

overthrew the then dominant political influences and for a time controlled all legislation in those States. Farmers brought about, indirectly, the reciprocity proposals of 1911. Farmers are the most-considered class in the deliberations of the House of Commons at Ottawa to-day, save only the railroads, whose very existence sometimes seems to depend upon vigilance in the lobbies. It may be shocking to appear to condone the railroad lobbies, yet in a day such as this, when one class of opinion takes the place of a real public opinion and the pressure brought to bear upon Parliament is so one-sided, the great interests are forced to take steps to protect themselves against the lively radicalism to which they are exposed. The railways and other interests would have less to fear and perhaps less to hope for in the lobbies if Parliament were more thoroughly representative, and public opinion, upon which it rests, better balanced.

THE farmer gives weight and energy to public movements, but the cities provide other factors; acting now as a counter-balance, now giving edge to the weapon, now directing the stroke, and always providing the other part which should be present in any good national alloy. The cities represent manufacture and the agencies of exchange. No nation reaches its highest aims that grows by agriculture alone or by manufacture alone. For without the farms the cities would soon be exhausted of their strength, and without the cities—the homes of manufacture—there would be lacking that variety of outlets for human activity which is essential to the development of the nation. My father was a failure as an agriculturist, but a constructive citizen as an iron-moulder. The city gave him his opportunity. Without the city his abilities would have been wasted. In short, the cities represent one of the two great departments of national life. Town and country are counterparts. Working together they achieve greatness, develop great sons who do great works. When they fail to work together, when the city man becomes selfishly and short-sightedly absorbed in the complexities of his own engagements, and when the farmer in his isolation is left to be led or misled by the first demagogue who knows how to play upon the natural self-interest of the race, evil results for the nation at large. Rural opinion without its counterpart, urban opinion, claims everything for rural interests. Urban opinion sleeps, and the special interests, failing to obtain the natural and normal support which should automatically come to them from the cities, establish special influences at court, influences which are not always wholesome.

It has become the fashion to speak of the heroic agriculturist! How he toils! His isolation! "All wealth comes from the soil!" He is called "nation-builder" and "empire-maker." It has become the fashion in newspapers and from platforms to flatter the farmer as if he were a child, needing attention. "The Man with the Hoe" has become a sort of fetish with certain newspapers, and his praise is canted six times a week. Men have sprung into light who make a good living just by telling the Western farmer how badly he is treated, and what he ought to be getting from Parliament and the greedy East! Other men become "leaders" of the farmers, directing their political activities from comfortable offices in Winnipeg and Calgary. It is noteworthy that few of these farmer "leaders" live by farming. It is also noteworthy that there are farmers, especially in the East, who decline this so-called leadership and continue to think for themselves in terms of national welfare.

YET through constant iteration and reiteration the public has come to accept this representation of the farmer as being correct. It takes argument to show what should otherwise be obvious; that the farmer is only half the nation and farming only half of its ultimate business; and that the cities and the dwellers in the cities are, for all their indifference, quite as essential to the building of the nation. Is no credit due to the man who "farms" with his few hundred or few thousand dollars in some industrial pursuit? Who, living as he does amidst the strenuous competition of city life, is yet willing to place his means in circulation in order that he may build up an industry? The farmer is not the only contributor to the achievements of the State, and yet, which gets most of life? Whose is the healthiest occupation? Which has the quiet night's rest? Which has the real opportunity to enjoy living as measured by proper standards? Which has more opportunity for the enjoyment of family life? For the reading of books? For the contemplation of natural objects? Has that man more anxiety who watches the rain clouds hovering over his already-too-well-watered fields, than the other, the city dweller, who sees unfavourable business conditions threatening to cut off his earning power and leave him practically resourceless in a city—the place where a man must pay dollars upon dollars for the mere privilege of keeping alive, whereas the farmer, even at the worst, can maintain himself on comparatively little? Crop failure to the farmer still leaves him with the fields—on which taxes are a mere pittance. Business calamity to the city dweller is likely to leave him stripped of everything, including his credit. The average city dweller handles more money in a year than the average farmer, but at the end of the year he thinks he has done well if he has kept pace with his obligations,

