

The Farmer's Advocate AND HOME MAGAZINE.

THE LEADING AGRICULTURAL JOURNAL IN THE
DOMINION.

Published weekly by
THE WILLIAM WELD COMPANY (Limited).

JOHN WELD, Manager.

Agents for "The Farmer's Advocate and Home Journal,"
Winnipeg, Man.

1. **THE FARMER'S ADVOCATE AND HOME MAGAZINE** is published every Thursday. It is impartial and independent of all cliques and parties, handsomely illustrated with original engravings, and furnishes the most practical, reliable and profitable information for farmers, dairymen, gardeners, stockmen and home-makers, of any publication in Canada.
2. **TERMS OF SUBSCRIPTION.**—In Canada, England, Ireland, Scotland, Newfoundland and New Zealand, \$1.50 per year, in advance; \$2.00 per year when not paid in advance. United States, \$2.50 per year; all other countries, 12s. in advance.
3. **ADVERTISING RATES.**—Single insertion, 25 cents per line, agate. Contract rates furnished on application.
4. **THE FARMER'S ADVOCATE** is sent to subscribers until an explicit order is received for its discontinuance. All payments of arrears must be made as required by law.
5. **THE LAW IS**, that all subscribers to newspapers are held responsible until all arrears are paid, and their paper ordered to be discontinued.
6. **REMITTANCES** should be made direct to us, either by Money Order, Postal Note, Express Order or Registered Letter, which will be at our risk. When made otherwise we will not be responsible.
7. **THE DATE ON YOUR LABEL** shows to what time your subscription is paid.
8. **ANONYMOUS** communications will receive no attention. In every case the "Full Name and Post-office Address Must be Given."
9. **WHEN A REPLY BY MAIL IS REQUIRED** to Urgent Veterinary or Legal Enquiries, \$1.00 must be enclosed.
10. **LETTERS** intended for publication should be written on one side of the paper only.
11. **CHANGE OF ADDRESS.**—Subscribers when ordering a change of address should give the old as well as the new P. O. address.
12. **WE INVITE FARMERS** to write us on any agricultural topic. We are always pleased to receive practical articles. For such as we consider valuable we will pay ten cents per inch printed matter. Criticisms of Articles, Suggestions How to Improve "The Farmer's Advocate and Home Magazine," Descriptions of New Grains, Roots or Vegetables not generally known, Particulars of Experiments Tried, or Improved Methods of Cultivation, are each and all welcome. Contributions sent us must not be furnished other papers until after they have appeared in our columns. Rejected matter will be returned on receipt of postage.
13. **ADDRESSES OF CORRESPONDENTS ARE CONSIDERED AS CONFIDENTIAL**, and will not be forwarded.
14. **ALL COMMUNICATIONS** in reference to any matter connected with this paper should be addressed as below, and not to any individual connected with the paper.
Address—THE FARMER'S ADVOCATE, or
THE WILLIAM WELD COMPANY (Limited),
London, Canada.

A Boost for Government Ownership.

The authorities in Great Britain are to be congratulated upon the success which they have made of Government operation of the railroads since the war began. All the railroads in the British Isles are under government control, and are worked by a committee of managers, and so far the cost has been amazingly small, economical methods introduced under the committee of competent managers being responsible for the comparatively small outlay. An adequate passenger service has been maintained, while some of the roads have supplied as many as fifty troop trains daily. It is now hinted that the people of Britain, when the war is over, will be slow to ask for a return to the old, private-ownership method of operation of their railways. There are many good things in public ownership, which have been pointed out from time to time through "The Farmer's Advocate." Ontario's Hydro Electric Power and Lighting scheme has been the object of much favorable comment, and has succeeded in giving the people of Ontario cheaper power and light. Public Ownership of Public Utilities is undoubtedly the proper system, provided there is put into the management in whatever sphere it operates, the same competency that is developed under the system of competition, where one private firm is kept on tip-toe by another in the same line. At a Conference on Marketing and Farm Credits, held in Chicago, about two years ago, it was pointed out by certain speakers, that the greatest difficulty in the way of unlimited success of the Parcel Post system in the United States, was, that clerks and overseers were not always as courteous and ready to help those using the system, as were the men in the employ of Express Companies, and directly responsible to some one. It is a trite saying that "What is everybody's business is nobody's business, and too often employees working for municipal, provincial, or federal governments, seem to act on this principle. We are entirely in favor of government ownership, or to put it in other words, of having the people's work done by the people themselves, but the removal of the element of competition should not take with it the desire to have the articular line of business operated on the most

economical and business-like scale possible, with every employee, from the manager down to the lowest-paid clerk just as courteous, obliging and efficient, as he or she would have to be if working for a private firm or corporation. A correspondent, in this issue, makes the statement that the business of government should be the best operated business in the country because it is the biggest. All business coming under any of the departments of government right down to the municipality should be the embodiment of efficiency. We are pleased to note that the nationalization of the railroads in Britain has been such a success, and we believe that more government ownership would be a good thing for this country, provided the right kind of men are placed at the head of affairs, and all graft, corruption, intrigue, political pull, and inefficiency obliterated from all departments of the work. The bane of government ownership is bad government. Honesty and efficiency should be the keynote of government and government ownership.

Pure-bred or Grade—Which?

