

REFLECTIONS

By THE EDITOR

In Town and Out

WHETHER one lives in the town or in the country, he is interested in the methods adopted to keep the rural population on the land. As citizens, we are either interested in land development or in the price of products grown on the land. To every householder and every housewife this is a vital problem. Even those who live in apartments are affected by the prices of apples, potatoes, butter, eggs, cheese, poultry and meats.

Therefore we should all take a deep and abiding interest in all efforts to keep the people on the land, and to enlarge the output derived from every unit of labour. Canada's urban population, as in all other countries, is growing faster than its rural population, hence the price of foodstuffs goes steadily up. Every effort to stem this tide is vital to us all, vital individually and vital nationally. Cheap food means strong, healthy bodies. Cheap food lowers the cost of living. Cheap food means lower wages for the mechanic and still leaves him a wider margin for saving. Cheap food begets cheap manufacturing.

Every movement to teach agriculture in rural schools, every change towards graded country schools instead of the one-roomed school-house of old, every advance in the methods of production employed by the farmer means better times for him and for all the rest of us.

Manitoba's Example

STRANGE as it may appear, Manitoba is doing more along the line of keeping people on the farm and keeping the farmer progressive than any other province in the Dominion. Some of the others are making an effort, but none is equaling Manitoba. And the inspiration of it all is the Minister of Education, Hon. G. R. Coldwell.

I have never met with Mr. Coldwell. Whether he is a big man or little, fair or dark, energetic or sluggish, I don't know. But watching his work for years from the outside, and hearing of it from many sources, I have come to believe that it is exceptionally apt. On his good work in establishing consolidated or graded schools for country districts, the CANADIAN COURIER has had several articles. Now, it is opportune to speak of his course in agriculture for rural schools.

Ontario and Nova Scotia have been trying to teach agriculture in rural schools, but have not got much farther than trying to train teachers and establishing skimpy flower gardens. They cannot get much farther until they get consolidated schools, situated on five, ten or fifteen-acre plots. Trying to teach agriculture on a rural school ground one hundred feet square is a joke. The school yards of rural Ontario have seldom enough area to lay out a football ground or a baseball diamond for the kids, to say nothing of illustration vegetable and grain plots.

Mr. Coldwell has established the larger school ground in connection with his consolidated schools. These school-grounds are big enough to accommodate a miniature farm and still leave large play areas for all the children the big vans bring in from the five-mile circle. Alberta has decided to adopt the same plan. Prince Edward Island is going that way. Perhaps in a few years the other provinces will wake up and follow.

Manitoba's Methods

AS for methods, Manitoba is looking to making every rural school a miniature agricultural college. It has a text-book in agriculture which gives the teacher information about the elementary chemistry of agriculture, the book-keeping of the farm, and all the general features. But the Department of Education does not stop there. It obtains from the Experimental Farm, at Ottawa, packages of grains and potatoes for free distribution—each package containing enough seed for 44 square feet of land. There are three kinds of corn, three of millet, three of wheat, three of barley and three of oats. They also supply seedlings and cuttings of maple, ash and willow for schools desiring to establish wind-breaks. Garden and flower seeds are also distributed.

If the surest way of keeping the boy on the farm is to get him interested in farming, then Manitoba is going the right way about it. Even though the

work done be elementary it will reflect in the life of the pupil and in the life of his parents. It puts farming on a plane with retail business, manufacturing and even the professions. The boy learns that farming does not consist wholly of doing "chores."

Moreover, such a system brings agricultural education to the people as no agricultural college can do, however excellent it may be. Not five per cent. of the boys go to high school, and not five per cent. to an agricultural college. Therefore this is the only means of reaching the 95 per cent. who pass directly from public school to work.

Manitoba's methods are to be applauded. If Mr. Coldwell follows them up with progressive administration in the future as he has in the past, he will have performed an inestimable service for Manitoba and for the nation as a whole.

Value of an Agricultural College

DR. CREELMAN, of the Ontario Agricultural College, and the editor, have been having some correspondence concerning the value of an agricultural college. This arose over some remarks on this page to the effect that the graduates of agricultural colleges do not go back to the farm and that the college does not reach the average farmer.

This correspondence shows that many of the long-course graduates do not go back to the farms, but fill important agricultural positions—farm managers, teachers of agriculture and instructors. From 1874 to 1908, 1,529 students from Ontario took the long course at the O. A. C. Of these, 864, or 56½ per cent., are on farms in Ontario now. So that the editor must modify his former statement.

While admitting the good work of the O. A. C., I still maintain that there is grave danger in putting too much stress on the agricultural college of any province. It is as necessary as a university. But there must be other agricultural institutions doing the work for the farmers that the public school, the high school and the technical school do for the mechanic and the business men. Chief of these is the necessity for illustration plots in connection with rural schools and the considerable teaching of agriculture in these elementary institutions.

