

afternoons and evenings when the wind blew in strong from the sea, and especially when fog settled down, overcoats and furs were in order. Yet the winters must be mild, for palms were growing in the open.

Farther inland the days were much warmer, but the mornings were always cool, almost chilly. There, where palms and olives are planted as roadside trees and where even oranges ripen, strange to say, corn does not do well. It is not warm enough for it. The farther south, if inland, the warmer. One day the temperature was a 102 degrees. But mornings are always cool and pleasant. Day by day the sun shone. Picnics are never postponed, because of the inclement weather. And yet, perhaps, because we are prejudiced in favor of what we are used to, the unvarying fine weather did not satisfy. We longed for a thunder shower to break the monotony and to cool and freshen the air. Even the sight of a cloud later on was gladdening. It must be admitted, though, that at the date of this writing, when the wind is searching through the buildings and the temperature hovers around zero, that the thought of that practically frostless climate has something of a draw.

Credit has already been given the Californians for their enterprise and energy in changing deserts into gardens. On two other counts at least they are deserving of the greatest praise. Their orchard culture is of the highest type. Neither grass nor weeds are to be seen, so thorough is the cultivation. As soon as possible after each irrigation the soil is plowed or cultivated to conserve moisture, and the process is continued between times as well. The other thing is the excellence of the leading roads. For a hundred miles and more in the one direction roads may be seen which rival the asphalt pavements of our cities. The construction of the road from Sacramento to Stockton was as follows: A layer of broken stone was first laid down and oiled profusely with some heavy oil and rolled. A second and finer layer followed, and was similarly treated. The finished road felt more like rubber than stone. Another remark of the Mississippian may be quoted here. "We could grow just as good fruit and crops in our State and the same kinds as here, and without irrigation too, but we don't like to work so hard."

Californians, like other Westerners, whether north or south of the line, believe in boosting the country. As one man put it, rather bitterly, (he was leaving the State—had been unsuccessful) "California lives on Eastern suckers." There is a measure of truth in this remark. The city of Los Angeles, which has had a marvellous growth of from 20,000 in 1880 to 550,000, has been built up almost entirely by money brought in from the East. No city has advertised itself so lavishly, that's how, say the San Franciscans.

Discount it as we may, however, California is a land where fortunes have been made, and where very large returns per acre are produced. But so far as could be learned, there is nothing in the general prosperity of the farmers there to tempt one from a comfortable home in the East. There are drawbacks. Net returns are sometimes large, sometimes nil. Much that is produced is perishable and cannot be consumed in the State. Markets get glutted, and frequently watermelons, cantaloupes and even peaches are fed to hogs. The price of dried peaches fell so low last season, owing to the war, that they barely paid expenses of harvesting and drying. We here think of the orange districts as being frostless. There, one hears incidental references to the year of the "big freeze" when not only oranges but owners were bitten. Irrigation costs. Where water is drawn from a stream by ditches the cost, not including labor is around \$48.50 per acre per annum. Under pumping system in the southern counties it runs from \$5 to \$12 and up per acre each year. Land prices are away up. Even poor agricultural land, barely fit for cultivation is held at \$50 to \$80 per acre. In peach and apricot districts as high as \$300 per acre is asked for the bare soil, and for bearing orchards and vineyards up to \$500. The price of bearing orange groves per acre runs from \$1,200 to \$2,000 and upwards.

The visitor to California has the feeling constantly pressed upon him of being in another world. On the Pacific slope, facing westward rather than east, with its contrasts in climate, scenery, products and even people, it is well worth going to see, but it leaves one sort of giddy.

Getting back home and driving across country, the green roadsides with goldenrod and asters in bloom looked beautiful. Observing also the luxuriant foliage of the trees and the invigorating freshness of the atmosphere, and noting the comfortable farmsteads dotting the country, one felt there was no place quite equal to Old Ontario.