whereas the farmer, with his farm still beneath his feet, his larder well stocked at no monetary cost to himself, and many assets unliquidated, worries if he has not at least a few more dollars in the bank now than he had a year ago. There is no bug-a-boo of "keeping up appearances" to fret the farmer, yet "appearances" are vital to the book-keeper, the salesman, and the mechanic. The farmer can live frugally from the products of his own land, whereas the city worker can only obtain the actual requisites of life by the expenditure of his daily wage, and he is practically forced to purchase much that the farmer never troubles to think about.

Who, then, pays most in the form of duty on imported goods? The city dweller—because he is obliged to pay duty even on such common necessities of life as eggs, butter, milk and meat—thus putting money in the farmer's pocket—the while the farmer himself gets his staples of food as mere incidents in the management of the farm. For hats, for shoes, for socks, for ties, for collars, for women's supplies—for scores of articles, the city dweller pays very heavily in duty. The farmer, buying very much less, contributes very much less to the customs revenue.

Take the city man starting up in a small manufacturing business: He must pay 27½ per cent. duty on the machinery and tools he requires. But the farmer buys some of his implements free of duty,

The Song of the Lathe

THIS is the law of the builders: "Ye must make, if ye would have fame,

Else ye stand, at the forge of the Titans, with pigmy blushes of shame."

Yea, this is the age of the Titans, but have our hands shown their worth?

Do we beg from the spindles of others, seek we alms in the workshops of Earth?

Are we drones in the hive of the world, are our talents all buried in words?

Are we clad with the fleece of our sheep, are we shod with the hides of our herds?

Are we housed in the castles of Spain, are we couched on the carpets of Turks?

Lo, here are our works made known, and we are made known by our works.

Lo, here are the things that we make, yea, here are the works of our hand!

For we are heirs of the nations and the skill that the nations command.

Ask, and it shall be created; demand, it shall not be denied;

We have covered the land with our mills, but our strength is yet to be tried.

For the iron and the coal obey us, and all things bow us the knee,

Where the prairies call to the mountains, and the lakes flow into the sea.

We have paved the prairies with cities, we have furrowed the lakes with prows;

But we are not ploughmen alone, we are the makers of ploughs.

Oh, the broad axe rings through the forest, and the ploughshare cuts through the plain,

But this is the song of the makers of the reapers that reap the grain.

Oh, this is the song of the lathe, and this is the song of the loom,

We are young in the workshops of nations, but the nations have found us room.

—R. C. Reade, in *The Canadian Magazine*.

some at 15 per cent. duty and none at more than 20 per cent.; and his machines do not represent the same large sums of money. The manufacturer must pay for raw materials, for labour and for heavy "overhead" expenses. The farmer grows his own seed, or at the worst, pays comparatively little for it. He is continually assisted with government experiments and other special aids to agriculture, which are provided for out of the public chest, to which, as I have already pointed out, the farmer contributes the smaller portion. His labour costs him less than the city man has to pay for an ordinary mechanic. For a gross return of ten dollars the former must at least set five dollars—more likely nine dollars—in circulation. The farmer places in circulation much less money. The farmer's costs for machinery have dropped between thirty and fifty per cent. in twenty-five years, and that same machinery now saves him two-thirds of the labour which used to be required. He gets increasingly more for his beef, butter, eggs, cheese, milk, vegetables, and fruit. And he pays less for his tea and sugar. The net profits of farming have risen, while the city dweller finds it increasingly difficult to meet the high cost of living. And who have the largest savings accounts? The farmers.

