

The Farmer's Advocate

and Home Magazine

"Persevere and Succeed."

Established
1866.

REGISTERED IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE COPYRIGHT ACT OF 1875

Vol. XLV.

LONDON, ONTARIO, NOVEMBER 17, 1910

No. 947

EDITORIAL.

A thousand dollars a year will not purchase in the average Canadian city as good a living as many a family is enjoying on the farm.

The wealth of a nation is not in her natural resources, but in the genius which she brings to bear upon these natural resources.—N. Dwight Hillis.

Beware of the disease called "little peach." Mr. Casar reports that Michigan growers consider it several times more destructive than peach yellows.

All wealth is for the people. If a man takes out of the granary of society with one hand more than he puts back in with the other, through creative labor, he is a pauper.—N. Dwight Hillis.

Cow-testing is the bed-rock foundation of real progress in milk production. Nothing in connection with the dairy industry is more satisfactory than the growing practice of keeping milk records, with periodical testing for butter-fat.

There is one good thing about the fence-corner plan of implement storage—a fire is not likely to burn the machinery all up at once. On the whole, though, we would prefer to take this slight chance in a well-located implement shed.

Land values on this continent are rising. In at least one section of the Illinois corn belt, we learn, there are no farms selling for less than \$200 an acre. We have scarcely begun to appreciate the producing capacity and earning power of an acre of good land.

"The Farmer's Advocate" saved a good many of its readers several dollars apiece this summer by refusing to publish the advertisement of an egg preservative until the article could be tested. Nor is this by any means an isolated case. Tens of thousands of dollars' worth of advertising running regularly in prominent papers is being annually declined by the publishers of this journal.

Freer exchange of natural products has been mooted as a first basis of reciprocity negotiations between Canada and United States. A very substantial measure of tariff easement may be effected in this way—if the American farmers are willing. We must not, however, consent to the continued unrestricted export of those valuable natural resources of which Canada has a measurable monopoly, such as pulpwood and certain forms of minerals. These should be manufactured at home, or, if exported in raw form, should be subject to an export duty.

The moral of the rabies situation is that thoroughness is essential to make such laws as the dog muzzling order completely effective. Every evasion provides a loophole for contagion to spread. It is a poor friend of the dog who will, by laxity in compliance, prolong his necessary period of restraint and extend the danger of his being from such a horrible disease. Let us, as honorable citizens, comply with beneficent regulations, and thus stamp out the contagion which threatens the health and safety not only of dogs, but of other animals and of human beings.

Rabies Not Yet Stamped Out.

Disturbing reports come to hand again of rabies outbreaks in Western Ontario. Inasmuch as the muzzling order, proclaimed early in February of this year by the joint authority of the Dominion and Provincial Governments, should, if faithfully observed and enforced, have been the means of stamping out ere this the dread contagion, attention may be properly directed to the lax manner in which the order has been executed and obeyed.

As intimated above, two separate Governments are concerned in the control of rabies. The Health of Animals Branch of the Dominion Department of Agriculture had to deal with it from a veterinary point of view in so far as it affected or endangered the health of dogs and live stock, about one hundred head of which (other than dogs) had succumbed up to the date of the passage of the dog-muzzling order. The Provincial authorities were concerned in the disease from a still more important standpoint, namely, that of Public Health. Now, in order for the Dominion Department to properly enforce a muzzling order over the large area involved, it would have been necessary to employ a large force of special inspectors whose salary and expenses would have been an extra charge on the country; while, owing to the fact that the majority of them would be more or less new to their duty, it would likely, in some cases, have been rather inefficiently performed.

Under these circumstances, the co-operation of the Provincial authorities was solicited through Dr. Hodgetts, then Chief Health Officer for Ontario, who, with the full approval of the Provincial Secretary, undertook the passage and enforcement of an order identical in every way with that passed by the Dominion Department of Agriculture. This arrangement was looked upon as eminently proper and satisfactory, especially as the Provincial authorities possessed their magistrates, city and town police, county constables and other machinery necessary for the proper enforcement of the order.

