

THE SEMI-WEEKLY TELEGRAPH is issued every Wednesday and Saturday by THE TELEGRAPH PUBLISHING COMPANY, SAINT JOHN, N. B., incorporated by Act of the Legislature of New Brunswick.

**E. W. McCREADY,**  
President and Manager.

**SUBSCRIPTION RATES**—Sent by mail to any address in Canada at one dollar a year. Sent by mail to any address in the United States at two dollars a year. All subscriptions must be paid in advance.

In mailing price of subscription always send money by post office order or registered letter.

**ADVERTISING RATES**—Ordinary commercial advertisements, taking the run of the paper, each insertion, \$1.00 per inch.

Advertisements of Wants, For Sale, etc., one cent a word for each insertion.

**IMPORTANT NOTICE**—All remittances must be sent by post office order or registered letter, and addressed to The Telegraph Publishing Company.

Correspondence must be addressed to the Editor of The Telegraph, St. John, N. B. All letters sent to The Semi-Weekly Telegraph and intended for publication should contain stamps if return of manuscript is desired in case it is not published. Otherwise, rejected letters are destroyed.

**Semi-Weekly Telegraph and the News**

ST. JOHN, N. B., SEPTEMBER 6, 1916.

#### AFTER THE WAR.

The war will change many conditions, but here in Canada it will leave many of the old problems unsettled, and not a few of them in much greater need of just settlement. Is there any political party in Canada which is preparing adequately to deal with the domestic questions which will press still more insistently for treatment, if Canada is to continue to be a good place in which a great majority of the population may live?

Political leaders who serve their party merely are of little use. Politics is a poor line of endeavor unless it continually evolves measures and movements for the general good, unless it develops the vision and the courage necessary to prepare the ground for good seed. Today in Canada the cost of living is a vexed question in every community, and it tends to become more rather than less troublesome. Among those of small income the enhanced cost of necessities is already a heavy burden, and to some a tragic one. Just at the moment, in St. John, Ottawa, and other centres, there is an agitation over the price of milk. A few months ago it was bread. Often it has been shoes. What the country has to learn is that there is no single or simple remedy for any of these conditions, but that selfish competition, unrestrained, and even fostered by protectionist laws, is bound to result in increasing strain and unhappiness under our modern conditions. No one class can be held responsible for the rapid rise in the cost of living, but just as no one class is to blame for the uneven distribution of this world's goods. Not long ago it was the fashion to say that monopolies and combines had brought high prices upon us, and that the punishment and dissolution of such combinations was the only way out of the trouble. That theory was only partly sound. In an article on the cost of living the Saturday Evening Post acquires the trusts and combines on wholly insufficient evidence, but in doing so it brings to the public attention the amazing advance of the prices of certain necessities in the United States, which advance can be duplicated largely in Canada. Let us look at its figures rather than at its theories. It says:

"Every now and then we get a letter that attributes high prices to trusts and combinations. We should rather like to believe it, for that would obviously simplify a very troublesome problem; but there is really no evidence. Such evidence as exists, on the whole, negatives that assumption. The Bureau of Labor Statistics of the Department of Commerce recently issued, for example, its usual review of retail prices for 1915, covering forty-four cities in different parts of the country. All kinds of fresh beef and all poultry products were cheaper than in 1914, though there is a highly centralized meat trade. Wheat flour, corn meal and sugar were decidedly dearer. On the whole, however, the report on wholesale prices from 1896 to the end of 1914 shows that all the commodities covered rose, roughly, fifty per cent. Farm products, not much subject to combination, rose ninety-four per cent. Fuel and lighting, in which there is a considerable element of combination, rose thirty-five per cent. Metals and metal products, more extensively combined, rose seven per cent."

"You may turn to house-furnishing goods, which actually declined three per cent, and say that, but for combinations, improved methods of manufacture and distribution would have brought about a fall in metal products; but that does not answer the question: What causes prices to rise? Food and lumber and building materials rose in practically the same degree. So far as we can make out, trusts and combinations have so little to do with price movements, as a whole, that they are hardly worth considering."

Some of these figures certainly give reason for considerable thought. They would be of more value if they were accompanied by similar information as to the advance in wages, to the incomes of salaried men, and in the returns which manufacturers and capitalists have received from their investments. And so far as such information is of value in both Canada and the United States, it should be read in connection with the fact that about ninety per cent. of the people in the Western Hemisphere have very moderate or very small incomes. Yet they control the balance of power politically and can, when they wish, produce by the mere process of voting the most sweeping of political resolutions.