T. B.

A New York physician, Dr. Abraham Jacobi, offers the novel suggestion that all governments now have a Secretary of Peace rather than a Secretary of War. They could not very well have the two, or there might be war in the cabinets.

Questions of the Day in Canada.

Editor "The Farmer's Advocate":

In one of your recent issues Peter McArthur has called attention, in a most striking way, to some of the tremendously serious consequences of the authorization of five hundred thousand Canadian soldiers. You have also called attention to this matter editorially; and in the agricultural press elsewhere, the question has been discussed. There is absolutely no difference of opinion as to the effect which this amount of enlistment will have upon Canadian agriculture. It is scarcely credible that Canadian farmers can in any appreciable way nullify these effects by greater efforts, longer hours, or more systematic work. The shortage of labor, against which they have been struggling for so many years, has necessarily resulted in every possible economy of labor of which those concerned are capable. If we could replace our farmers by men twice as strong and twice as intelligent, or by men who did not need about eight hours sleep, something further might be hoped for. But, under the circumstances it is scarcely believable that the very serious consequences of such an added labor shortage as is involved in the authorized enlistment, can be in any material way avoided. About the only direction in which I see a ray of hope is that of various kinds of co-operative effort. And even in this respect I do not see how we may reasonably look for any great sudden expansion. I do not believe that the late P. and P. campaign was in any appreciable way responsible for the greater harvest of 1915; this latter was due almost wholly to climatic conditions and increased acreage, the latter inspired by the prospect of better prices. From a Canadian standpoint, the withdrawal of so many more young men from our farms is a national calamity; and its imperative necessity ought to be demonstrated beyond question before it is recommended.

There is another matter which should merit our Government's attention in connection with their enlistment proclamation. What means have they taken to enlist the wealth of the country? Talk of conscription! If the life of the poor artisan or laborer is to be confiscated, and laid upon the national altar, what of the wealth of the millionaire? It is even more important just now to provide financial strength than rifles, and what are we doing towards that end? The war loan is a pretty safe and profitable investment for all who have money, for the banks as well as the poor widow; and it is not necessary to pre-suppose much genuine patriotism as a condition of its being taken up. Otherwise, what is being done? War expenditure is not being paid for; the money is being borrowed, and the burden is to be laid upon posterity. The Government has apparently not seriously considered any scientific way of raising the required revenue, but has had recourse to effete and pernicious systems of taxation which restrict production, hamper industry, and put obstacles in the way of commerce. They have appealed to the young men to enlist, and have exercised various mild forms of compulsion. But what have they done with the rich? Have they made a similar appeal to them to furnish the "sinews of war"? On the contrary, it looks as though they had been party to gigantic thefts from the public treasury, or at least had winked at such, whereby Canadian financial and industrial magnates have covertly harvested their millions in war profits, all the while urging "the boys" to enlist. We have heard of international armament firms who deliberately fomented international animosities, so that they might profit by bigger orders for munitions. May God help them when the glazed eyes and mangled features of innocent millions look with reproach upon them! And may God also help those in Canada who have murdered "the boys" by paper shoes, restricted production of munitions, and the diminished purchasing power of British money! Our Government cannot be held responsible for all of this; but they are at least directly responsible for the duties imposed against British goods whereby British credit and financial strength is impaired. Nothing is more imperative just now than that British industries should receive all possible encouragement, and nothing seems to me a fouler blot, in the public acts of our Government, than the increase in the duties against British goods last winter.