Elsewhere in this issue is a letter from Professor Zavitz, which closes a discussion which may be described as a drawn battle.

Mr. Cockshutt Backs Down

MR. COCKSHUTT, M.P., has been home to Brantford to tell his constituents that he is misunderstood. He did not intend to convey the idea, in his speech in the House, that he is in favour of permanent contributions to a central navy. So far as this journal is concerned it accepts Mr. Cockshutt's explanation. Whether he was misconstrued or whether he has since been converted, it is pleasant to know that he is now in favour of a Canadian navy.

At the same time, it will be the duty of Mr. Cockshutt's constituents to consider whether it will be advisable to retain him as their representative. A man who cannot make his position clear on a great occasion such as that on which he spoke may be a dangerous man in parliament. Indeed, Mr. Cockshutt has made many speeches with "centralist" views which require amendment before he can be considered a safe and sane legislator.

Moulding the Destiny

AT the banquet given to Mr. Borden by the Conservative members of the House last week, the Conservative leader remarked that every member should be proud to have an opportunity to bear his part in moulding the destiny of the country. This is a fine sentiment and quite worthy of the Premier. But is the average member of the House trying to mould the destiny of the country or of his party? Is there any evidence that more than a small percentage of our representatives in Parliament place country before party? Is not partyism as rampant in the Canadian Parliament to-day, in this enlightened twentieth century, as in any English-speaking parliament that ever gathered under the Union Jack or the Canadian ensign?

Party government is our system and under it

there must be party discipline. While this is so, it was never intended that every member of a particular party should cast every vote in favour of the particular oligarchy which bosses that party. Rt. Hon. Mr. Borden is entitled to general support from every Conservative member, but not slavish support. Sir Wilfrid Laurier is entitled to the same from his followers. If there is to be no independence within the parties, then our parliament should do as the United States electoral college does—send in its ballots by mail.

Not many of the members of the present parliament will be credited by the future historian with having done anything notable in moulding the destiny of his country. Beyond getting their names in the Parliamentary Companion and Hansard, there will be no mention of them. They are just about as important as the toga-clad supers who throng the stage when some renowned actor plays Julius Cæsar to a critical audience.

The Eight Who Did Not

WHEN the division bells rang on Thursday night of last week for the first division on the Navy Bill, there were eight members out of 221 who refused to hear the crack of the party lash. There were eight men who voted as they thought they ought to vote, in spite of the opposition which their fellow-members will probably visit upon them. They knew that henceforth they would be marked men, but they did what they considered best according to judgment and conscience.

These eight men may have been wrong, but most of us will honour them for their sturdy independence. That seven of them are French-Canadians is a tribute to that portion of our population. They saved the occasion. A purely party vote on so momentous a national issue would have been a sad spectacle. That they did not affect the result matters little. They showed that there are eight men at least in the House who on one occasion have realized the force of Mr. Borden's statement that every member of parliament should realize that he is doing his share in moulding the destiny of this about-to-be-important country.

The Enemies of Peace

THOSE who build warships and armaments in Great Britain and Germany are the real enemies of peace. The agitations which lead to increased armies and armaments are largely made by these men and their political allies.

In a splendid book on "Canada and Sea Power," Christopher West (whoever he may be, I know not) says:

"We hang a man who sells a plan of a British fort to a foreign military officer, but we honour with great titles the men who sell to foreign war departments the battleships, cruisers, submarines and torpedo boats whose assemblage into fleets terrorizes the British politician and journalist into demanding more Dreadnoughts and swifter cruisers. While the spy pays the penalty of his petty perfidy, we call the trafficker in foreign fleets to the councils which determine our peace or war."

Mr. West advocates that all war equipment should be made in government shipyards and factories, so that no foreign nation could get war machinery from British workshops. When Canada starts to build a navy of its own, it should bear this pointer in mind. The professional builder of warships is more dangerous an enemy of peace than the professional soldier.

Pay in the Navy

STATISTICS show that the pay in the United States navy is larger than in any of the European navies, but perhaps not so much larger than in the British navy as some people assume. The figures are as follows:

	United States.	Eng-land.	Ger-many.	France.
Captain	\$4,000	\$2,443	\$1,905	\$1,945
Lieutenant	2,400	1,287	614	837
Ensign	1,700	444	200	534
Midshipman	600	155	116	190
Warrant Officer	1,500	977	614	951
Chief Petty Officer ..	480	326	214	389
Seaman, First Class.	288	170	97	83
Seaman, Second Class	228	148	84	56
Seaman, Third Class	192	111	34	42

If Canada had a navy of her own, the pay would necessarily approximate the United States figures. These would naturally attract experienced officers and men who found it necessary to retire from the British navy because the pay was inadequate to their needs. Thus these men's services might be saved to the Empire.