In approaching the question of political treatment of domestic problems, then, we should keep in mind that policies which are sound and which respond to the need of the time must be those which are designed to promote the welfare of the population as a whole. Such policies will not emerge if the political power in any country is controlled by a comparatively small number of people and by those interests of which they are in control or with which they maintain, openly or secretly, an effective offensive and defensive alliance.

A great deal of our political legislation is based on the assumption that industries which can only flourish in this country by means of high protection must be encouraged even though the people at large are thereby compelled to pay unreasonable prices for articles of necessity. The Ottawa Citizen cites one Canadian industry—shoes—in support of which the workers of Canada are contributing \$35,000 a day in tariff duties. The industry employs 17,000 hands, and it is argued that, unless the business were protected by the tariff, the boot and shoe workers would lose their occupation. To this the Citizen replies:

"Taking the 1911 figures again, it is shown that the number of workers totalled approximately 17,000 and that their aggregate wages totalled some \$7,500,000. But, as the workers contributed over ten million dollars to give 17,000 workers wages amounting to \$7,500,000, it is obvious that, for the same money as they contributed to the 'protection' of the boot and shoe industry, they could have paid these 17,000 workers the same wages for walking the street—and still be about \$8,000,000 better off."

It does not necessarily follow from this that tomorrow the tariff should be taken off shoes—it is the whole situation that must be studied. But it does follow that the Canadian tariff needs that sort of revision which will tend to give employment to Canadians at home in industries which this country, by reason of its position and its natural products, is able to carry on successfully in competition with the world. This must be a great manufacturing country. There is every reason why it should be. The factories are as necessary as the farms, for we cannot all live in the country. But a tariff intended to foster industries should foster the kind which have some chance to get beyond the infant stage and stand on their own feet. If that principle be ignored, as it has been ignored now to a great extent for forty years, we have a costly crop of special privileges, a growing suppression of free competition, and a sharpening of the lines between various sections of the population—a tendency, in fact, to divide the people, broadly speaking, into two main groups, the first a small one and the second a big one, but with power in the hands of the few who may use it for their selfish ends. In time that would mean that they and their dependents and allies would exploit a loosely organized or wholly unorganized public.

The extent to which this has already happened in Canada is a debatable question, and on both sides of the argument there are extremists. One group minimizes, as the other exaggerates, the growth and the evils arising from class legislation and special privilege in this country. The truth lies between such extremes. The need is for such a general study and understanding of the situation as will check these evils and promote among all our people a better appreciation of the truth that legislation should aim at the public good—the greatest good of the greatest number—and that while a citizen should be firm in demanding justice for himself, he should be quick to see that his neighbor, or the men in other stations or occupations, are equally entitled to the full measure of freedom of action, protection by the state, and equality of opportunity.

The price of milk, the enhanced cost of shoes, the scarcity of money among those of small income in a day of rising values (or the falling purchasing power of money) are in a sense not separate questions calling for special treatment, but parts of one great question which is both social and political, and which challenges the genius of our public men to-day. Next year and the next, and for years to come the challenge will be louder and more insistent. Those in public life who seek to meet it with the old answers, with compromises, with opportunism, with the nostrums of politics, will be shamed and set aside in time, though in the interval they may cost the country dear.

There has been no time in our history when Canada so needed men of courage and vision as she will need them during the period following the war. It will be strange if the country does not, in the near future, develop a greater independence in political thinking, a quicker distrust of pretenders in public life, a livelier scorn of the colorless men in both parties, a robust and aggressive demand for government of the people for the people. A Lloyd George is needed to preach a crusade among us. The high cost of living is only a symptom which indicates how badly we need what the editor of The Spectator once described as "a new way of life." National happiness, national sanity, national greatness cannot spring from the mere triumphs of an iron materialism. True leaders must look beyond gets of trade figures and tables of prices, and trace from the old but neglected premise that no country is truly rich, or great, or admirable, merely because of its national wealth or its extent of trade. The welfare of its people is the real measure of a country's quality. The new politics will need a soul as well as a brain if we are to fare well and honorably in the years that are coming. The leaders and the led have to learn that happiness and tranquility, so far as they are possible, are not purchasable commodities. We get some glimpse now of what the war's agony has done for France, for the soul of the country. How much of

## KAISER'S DAUGHTER AND HER HUSBAND, WHO IS REPORTED INSANE



The Duke of Brunswick, who married Princess Victoria Louise in May, 1913, is said to have been so affected by his experience on the Russian front that he has become a victim of confirmed melancholia.

sound philosophy, what better sense of proportion, will Canada gain from the war? Unless the gains are great we shall not soon begin really to solve such problems as "the increased cost of living," and others like it. They are but indications of our real trouble, and their seat and source are not to be found in the pocket-book.

