The Farmer's Advocate and Home Magazine

"Persevere and Succeed."

Established 1866.

REGISTERED IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE COPYRIGHT ACT OF 1875.

Vol. XLV. LONDON, ONTARIO, JULY 14, 1910 No. 929

EDITORIAL.

People are now "tumbling" to the conclusion that the best way to make money out of hogs, or any other class of stock, is to stay with the game through thick and thin, varying, if at all, by dipping in a little extra heavy when any particular line of stuff is flat. That is the way to have plenty to sell on the crest of the succeeding wave of high prices.

Canadian farmers should not allow Mr. Biggar or anybody else, no matter how well intended, to pull the wool over their eyes. Their true interests lie not in working for special protection on their products, but in a persevering, fair-minded effort to decrease cost of production and cost of living by a general decrease in existing tariff burdens. The man who accepts a sop weakens his case against others who get a bigger share.

Viewing the appalling extravagance which characterizes the naval expenditures in Great Britain and the United States, overwhelming the people with financial burdens in times of peace, President Brown, of the New York Central Railway, before the Minnesota Bankers' Association, expressed the desire that the money spent in building at least one battleship could be devoted to the work of improved, intelligent agriculture. It would be enough, he said, to establish two splendid agricultural demonstration farms in each State, and he believed the increased product accruing would in ten years pay for all the ships of all the navies in the world.

It is a mistake to assume that the establishment of a certain industry in a country through tariff intervention is necessarily of advantage to that country. It may be a costly disadvantage. This may be so, even though no increase in price of the commodity results. The transfer of a 25 or 35-per-cent. premium from the national customs house to some manufacturer's pocket deprives the country of just that much revenue, which must then be raised in some other way. The indirect advantages to the community resulting from the establishment of the new industry would have to be very great indeed to balance that loss. When a large new industry can be established by a temporary protection of say ten or fifteen per cent., it may sometimes be advisable, but thirty or fifty-per-cent. protection is absurd.

An immense number of new silos are going up in Canada. This is encouraging, indeed, but it is hardly a matter for congratulation that we should have taken a generation to become generally convinced of the profits of corn-growing and ensilage. Even to-day, probably not one-quarter of the farmers in Ontario have silos, while only a few have grown alfalfa to any extent worth mentioning. These, and many similar facts that could be mentioned, speak loudly of opportunities unimproved, and lend weight to Mr. Flavelle's somewhat overemphasized indictment of agricultural enterprise. There are, of course, explanations and extenuating circumstances. While we are not all forehanded enough to do even the things we are convinced would prove profitable, nevertheless, many of us are in a position to do much better than we have done. More earnest study of books, bulletins and the agricultural press, more earnest thinking, more receptiveness to [illegible] ideas, more energetic application of these new [illegible] and more headwork generally will tell ama[illegible] in the way of increased agricultural prod[illegible] and improved rural conditions. Let us [illegible] improve.

Who will Pick Our Plums?

In the symposium of farmers' opinions, published last week in reply to that trenchant article, "What is the Matter with Ontario Agriculture?" Mr. Campbell takes a rather neat lift out of Mr. Flavelle by answering: Nothing, only that hogs are now paying 120 per cent. Developing an argument along this line, he expresses the opinion that farmers will maintain present halcyon conditions by taking good care that production of agricultural products does not soon again overtake demand. There is, however, another side to the case. While we rest on our oars, other countries will certainly seize the opportunity to cinch our export markets. The steady-going Dane is not asleep. Agricultural Ireland is waking up. Argentina bulks yearly larger as a source of world food supplies. New Zealand begins to cut a figure in the British cheese market, and so all along the line. Unless this agricultural country is content to raise less than enough food for its own population, it behooves us to keep pegging away with a steady supply of choice goods regularly forwarded to our export markets, holding our own, or increasing our grip upon them. We are under no obligation to do this in the interest of the cheese-buyer or pork-packer. But it will pay to do it for our own sake. Steadily increasing production, developing expanding markets, is the soundest policy. Opportunities in trade are fruits that do not wait long to be plucked. If one nation does not snatch them, another will. Are we content to let the other fellow pick our plums?

The Invading Moth.

