champion female, London, 1910. Imported and owned by Alex. F. McNiiven, St. Thomas, Ont.

in the field of labor or in the acquisition of wealth. The right use of that wealth and opportunity is another question, and the misuse of wealth is common in every nation, no matter what its fiscal system. There are tyrannical combinations of capital in free-trade Britain, as well as the United States, and the manufacturers of the Motherland have the same habit of selling abroad cheaper than at home that characterizes the German and French manufacturers. Britain prospered for hundreds of years under protection; she prospered still more under free trade when she became the greatest manufacturing nation of the world but the prophecy that she would become the world's workshop is not only unfulfilled, but of recent years she has receded, in comparison with the United States and Germany, the latter a