**RE-ENTER MR. FLEMING.**  
A conspicuous headline in the Standard, which headline many Conservatives and other troubled adherents of the government throughout the province will read with rising eyebrows, is as follows: "MR. FLEMING TO TAKE PART IN CAMPAIGN."

Under this headline the Standard, which is the mouthpiece of the government and the party, says that Mr. Fleming's decision "to take part in the coming campaign is a source of great pleasure to his many friends. He is an eloquent and forceful speaker and will doubtless be of vast assistance to the minister's forces in the coming campaign."

The government's campaign is taking on all the signs of a perfect work. Let us see how the matter stands. To make Mr. Smith Minister of Public Works was enough. To trot out Premier Fleming, with the verdict of the Dugal Royal Commission still showing through the coat of whitewash applied to him by a servile Legislature, looks like adding the one extra straw to the already overloaded camel. The animal's back will not stand it.

For the association of these two men means what? By selecting Mr. Smith the government showed what kind of a government it is, and what kind of a Minister of Public Works it wanted, in this day when the province is crying out for reform. And to call in Mr. Fleming as an orator to trumpet the work of the administration and the virtues of the new Minister of Public Works—what could be a more perfect combination of high morality and deep political strategy?

The people of New Brunswick are asking for clean government and a new set of representatives, alert, progressive, honest, determined to protect the public interest. In response to that demand the government presents:

Hon. B. F. Smith.  
Hon. J. K. Fleming.

Westmorland county declined to give the government a certificate of character, or an extension of power, or permission to add to its cabinet circle, even though the administration there put forward as its standard-bearer a business man of good repute. His sole office was that he came as an apologist for a government beyond apology. With the Westmorland lesson still in mind the government now confronts the country with its impudent proposal to whistle the verdicts of its own Royal Commissions down the wind and tell the people that their interests, that the patronage, yes, and the greatest measure of control over the public treasury, shall be continued in the hands of B. F. Smith and J. K. Fleming as such other congenial souls as would naturally seek advancement in such company.

The Standard tells us that Mr. Fleming is "an eloquent and forceful speaker." He was. There are people in every one of the country districts who can remember when he made the tears come to their eyes by harrowing recitals of the extravagance of the old government which was ruining the country by buying white gloves for the little pages in the Legislative Assembly. Mr. Fleming solemnly denounced that extravagance. He preached economy, and at times he seemed almost to convince himself of his own sincerity.

And the time came when he had

great power with the people. They believed in him. In that day

"One blast upon his bugle horn  
Was worth a thousand men."

But a little later one blast upon the same horn was worth a thousand dollars, from one source or another, and then \$2,000, and then, with the assistance of W. H. Berry and others, the cost of the bugle music ran up to \$70,000, and \$187,000, and no one knows how much more. The apostle of purity and economy did more to degrade public life in New Brunswick than any other of his day and generation. And he was able to do so because he had won the trust of the people by words of base hypocrisy and pretence.

And this is the eloquent gentleman who is now to lead the campaign of advocacy which is to reconcile the voters of Carleton county to Mr. Smith's toying with the patriotic potatoes and with the "Touque Indian" reserve, and with those other activities in which he dealt from motives of white-hot patriotism.

Presumably the same master strategist who selected Hon. Benjamin Franklin Smith as Minister of Public Works is also responsible for the resurrection of Mr. James Kidd Fleming. Well, who ever may be the political genius responsible for this line of action surely, in Tallyrand's epigram, "It is worse than a crime, it is a blunder."

It is both. What will Carleton county say to it? And what is more important still, what will the other counties in New Brunswick say to it? When they get a chance to speak there will be no uncertain sound.

**WELL, IT IS MR. SUTTON.**

Friday, Sept. 1.