The addition of experienced field workers to the staff of the Dominion Entomologist (Dr. C. Gordon Hewitt), as announced in last week's issue of "The Farmer's Advocate," to aid in coping with the Brown-tail moth invasion in the Maritime Provinces, is commendable, and necessary to the enforcement of the Destructive Insects and Pests Act, which, with foresight, the Minister of Agriculture, Hon. Sydney Fisher, had placed on the Canadian statutes last winter. The Brown-tail-moth area now extends from Rhode Island, northward along the coast of the State of Maine to the Canadian frontier, and the Gipsy moth has already spread as far north as York and Cumberland Counties, in Maine, within 100 miles of Canadian territory. There is little doubt, in the opinion of competent entomologists, that in a few years these two pests will be among the most serious with which the Canadian authorities and people will have to deal. Altogether, about one million dollars are being spent annually in the warfare against these moths in Massachusetts, and to this end the State alone devotes more than one-tenth its annual budget, the Federal Government contributing an equal sum. The serious and alarming nature of the devastation wrought by these two insects cannot be realized by anyone who has not visited the States affected, where large areas of forest and fruit trees have been defoliated and killed, or are dying. And not only this, but the personal discomfort arising from the irritating hairs of the larvæ of the Brown-tail moth is very great, and in several cases has already proven fatal. Laboratory workers and other specialists engaged in the campaign against the moths have to protect their hands and faces against the contact. Many towns along the Atlantic coast have lost large sums of money owing to the fact that people will not now spend their summer vacations there, because of the disagreeable presence of the moth caterpillars. It is, therefore, necessary to take every possible precaution to control the Brown-tail moth, and to meet the Gipsy moth upon its arrival. Readers of "The Farmer's Advocate" in the Eastern portion of Canada can render aid in countering the invasion, by sending to the Division of Entomology, at the Central Experimental Farm, Ottawa, any suspicious moths, caterpillars, winter nests or egg-masses which they discover and may believe to be the Brown-tail or Gipsy moth.

Some Flaws in Mr. Biggar's Argument.

Sincerity and temperateness in argument are qualities that must always command respect. Mr. Biggar has exhibited both in his lucid communication, entitled, "The Farmer and the Wool Tariff," published in "The Farmer's Advocate" last week. He has, furthermore, presented some facts calculated to add to the general information on the subject treated. His argument, however, while plausible to the casual reader, lacks cogency when subjected to the critical examination of cold, economic logic. Starting out with a frank admission that direct taxation would be a better and fairer way than customs tariffs to raise revenue for Governmental purposes, he proceeds to grant that, under our accepted policy of tariffs, involving a considerable element of protection calculated to build up a diversified system of national industries, agriculture has always had the short end of the stick—has borne the heft of the burden, in other words. He then invites Canadian sheep-raisers to espouse a policy of tariff revision designed to place a moderate duty on wool, a larger duty on tops, noils and yarns, a very high duty on woollen cloth, and a still higher one on manufactured clothing. The consumer is seductively cheered with the promise that after we have, at his expense, developed a vast, strongly-organized, highly-specialized woollen industry, as the United States has done, at a staggering cost, spread over a good part of a century, equally attractive values in woollen goods may eventually be obtained here as we now procure. Indeed, Mr. Biggar is even more optimistic than this. He offers the opinion that it is questionable whether the consumer would, under present-day conditions, pay more for his suit of clothes if higher duties were placed on woollen goods, "because the chief profit, after all, goes to the merchant or merchant tailor, and not to the maker of the cloth." Passing by this ingenious palliation of the incidence of a tariff burden, it is enough to point out that, unless prices were lowered as a result of home manufacture—and early consummation of this is improbable—we would, by using home-manufactured woollens, lose exactly the amount of the net customs duties which are at present collected, and which now go to defray Governmental expenditure. A dollar extra tacked on to the price of an imported article by reason of duty is not lost, but goes into the Dominion treasury. A dollar extra levied on the price of a home product (as compared with equal value in foreign goods), by reason of the duty, is either an outright economic loss or an extra profit to the producer, or may be partly both. This important principle, Mr. Biggar should not ignore. To say that a country can, by its fiscal system, put money in one citizen's pocket without taking it from another's—save to a slight extent—is tantamount to arguing that one can add by subtraction. It is absurd. To realize that Canadian agriculture is handicapped by our present system of tariff protection, and propose to remedy present burdens by adding others (in return for small concessions), is not good sense. Because we have, at an expense of many million dollars, established an iron and steel industry, only to see it wasting its substance in a gigantic legal battle, is scarcely sufficient reason for repeating that expensive brand of fiscal folly in the case of the