One thing at all events is patent, the heaping up of war debts, in addition to the three or four billion debt which we have already incurred for various kinds of constructive work, combined with the withdrawal of so many workers from our already undermanned primary industries, and combined with a form of taxation which puts every possible obstacle in the way of industry and commerce, and which enriches the rich at the expense of the poor; all this can have but one end—national bankruptcy. Those who have guided this country's public policy during the last quarter of a century are not to be trusted. Their motives may be benevolent; if so their stupidity, greed, and lack of foresight, is almost incredible. If this country is to be saved democracy must become a fact instead of a name

amongst us, and power must be given to those who see instead of those who are blind. It is admitted on all hands that the development of our primary industries is an imperative necessity, and yet these industries have been throttled and hampered and burdened with the support of innumerable parasites; and now, in addition, comes the added burden of a huge war debt which must fall ultimately upon productive industry, already weakened and tottering. What is the end? Any one whose conscience and mental faculties have not been drowned by a surfeit of ill-gotten gains can see for himself.

There is, I believe, a cure, a composite one. A new spirit must take possession of the people, and a new purpose animate them. A real interest in real politics must be born. False gods must be dethroned, and false prophets banished. New and true leaders must be discovered, and entrusted with the task of social reconstruction. Forms of taxation hitherto accepted without challenge must be examined, and, if pernicious, ruthlessly abolished. Industry and commerce must be freed from the burdens hitherto and now oppressing them, and labor must be guaranteed a just return. All this and more must be done. But it will not be done easily or quickly. It may be done, figuratively if not literally, through a sea of blood. If done, social health will be restored. If not done, this people, politically and socially, will decay and perish, like many nations in the past, and what material evidences of its civilization endure will be exhumed in future ages, like the temples and pyramids of Egypt, silent monuments of grandeur, folly and slavery. If we had discerning eyes we should see many temples and pyramids in Canada which are just as truly significant of national folly and economic slavery as any in ancient Egypt. But we have not yet discerning eyes; we do not really believe that the road to material prosperity is by seeking first the Kingdom of Righteousness. Shall we see or perish?

Brant Co., Ont.

W. C. GOOD

Agricultural Knowledge Cannot Be Standardized.

Editor "The Farmer's Advocate":

W. L. Martin, who writes in the Jan. 27 issue, seems to be somewhat of an idealist. He dreams of the day, when all men will see alike and everything will run along so smoothly. If one professor makes a statement it will be a breach of etiquette, or an indication of ignorance for another professor to contradict him. Your correspondent expects too much. It is not well for all men to agree. Furthermore, it is impossible. Man has not, in spite of good educational advantages reached, that degree of perfection when a standard of knowledge has been reached. On the contrary we can look forward as far as we like, and though man may be as erudite as Goldwin Smith, you will find that for everything he knows there will be a million things that he does not know.

He uses the term "Academic half-knowledge." It is true that it is half-knowledge, even less than that. Prof. Grisdale does not profess to know it all. His experiments with the Banner oat have led him to believe that it is the best of all, but his deductions in that line are not regarded by him as conclusive, which is indicated by the fact that he continues to experiment and improve, with the probable result that some other improved oat may finally supersede the Banner. But that will not cause him to cease experimenting, or some other professor to sit still and adopt his views. This is an age of progress and hurry, and we do not pay our professors to merely agree with the other fellow.

Prof. Zavitz is doubtless equally sanguine of the superiority of the O. A. C. No 72 oat, yet he like Prof. Grisdale, does not consider his researches completed. He still goes on experimenting, and will continue to do so as long as he occupies his present position, and so will the men who follow him.

As for his suggestions that the Professors "get together" and agree on these matters, it is out of the question. Prof. Zavitz could not very well agree with Prof. Grisdale on the best variety of oat because their experiments have led them to different opinions. The conscience of either would lead him to differ from the other. It would be perfidy to do otherwise. Prof. Graham, who likes the Barred Rock chicken could not very well agree with some other professor whose experiments have led him to believe the White Wyandotte is the better of the two. Likewise the professor at Cornell and the professor at Macdonald College would disagree on the methods of feeding chickens. The different professors would likely discuss the relative merits of the Clydesdale, Percheron and the Belgian Horses, but after all their "threshing" out of the question no headway has been made. They remain of the same opinions as before. No kind of reasoning or persuasion is going to make a man conclude that the Banner oat is a better oat than the Siberian