When the Hon. B. F. Smith, at yesterday's government convention in Woodstock, asked "Who will stand by my right hand and keep the bridge with me?" there was a noticeable pause. Then in a tone by no means vigorous or vibrant the selected victim replied, "I will," and when men looked, lo there was Mr. W. S. Sutton, Mayor of Woodstock. He is the man who feels proud and honored by the chance to become the running mate of Mr. B. F. Smith. That is the fact Mr. Sutton himself has placed on the records. Worse yet, he found himself praised a little later, along with Mr. Smith, by whom? Why, by ex-Premier James K. Fleming, who was the chief convention orator. The hero of the Crown Timber fund and the railway "collection" gave Mr. Sutton and Mr. Smith his blessing, which ought to help some—and made an announcement of his own. It contained a piece of news which will be of interest all over the province—namely, over Canada Mr. Fleming said he had "decided to remain in public life." Indeed! The people of New Brunswick will have to be consulted about that. They will decide.

But today they will note that the Fleming-Smith partnership has been renewed. A few weeks ago in Westmorland Mr. B. F. Smith told the people Mr. Fleming had done *good*, but that since then the government had cleaned house. That was mere make-believe, handed out because Mr. Smith thought the Westmorland atmosphere demanded some sign of compunction or contrition. But the pretence is gone now. Back on his native heath Mr. Fleming, and together they hang out the old sign: The same old business at the same old stand. Carleton county is asked by the government to swallow this sort of thing without a wry-face. Carleton county must be highly honored by the government's opinion of it.

As for the other counties—now awaiting their turn—they know what the Smith-Fleming re-union means, and what it will mean if the government, with these men high in its councils, could continue to cling to power.

**SIR SAM AGAIN.**

General Sir Sam Hughes was interviewed by the London Daily Chronicle on July 30. Sir Sam is a busy man, but the press interviewer appears to encounter little difficulty in breaking through his natural crust of reserve and reticence. The Chronicle reporter asked our leading military and political representative many questions about conditions in this country. Here are some extracts:

"What are the prospects of the coming harvests in Canada?"  
"They are excellent. We shall have plenty of cereals to spare for you in this country. We have had some beautiful rains, and if we only escape early frosts, we shall reap the biggest crop this year that we have ever done."

"Are you making any arrangements for the replacing of your men when they return after the war?"  
"We shall have room for them all—and as many more as like to come. We are opening out large areas in the northwest by building new railways."

All of which would be fine and impressive but for one or two files in the omnium which are discovered by the Ottawa Citizen. It says of the interview:

"This has the right ring to it. The fact that our crop is not the biggest—that it is about eighty per cent. of last year's—and that we are building no new railways (for which the public should be devoutly thankful) while we have done absolutely nothing for our returned soldiers should not be allowed to mar the impression created by our military sphinx."

The Citizen should remember that great and daring minds are never hampered by the mere facts.

**DAYLIGHT SAVING.**

Youth is essentially prodigal. The young have before them, as they see it, an endless period of health, and of enjoyment, of fresh air, and of sunshine. The supply of all these good things, as it is learned later, is not so boundless as it seems.

With maturity comes, as one of the compensations of the passing years, a wholly new and much truer appreciation of the open air, and of the sunlight, and of such leisure as can be wisely employed. But both young and old quickly recognize the value of a longer day when it means more freedom in the sun.

Impatient folk tell us that it is useless to doctor the clock and to attempt to deceive ourselves by reading from its face something that is not true. That is the pessimist's idea of daylight-saving. But even the pessimist this year in St. John has had an uncommon supply of daylight thrust upon him under the daylight saving plan, and in a shame-faced sort of way he has enjoyed it, immensely.

It has been wisely decided that the clock shall be changed again next week, and already the public thought is going forward to next year, and what will then be possible and advisable. It seems to friends of the daylight-saving movement that it has been essentially a great success. Against this some voices—some say a great number—are raised in protest. But what seems to be the truth is that the only weakness in the scheme was a lack of uniform practice. The railroads did not come into line, and the province generally adhered to the old system. This made for confusion, and in some instances for injustice. It comes down to this, that during the coming autumn and winter public opinion in various parts of Canada should be tested to ascertain whether the adoption of the new time for four months next summer cannot be made uniform throughout Canada, or whether each province must still continue to make the best arrangement upon which its people can agree.

The people of Great Britain, when the daylight-saving plan was brought into operation there, accepted it without question and ceased to think in two times. Having turned the hands of the clock, they did not look backward. The thing was settled, and well settled, and they went on with the business of the day. The country almost instantly readjusted itself, and hence it secured the full benefit to which the scheme gave rise.