On February 9th, the Secretary of the Provincial Board of Health sent out to local boards within the 23 counties specified a copy of the Provincial order, reminding them that, under the provisions of Sec. 14 of the Public Health Act, it was the duty of the local Boards of Health to superintend and see to the execution of any regulations made by the Provincial Board. The attention of all municipal councils and Boards of Health, and police commissioners in cities of 100,000 or more, was directed to the provisions of Sec. 540 of the Consolidated Municipal Act, which empowered them to pass by-laws and to make regulations as to dogs and the killing of the same. The hearty support and co-operation of all municipalities was confidently bespoken. Thus, we had a joint Federal and Provincial order, not any too popular among dog-owners, left to municipal execution.

However, thanks to the alarm of many outbreaks and a horrible human death by rabies, the machinery of the law, after being rather tardily and irregularly started into action, worked fairly well for a time, and a marked diminution in the cases of rabies—and, incidentally, in the number of dogs—was soon noticeable. As alarm subsided, the municipal authorities became lax, while dog-owners, many of whom were never any too punctilious about observing the order, became increasingly neglectful. In many cases the rural telephone was used to warn a whole neighborhood of the approach of the dog-catcher in his automobile, so that muzzles which had been hanging

around unused would be quickly brought into requisition, until the danger (of being fined) had passed, when Fido would again be allowed the liberty of his jaws. The Provincial Board of Health, when it would hear of municipalities that were not enforcing the regulations as required, would continually communicate with them urging compliance. Other than this, we have heard of no pressure brought to bear to insure the thorough enforcement of the order, which in many localities has practically become a dead letter. Indeed, in the City of London, a police magistrate refused to impose a fine, on the ground that the owners of the dogs had been misled by the public prints to think the order had expired. Subsequently, the City Council, in its omniscience, repealed the by-law.

Had the muzzling order been properly and effectively enforced throughout the whole of the affected area, Dr. Rutherford, the efficient Dominion Veterinary Director-General, declares that the disease would long ago have completely disappeared. As matters stand, an occasional case is from time to time reported, and it would almost appear as if the Dominion Department would be obliged to amend its policy somewhat, and pass local muzzling orders, trusting to the intelligence and common sense of the communities interested to assist in their proper enforcement.

It must, of course, be distinctly understood that it is the Dominion Department of Agriculture that is enforcing the order prohibiting the removal of dogs from the infected area, a number of persons having been heavily fined for infractions of this regulation.

How to Improve Rural Education.

Before the Royal Commission on Industrial Training and Technical Education we told an experience which we think illustrates well the manner in which rural education could be advantageously related to agriculture.

Visiting, not long since, at the homes of a couple of middle-aged farmers who have been trying alfalfa, one of the editors of "The Farmer's Advocate," walking across the new-seeded meadow in company with the two men and their three sons, age four, six and nine years, respectively, asked for a spade, and began digging down to examine the roots, which were found rather plentifully supplied with nodules. Not altogether to his surprise, it proved that neither of the two men had ever seen the nodules before, although they had been reading agricultural journals to some extent, and one of them had acted upon a friend's suggestion to inoculate some of his seed with nitro-culture. Neither had they ever seen the nodules on clover roots, though all that anyone need do to find them is to take up a clover root carefully, so as to avoid stripping them off. Of course, the journalist explained how, within these little nodules, varying in size from a pin-head to a pea, dwell the microscopic bacteria which take up from the air, circulating through the soil, the gas called nitrogen, and, after using it in their own life processes, pass it on to the plants, to be built up in their tissues; and how that in this way the clovers, alfalfa, peas and other legumes capture from the atmosphere many dollars' worth per acre of this nitrogen, which, if purchased in the form of commercial fertilizers, would cost 16 to 18 cents a pound. No doubt they had read this before, but, not seeing the nodules, it had not become a vivid reality to them.

Then we dug down to see how deep the roots had penetrated, and, after excavating quite a large hole, were content to cut the taproot off at 21 inches below the surface. Both men were