

SIX REASONS

Why You Should Use a Cream Separator Having a Self-Balancing Bowl

1. **SMOOTH RUNNING.**—The bowl will always run smooth and true, even if out of mechanical balance.

2. **SPRUNG SPINDLES.**—Even if the spindle should become slightly sprung by accident, it will not interfere with the free running of the bowl.

3. **NOT AFFECTED BY WEAR.**—As the machine wears, instead of becoming noisy, and running harder, as in the old style mechanically balanced machines, it will continue to run easily and smoothly.

4. **RUNS EASIER WITH USE.**—The experience of users is that the "Simplex" Self-Balancing Separator runs easier with continued use.

5. **NO FINE ADJUSTMENT NECESSARY.**—As the Self-Balancing "Simplex" does not depend on mechanical balance for its running, it does not require the fine adjustment of other makes of Separators.

6. **LIVES LONGER.**—In ordinary makes of Separators the greatest wear and tear on the bearings of gearing, etc., is caused by the uneven running of the bowl. The "Simplex" Self-Balancing Bowl is never out of balance, consequently there is the minimum amount of wear and tear, and the life of the Separator is greatly increased.

BE SURE YOU GET A SIMPLEX. Remember that the Self-Balancing Bowl is but one of the many exclusive features of the "Simplex" Separator. Write us for full particulars, and a copy of our free illustrated booklet.

D. Derbyshire & Company

Head Office and Works: BROCKVILLE, ONT.

Branches: PETERBOROUGH, ONT. MONTREAL and QUEBEC, P. Q.

WE WANT AGENTS IN EVERY DISTRICT

A BT Litter Carrier and BT Feed Carrier



should be in your stable—
1st. Because they will save you more hard and disagreeable work than any other machine you can invest your money in.
2nd. Because they are the best machines made for handling Litter and Feed.
Let us tell you what they will do and why they are better. We also build Cows, Sows, Hogs, Steel Stalls, Hay Carriers, Forks and Slings.
BEATTY BROS., FERGUS ONT.

BT stands for Best

It is desirable to mention the name of this publication when writing to advertisers

THE SECURING OF BETTER MARKETS FOR CANADIAN FARM PRODUCTS.

Farm and Dairy as a rule does not care to publish articles on tariff questions. Space does not permit of their proper discussion in a purely agricultural paper. An exception has been made in the case of the following report of an address delivered recently by Mr. W. Sealey, M.P., at a gathering of farmers in D. Wrentham county. Although a Liberal, Mr. Sealey was elected to the House of Commons in a constituency previously Conservative, largely because he advocated greater protection for our Canadian farmers. Such protection, he contended, will send them to secure free trade. The following outline of his address speaks for itself—Editor.

How can we get better markets and prices for our products without being unfair to the consumer? While our distant and foreign markets are very good, our home and nearby markets are by far the best and most profitable. They are, therefore, the most precious to be preserved.

Universal free trade would give us the best natural opportunities. Free trade, however, is impossible at the present time. We must, therefore, make the best of the circumstances as we find them, both at home and abroad.

TARIFF READJUSTMENT.

Of the various suggestions for improvement that have been made, a rearrangement of the tariffs on agricultural products, strikes me as being most practical. While some may say that "Trade Laughs at Tariffs" and still continues to grow, it grows in the direction of least tariff resistance and, therefore, the tariff influences its direction and determines to quite an extent what country shall profit most by it. For instance, very few Canadian eggs are being sold in the United States because the McKinley tariff prevents their sale. Previous to the passing of the McKinley bill we sent millions of dozens of eggs to the United States. No United States steel rails are being sold in Canada. Why? Because the Canadian Tariff prevents it.

If it is good for Canada, by tariff, to get the whole tariff in the hands of two concerns, only, who might chance to arrange a combine, why would it not be good for Canada by tariff to put the trade in agricultural products in the hands of one million of Canadian farmers, who are perfectly safe from any possibility of a combine, and whose local competition provides the consuming masses of Canada with the best and cheapest necessities of life?