It seems difficult to persuade some folk that early rising in the summer, a longer time out of doors, a more protracted enjoyment of daylight hours, are really valuable. One sometimes thinks these are folk who are open to conviction, but would like to see the man who could convince them. Perhaps that is too harsh a description, for, after all, the individual, if his occupation permits, must be a law unto himself in the matter of going to bed and getting up. But if one could conduct a group of the dissenters to the country early some fine summer morning—very early—to see the sunrise, while the winds are still asleep, they would feel creeping into their consciousness a fresh understanding of those lines penned by one who had the vision of an eagle and who was always young at heart:

"Night's candles are burnt out, and  
Jocund day  
Stands tiptoe on the misty mountain-tops."

Here in the North we get little enough of the daylight and the sun. If we can borrow a little more, and add somewhat to the joy of living at the same time, is it not the part of folly to refuse?

**NOTE AND COMMENT.**

Conservatives in New Brunswick will be struck by Sir Herbert Tupper's statement of a citizen's duty to condemn evil government whether it falls itself Conservative, or Liberal, or Coalition. He is a Conservative of Conservatives, says:

"I am a Conservative and always have been. I do not believe, however, in supporting a government simply because it calls itself Conservative, especially when

that government is in the hands of a man whose sole conception of politics is 'author.' Mr. Bower himself states that it is necessary to 'grease the palm of an Indian' at times. I deny there is any such necessity. For the Premier of a government to excuse bribery on the ground of necessity is exactly the same as for a nation to excuse the violation of Belgium on the ground of necessity."

Let public-spirited Conservatives apply Sir Herbert's reasoning to the New Brunswick situation today. The public interest rises above all individuals, all parties. No label can excuse crime: no party allegiance warrants a defence or support of rotten politics and the men responsible for it.

Everybody in New Brunswick who really desires to see the affairs of the province conducted on a higher plane, ought to observe the refusal of Hon. B. Frank Smith to enter into an agreement with the Opposition to carry on the Carleton county campaign without the use of money or liquor.

The nature of Mr. Sutton's introduction to the province at large is unfortunate. A man is still known by the company he keeps. Mr. Sutton is praised, and supported, and backed by Mr. Smith and Mr. Fleming. Query: What sort of a man is Mr. Sutton?

It is not easy to grasp at once the full meaning of the British casualties, on all fronts, during August: 4,711 officers and 123,234 men killed, wounded or missing. It is a frightful toll, and it may be worse before it is better. Yet the price of complete victory will be paid. There is no other way.

The confident hope that Mr. James Kidd Fleming would again be Premier some day was expressed by more than one speaker at the convention which nominated Messrs. Smith and Sutton. The country can't afford it. Mr. Fleming is too costly a luxury. Hon. Mr. McLeod's figures show that.

Those who vote for the good of the province will vote against Messrs. Smith and Sutton in Carleton county, and in every county for a change of government just so soon as the Lieutenant-Governor and his advisers are willing to permit the judgment of the people to be recorded. Vote for New Brunswick.

When Mr. Fleming takes the stump in Carleton county he should read to his audience the sworn statement of Mr. H. M. Blair, containing a document prepared by the former Provincial Secretary of this province, Hon. H. F. McLeod. The people of Carleton county know the contents of that statement, but it would take on new beauties and a fresh significance if they could hear it from the lips of Mr. Fleming himself. Will he read it?

**A Lesson in Farming.**  
(Montreal, Mail.)

For more than two years, Germany has been cut off from the trade of the world, to a most important extent. It has been necessary for the Germans to make the greatest possible use of agriculture, indeed, if they had not been able to obtain from the land an exceptional yield, it may be doubted if the people would have been sustained.

It is the business of patriotism to estimate and appreciate what the enemy has done and to make practical application of the lessons to be drawn from his accomplishments. Any talk about this or that which must be done in the reconstruction that is to follow the war is comparatively useless. Canada must face the facts, which explain Germany's ability to sustain a people with millions of men in the field for more than two years on cultivated area that, under ordinary conditions, would not furnish the required food supply.

A comparison between German and Canadian methods of farming may be drawn by contrasting the average yield per acre of the principal field crops in the two countries for 1914. It will be remembered that Canada has a distinct advantage in soil, that of Germany having been used over and over again for hundreds of years, while much of the area under cultivation in Canada in 1915 was comparatively virgin.