A short time ago we received a letter from a correspondent, in which he asked the pertinent question as to whether or not we had found in our experience that the best of grade cattle were more desirable than pure-breds. We had no hesitation in answering that we had not found this to be the case, but that high-class grades are to be preferred to an inferior type of pure-bred stock. The point is well taken. Not so very long ago we were talking with a man, who happened to remark that his mongrel-bred pullets were giving him a higher percentage egg production, than were his earlier-hatched, bred-to-lay Barred Plymouth Rocks, on the same feed, and with the same care. We remember having seen in a stable last summer a grade cow, which in her ten-year-old form, produced over 10,000 lbs. of milk in one lactation period. In the same stable were pure-breds of the same breed, which could not boast such production. We have seen many grade breeding sows, which were giving their owners larger, more uniform, and better-feeding litters, than were certain pure-bred sows in the same herds. Almost every reader knows of grade mares, which, when mated with the right class of sire, produce colts which compare very favorably with those from certain pure-bred mares, mated with the same horse. The same holds true with sheep, and we are forced to recognize the fact that the grade animal judiciously bred and fed, and highly graded up, is superior to many inferior pure-bred animals. But this does not prove that the best grade is preferable to the best pure-bred. The average farmer, starting in stock breeding, would be wise to get his experience with grade stock, and through a process of grading up, using nothing but the best pure-bred sires, he can in a few years develop a herd or a flock equal or almost so in appearance and production to many pure-bred herds, or flocks. But when he has reached this stage, and wants to go on, there is only one thing left for him to do, and that thing he should do in justice to himself, and to the live-stock industry, namely, gradually replace his good grades with better pure-breds. We hold no brief for the scrub pure-bred. Such should not, in our opinion, be permitted to reproduce its kind, as it most certainly will, if put into the breeding herd or flock. We would not advise a man starting in the stock business to purchase, in the beginning, high-priced, prize-winning, pure-bred stock. It is always advisable to learn the business with good, hardy, grades, and to develop with the business by judiciously up-grading the foundation stock; but the aim of every good stockman, going into breeding operations, should be to some day own, and develop towards perfection, a herd or flock of pure-breds. Suitable and satisfactory sires can never come from a grade herd or flock. Pure-breds must form the foundation for all advancement in the stock business, and the best of the pure-breds, if our breeders do their duty, will always compare favorably in conformation and production with the very best grade animals of the same breed, in fact, they will always out-class them. But great care must be exercised in the breeding and dissemination of pure-bred stock, that too large a percentage of animals of the scrub order are not bred and sold as foundation stock to new men intending to take the step from grades to pure-breds. The scrub pure-bred has been the only cause of some breeders of high-class grades being able to make the assertion that their grades were bet-

ter breeders and producers than their neighbors', or sometimes their own, pure-breds. When it comes to a question of whether a farmer should keep grades or pure-breds for breeding purposes, provided he knows the stock business, and is in a position to make the most out of it after growing up with a grade herd, we unhesitatingly advise pure-breds.

Studies in Political Economy—I.

EDITOR "THE FARMER'S ADVOCATE":

The desire for wealth, in the proper sense of the term, is entirely legitimate. It represents the effort which man makes to extend his control over nature. How is it then that man's moral sense universally looks with suspicion on the rich man, and is disposed to pity and excuse the poor? What is the significance of the statement that "It is easier for a camel to pass through the eye of a needle than for a rich man to enter the kingdom of heaven?"

In popular thinking there is no clear definition of rich and poor. Speaking loosely the rich man is he who possesses much wealth or much power to command the services of others; and the poor man is he who possesses little of these. But where is the line of division between rich and poor? Is it the average standard of living in the particular grade of society under consideration? Is that man rich who possesses more than the average, and that man poor who possesses less? If this be so there is no reason for condemning the rich, no justification for the remarkable unanimity in the moral sense of all peoples in all ages and places. It cannot be that this is the right distinction. There must be some other, and radically different, line of demarcation, which will enable us to distinguish, with scientific precision, between rich and poor, which will harmonize man's reason and his moral sense. What is it?

All things which satisfy human desire can be divided into two classes: wealth and direct personal services. These two are, however, fundamentally one, since all wealth is valuable because it represents human effort, and is thus indirectly personal service. Therefore, all things which are sought by man, in so far as political economy is concerned, may be resolved into the same thing—service. Now the question arises: Is there a mean or normal measure of just possession or enjoyment of service? There is. A member of human society is justly entitled to receive from society the equivalent of what he gives to society. He is entitled to get as much as he gives; service rendered and service commanded should be equal.

Here then, is the scientific distinction between rich and poor. He is rich who can command more service than he need render; he is poor who can command less. Thus viewed rich and poor stand in the same relationship to one another as positive and negative; the existence of rich men necessarily involves the existence of poor men, and vice versa. Viewed from the standpoint of ethics the rich are the robbers, and the poor are the robbed.

This distinction harmonizes all the confusions in the popular mind. It prevents us from unjustly condemning him who may possess more wealth than the average, and from unjustly exonerating him who may possess less. It creates a radically different and scientific basis for classification. It reconciles reason and conscience. Thus defined the statement that "it is easier for a camel to pass through the eye of a needle than for a rich man to enter the kingdom of heaven" is not figurative, but is scientifically accurate. In the kingdom of righteousness there cannot be either rich or poor.

Brant Co., Ont.

W. C. Good.

The Christian Guardian quotes the eminent Dr. F. W. Gunsaulus as declaring that every one of the twelve most prominent preachers in Chicago was brought up on a farm, which has proven and is demonstrating every day that it is a good place to develop men. "And," adds the Guardian, "the church which controls the rural districts to-day will probably control the cities and legislatures to-morrow." This is encouraging and only needs the tangible backing of a livelier appreciation on the part of the ministry of the noble and destiny-directing opportunities of rural pastorates.

The pulpit of the rural community in quest of model discourses will look long and far before bettering those like "The Sower and the Seed" of The Great Teacher, or finding a more helpful circuit or parish plan of campaign than "going about" among the people "doing good."

The rural minister of the Gospel who would have the people of his community thronging to hear his pulpit message should identify himself with their lives by a first-hand and personal interest in their pursuits and aspirations.