If we are agreed on this, it is up to us to arrive at the best method of bringing this about.

AN IMPORTANT INDUSTRY.

In Canada, to-day, we have 500,000 acres in fruit worth about \$150 an acre, making an investment of \$75,000,000 yielding \$15,000,000 of produce annually. While special statistics for vegetables have not been kept separate, I take it that there is an equal acreage worth \$100 per acre or an investment of \$50,000,000 yielding \$10,000,000 annually at that in fruit and vegetable industry combined there are 100,000 people engaged. If space permitted I would be glad to show how these calculations have been arrived at. Our fruit and vegetable growers represent 10 per cent. of our industrial population, and a vastly greater amount of capital than any other Canadian industry except general agriculture. In fact, amalgamated with general agriculture as we should be and really are, we are of sufficient importance to have what we believe is for the best interests of Canada if we unitedly and forcefully ask for it. The question is, shall we do this?

IMPORTS OF PORK PRODUCTS.

The trade and commerce returns for 1908 show that \$3,000,000 worth of pork products were imported from the United States to Canada at two cents a pound, and only \$5,000 of hams and bacon exported from Canada to the United States at five cents a pound. Our consumers were not benefited and our producers were seriously injured. Horses worth \$1,

250,000 were imported at a tariff charge of \$12.50, on each and only \$300,000 worth were exported at \$30 each. Apples, \$150,000 worth were imported at 40c. and \$318,000 exported at 62c. Cheese, 800,000 lbs. imported at 3c. duty and only 173,000 lbs. exported to the United States at 6c. duty. Butter 300,000 lbs. imported at 4c., and only 200,000 lbs. exported at 6c. duty. Eggs, 1,100,000 dozens imported at 3c. duty and only 32,000 exported at 6c. duty. Hay, \$221,000 worth imported at \$2 and \$243,000 worth exported at \$4.00. Flour 43,000 bbls. imported at 20c. and only 25,000 bbls. exported at 6c. Of wheat nearly 6,000,000 bushels were imported last year, whereas only 115,000 exported to the United States, our tariff being 12c. against them and theirs being 25c. against us, and recently raised to 30c.

I do not imagine that all the wheat imported was ground for flour for Canadian use. So far as I can gather it was largely shipped to Great Britain, where it was sold at an equal number of bushels of our best Western wheat, getting the advantage of the extra price and substituting an inferior quality, thereby injuring the reputation of our Canadian product. Unless we are cautious, before long our reputation for wheat in the British market will be injured, as our reputation for bacon has been by the substitution of non-Canadian product of inferior quality.

The items quoted, as well as many other agricultural products that might be referred to, show that the McKinley tariff is most entirely effective in shutting out our products from their market, whereas our tariff against them permits them to supply our market with a very large quantity of their surplus product. Their consuming population is fifteen times more numerous than ours. Under perfectly equitable conditions the United States should take fifteen times more of our produce than we take of theirs. Instead the actual results are the other way, to the extent of three or four times. This shows that their tariff management produces a surplus for the importer and producer along agricultural lines to a very much greater extent than does ours.

If the consumer were getting the benefit of our tariff it might be made a moderate excuse for these conditions, but so far as we are able to investigate, it is the importer, speculator and commission man, who pockets the profits, largely on a speculative change of the slaughter market days in the United States, against which it is difficult to get our anti-dumping clause applied all along the line. This deprives our producers of their home market and discourages home production by bearing down the price to them. At the same time the middle men charge the home consumer all he can stand and in many cases much more than the foreign market price warrant.

WHAT IS WANTED.

We don't require these products from the States. Our farmers, our wives and daughters should keep a million more hens and produce these eggs, and our farmers keep a million more hogs and supply these hog products and keep 1,000,000 more horses and supply our requirements in this respect, and 10,000 acres more hay, (Continued on page 6.)