Of wheat, Germany in 1915 produced 85.0 bushels per acre, while Canada produced 21.04.  
In rye, Germany produced 30.4 bushels per acre, while we produced 29.3.  
In barley, Germany produced 40.9 bushels per acre, while we produced 29.9.

In oats, Germany obtained 61.0 bushels per acre, while we were getting 30.78.  
In potatoes, we obtained 165.38 bushels per acre while the Germans were getting 283.4.  
This is rather impressive evidence of what has been done in Germany mainly by constant and scientific fertilization of the soil and by educating the farmer's face for the work he ought to do instead of preparing him to leave the land and live in the city.

The increased use of potash salts and nitrates is held by experts to explain the big production of German farmers. In 1914, Germany imported nitrates from Chili to the value of \$41,000,000 and when war deprived her of this supply, her scientists had a sufficient grasp of the situation to find a substitute in certain domestic products.

We Canadians consider ours a great agricultural country and so it is, but Canada owes her agricultural greatness more to natural advantages than to our actual accomplishments in the world of farming. Production can be doubled or tripled when we find out how to apply the advantages of science to the soil, and the knowledge we lack is available, since the essential methods of German agriculture are a matter of record.

Desire to profit by efficient German methods in any line of industry is compatible with a hearty dislike and distrust of Germany and the Germans. The best way to defeat the ends of Germany now and in the future is to imitate each of her methods as are better than our own.

Beyond a doubt, in the matter of scientific agriculture, including fertilization, education, organized effort, the use of mixed farming and crop rotation, the Germans are far ahead of us. One of the essential needs in preparation for the coming period of reconstruction is appreciation and use of this fact in Canada.

The Fond Mother (to adventurous offspring)—Come away from the cliff, will you? Do yer want to dash yerself to pieces in yer best suit!—Sketch.

## LETTERS TO THE EDITOR

(The opinions of correspondents are not necessarily those of The Telegraph. This newspaper does not undertake to publish all or any of the letters received. Unsigned communications will not be noticed. Write on one side of paper only. Communications will be rejected. Stamps which will be returned of manuscript is desired in case it is not used. The name and address of the writer should be sent with every letter, as evidence of good faith.—Editor, Telegraph.)

**THE MISSEP AND THE SALMON.**

To the Editor of The Telegraph:  
Sir—In reply to the question from John White in yesterday's Telegraph, I take pleasure in giving the following information, and would be glad to give verbally to Mr. White, or to any other interested person, full details of what I have learned with regard to the "Missep-Salmon Question."

(1) The dam is not the only obstruction preventing the salmon entering the river.

(2) That the opening in the dam referred to is about five feet in diameter and located near the base, that it may be likened to a tunnel, the distance through the dam at this part being considerable, and that there would be a high waterfall at the mouth of the tunnel which, I think, that the salmon would not be able to surmount under present conditions.

(3) That the allowing of the water to pass through this tunnel, as suggested, would, if continued for a considerable length of time, cause the destruction of the dam.

(4) That I have seen the engineers' reports, mentioned by Mr. White, but I have been informed, and it appears from their reports, that the investigations made by these engineers were not complete, and that there is a possibility of obtaining, without great expenditure, a sufficient continuous flow of water in the river to make it advisable for the city to bring into use the existing dam.

(5) That if it should be found that the water power could be used, and I hope that our new engineer, Mr. McInnes, will investigate and report upon it, I think that it would be impossible to spare the water, which is necessary for the fishery, or to assume the very large expenditure involved in providing same.

Thanking you, Mr. Editor, for the space, and regretting exceedingly having to discontinue my efforts to have the stream opened up to the salmon, I remain,

Yours respectfully,  
G. FRED FISHER.

**THE MILK QUESTION.**

To the Editor of The Telegraph:  
Sir—Would you kindly allow me a small space in your valuable paper to answer Mr. Farmer and to offer a few suggestions to solve the trouble between the farmer and the dealer? The dealer, as a rule, is in sympathy with the farmer about the high cost of feeds and live stock and wages, but what we dealers want to know from the farmer is what the farmer gets for the milk he sells to the consumer? The consumer has nothing to do with the rise in prices. The farmer says that the war has all to do with it. I fairly believe it may have a little to do with it, but little. I want to ask "Farmer" if the war was on in the year 1911, Sept. 21, when the farmer could have had, hands down, what he is asking us dealers to take off the "farmer's" table today. Does not the "farmer" know he has the key in his hand to all he is asking now from the poor family, and he failed to turn it and open the door? Now, what we want the dealer to do is to place the sin where it belongs, on the people of St. John, who have nothing to do with his troubles, and he will find the people of St. John, as a rule, and milk dealers, will help him get what he is asking for. But the dealers refuse to have the big interests to pass that extra cost through them to the consumer's table. The dealers of St. John are going to stand by the people of St. John on this question and the farmer knows it. When the proper time comes, which we hope will be this fall, and then we will take our costs off and see he gets what he is looking for, namely, less cost of living to the consumer.