There is no ground for complaint in this. All one can ask is that these facts be recognized and that the city dweller take a new view of things and manifest a greater interest in public affairs. What the farmer earns let him keep. Let

him continue to raise his earnest voice in public discussion, but let him not speak alone. For this one-sidedness must eventually react upon the whole community. Politicians know a thousand ways to handle elections in city constituencies, but the farmer-voter has to be pacified at almost any cost—a cost usually expressed in terms of tariff reduction affecting only those commodities which farmers have to buy. Social conditions, franchises, Imperial politics and various other questions serve to split up the attention of what small part of the urban population is pleased to interest itself in political matters. But the tariff is the farmers' piece de resistance. It never wears out, though it sometimes threatens to do so. The results are obvious; public opinion, being replaced by sectional opinion, legislators estimate the strength of that section and yield to its demands accordingly. Legislation is likely to reflect the jerkiness of ill-balanced and unrepresentative opinion, and the long-suffering tariff is in perpetual torture.

WELL planned, carefully executed tariff revision is one thing; hasty adjustments and readjustments are quite another matter, and are the almost inevitable result of the position in which Parliament is from time to time placed. An agitation sweeps the West—which, like any new community, is easily fired—and the West moves upon Ottawa with some new, or renewed demand. Ottawa estimates, with a shrewd eye, the next election and the standing of the parties, and makes a peace offering—usually a slice off the duty on agricultural implements. In short, the result is "tariff tinkering" to appease still further the one section of the nation which really feels the tariff less than any other. In the case of agricultural implements, which industry has been to a large extent "the goat" whenever a "goat" was necessary, the duty has come down from 35 per cent. to 17½ per cent. and 20 per cent., while in some instances there is no duty whatever. The imports of American-made implements have consequently increased from \$1,585,350 in 1909 to \$4,384,394 in 1913; and the "export" of Canadian money, and of the Canadian labour which that money would otherwise have employed in Canada, has been accordingly increased.

Take, for example, this very trade in farm implements, an exporting industry and what might be called a "pivotal" industry, in view of the number of other industries whose welfare is more or less wrapped up with that of the implement trade. There are seventy-seven farm implement concerns in Canada. These constitute one of the fifteen largest producing industries in the Dominion. They give direct employment to practically nine thousand men—who rank among the four highest-paid classes of industrial workers in Canada. They support, say, forty thousand souls, spending among them about five million dollars a year—the wages paid out by the seventy-seven implement makers. These figures interest me particularly, because those 40,000 people are a part of the Canadian home market. Directly or indirectly they buy iron castings from me. The five million dollars a year which they spend is \$5,000,000 added to the purchasing strength of the Canadian home market. Some of it will come direct to me, but most of it will go to customers of customers of customers of mine. But it all affects me ultimately; it assists me in meeting my pay-roll. Then, again, the agricultural implement people pay out \$10,500,000 a year for raw materials, and that affects me because some of it comes straight out of my factory and most of it is supplied to the implement people by customers of mine, or by people from whom I also buy goods. By giving them more business it gives me, in one way or another, more business, and by giving me more business I am able to hire more men and pay more wages, which again reacts favourably on the community at large. The implement men export to other parts of the world something like ten million dollars' worth of implements. Thus, foreigners are helping employ Canadian workmen. The implement men are thus "importing" money, which goes to improve financial conditions in Canada.

LITTLE by little the duty has been reduced on binders, mowers, ploughs, and so on, and every time it has affected not only the implement men, but the manufacturers who sell goods to the implement men. The principle has been adopted at Ottawa that where the protection on a given article has been reduced the protection on the materials entering into that article must also be reduced. Logically, that means reducing the protection on the machinery which is used in making implements. Logically the duty on iron castings of certain classes should be lowered. My friend the textile man, who last year sold 200,000 yards of cotton duck to one implement manufacturer for the self-binders, stands to lose some of his protection. The linseed oil maker, who sold one factory alone 13,000 gallons of oil last year—what about him? A firm in my city sold a Toronto factory 35,000 oil cans in one year. I lunched with a man at the club to-day who is trying to get from that same implement factory, its order for cotters (split keys). "Why," he said, "I sold them last year 2,600,000 of those cotters." Leather men, wire men, makers of paints, of screws, of belting, of benzine, japsans, varnishes, turpentines, chains, buckles, drills, bits and taps, grind-stones, emery-wheels, nails, nuts, washers,

(Continued on page 17.)