A comparison between German and Canadian methods of farming may be drawn by contrasting the average yield per acre of the principal field crops in the two countries for 1914. It will be remembered that Canada has a distinct advantage in soil, that of Germany having been used over and over again for hundreds of years, while much of the area under cultivation in Canada in 1915 was comparatively virgin.

Of wheat, Germany in 1915 produced 85.0 bushels per acre, while Canada produced 21.04.  
In rye, Germany produced 30.4 bushels per acre, while we produced 29.3.  
In barley, Germany produced 40.9 bushels per acre, while we produced 29.9.

In oats, Germany obtained 61.0 bushels per acre, while we were getting 30.78.  
In potatoes, we obtained 165.38 bushels per acre while the Germans were getting 283.4.  
This is rather impressive evidence of what has been done in Germany mainly by constant and scientific fertilization of the soil and by educating the farmer's face for the work he ought to do instead of preparing him to leave the land and live in the city.

The increased use of potash salts and nitrates is held by experts to explain the big production of German farmers. In 1914, Germany imported nitrates from Chili to the value of \$41,000,000 and when war deprived her of this supply, her scientists had a sufficient grasp of the situation to find a substitute in certain domestic products.

We Canadians consider ours a great agricultural country and so it is, but Canada owes her agricultural greatness more to natural advantages than to our actual accomplishments in the world of farming. Production can be doubled or tripled when we find out how to apply the advantages of science to the soil, and the knowledge we lack is available, since the essential methods of German agriculture are a matter of record.

Desire to profit by efficient German methods in any line of industry is compatible with a hearty dislike and distrust of Germany and the Germans. The best way to defeat the ends of Germany now and in the future is to imitate each of her methods as are better than our own.

Beyond a doubt, in the matter of scientific agriculture, including fertilization, education, organized effort, the use of mixed farming and crop rotation, the Germans are far ahead of us. One of the essential needs in preparation for the coming period of reconstruction is appreciation and use of this fact in Canada.

The Fond Mother (to adventurous offspring)—Come away from the cliff, will you? Do yer want to dash yerself to pieces in yer best suit!—Sketch.

**THE MILK QUESTION.**  
To the Editor of The Telegraph:  
Sir—Would you kindly allow me a small space in your valuable paper to answer Mr. Farmer and to offer a few suggestions to solve the trouble between the farmer and the dealer? The dealer, as a rule, is in sympathy with the farmer about the high cost of feeds and live stock and wages, but what we dealers want to know from the farmer is what the farmer gets for the milk he sells to the consumer? The consumer has nothing to do with the rise in prices. The farmer says that the war has all to do with it. I fairly believe it may have a little to do with it, but little. I want to ask "Farmer" if the war was on in the year 1911, Sept. 21, when the farmer could have had, hands down, what he is asking us dealers to take off the "farmer's" table today. Does not the "farmer" know he has the key in his hand to all he is asking now from the poor family, and he failed to turn it and open the door? Now, what we want the dealer to do is to place the sin where it belongs, on the people of St. John, who have nothing to do with his troubles, and he will find the people of St. John, as a rule, and milk dealers, will help him get what he is asking for. But the dealers refuse to have the big interests to pass that extra cost through them to the consumer's table. The dealers of St. John are going to stand by the people of St. John on this question and the farmer knows it. When the proper time comes, which we hope will be this fall, and then we will take our costs off and see he gets what he is looking for, namely, less cost of living to the consumer.

A comparison between German and Canadian methods of farming may be drawn by contrasting the average yield per acre of the principal field crops in the two countries for 1914. It will be remembered that Canada has a distinct advantage in soil, that of Germany having been used over and over again for hundreds of years, while much of the area under cultivation in Canada in 1915 was comparatively virgin.

Of wheat, Germany in 1915 produced 85.0 bushels per acre, while Canada produced 21.04.  
In rye, Germany produced 30.4 bushels per acre, while we produced