

exhibitor would know where his animal fell short and would endeavor to improve the weakness in that and other animals he might own. Another benefit would be to the public or onlookers. They would be educated along the line of knowing the horse's good points, not judging by the style or appearance of the harness. Hence an interest in the horse would be stimulated.

Now if all these benefits would not overcome all arguments of extra work or too much trouble then judging by points and keeping record is not worth while. But if it is, then let us suggest that the Brandon winter fair adopt and try this method for their fair in 1911.

Man.

W. H. HICKS.

Note.—The use of the score card is to be advised in some circumstances, but we hardly think its use would render the work of exhibition judges any more effective than such work is under the present system of judging. If a judge is liable to be branded a "know nothing" by onlookers because in his opinion a certain horse should occupy a certain position in a line-up, and judges always are liable to be so branded, it is doubtful if matters would be helped any by the onlooker knowing that the animal he was "rooting" for scored say one and one-quarter "points" less than the one that stood above him. It would all come back to the judge just the same, for if he could not satisfactorily sum up in his mind the merits and defects of the animals before him and form an opinion as to which came nearest the type and kind and quality of his ideal, he wouldn't likely come any nearer doing it by reducing his comparisons to figures and trying to express himself in terms that meant simply percentages of the ideal.

On the whole we think the system under which horse judging is now carried on is simpler and more satisfactory than any method of judging by "points" that has yet been devised. There is of course the objection that owners of animals and the public at the ringside do not know the why and wherefor always, a defect that might be remedied by having the judge state briefly the reasons for his placings. To the giving of reasons, however, there are objections that have thus far deterred exhibition managements from requiring this service of the judge.

There is something in this writer's hint that a record of some kind should be kept of prize-winning animals. It has always seemed to us that it would be a good plan for the horse breeders' association to have photographs taken of the first prize-winning individuals at least at our larger exhibitions, and to have the judges make some comments for record upon these animals. In ten or twenty years the best of our prize-winners are forgotten and the records now kept tell nothing of what they were or what they won. What is needed is something of a "record of performance," to augment what we know about the breeding of our draft horses.

* * *

The Harvester, the five-year-old trotting stallion that has been a consistent winner in races under 2.10 last year and this, had been expected by track experts to establish a new trotting record before ending his racing career. This he did last month in the third heat of a race at the Fort Erie track which he won in 2.02 flat, thus lowering the world's stallion trotting record of 2.02½ established by Cresceus nine years ago. The Harvester is a son of Walnut Hall, out of Notelet by Moko. He was purchased as a two-year-old for \$9,000.

STOCK

Would a Duty on Wool Encourage Sheep Raising?

A few weeks ago we published in these columns a brief statement of the contention of those who are advocating and those who are opposing the proposal to impose a substantial duty on raw wool. Since then we have received a large number of letters, some favoring a duty, some opposing it; the majority, however, favoring the proposal to impose a duty of about 30 per cent. on wool. We publish herewith a number of the letters, which are passed on at this time without editorial comment. As this subject is scheduled to be discussed in the Topics for Discussion department this week the usual three dollars and two dollars each is allowed for the letters in the order in which they appear.

Believes in a Wool Tariff

EDITOR FARMER'S ADVOCATE:

Would a tariff on wool be of benefit to the sheep-raisers? Most emphatically, yes. Would two dollars per bushel for wheat be in the interests of wheat growers?

In principle I am not in favor of a duty on anything. I believe in being allowed to buy and

more profitable and none more easily handled than sheep. They will eat and digest 80 per cent. of farm weeds. Sheep will eat and transform into wool and mutton willows and poplar on scrub land. One hundred sheep will clear as much land as a hired man. They never have to be called in the morning, never talk back, never go on strike and do their work well and cheerfully.

I used to regard scrub land as a curse, but since procuring a flock of sheep I look upon the bush land differently. It looks now like wool and mutton. I have just disposed of my male spring lambs at \$5.80 per head. The cost of raising them was next to nothing, as each lamb paid me a premium in the way of clearing the land. This has been my experience in sheep-raising, and my opinion is that a duty on wool would be substantially in the interests of the industry.

Alta.

A. L. DICKENS.

(It would be of some interest to sheep-raisers generally to know how the writer of the above letter has solved the problem of protecting his flock from wolves. It is a well known fact that the wolf pest is one of the most serious that Western sheep-raisers have to contend with.—Ed.)

Tariff on Wool Would Aid Sheepmen

EDITOR FARMER'S ADVOCATE:

You have asked for opinions as to whether or not duty on wool would be in the best interests of sheep-raisers and of the country as a whole.

It is a question of national importance, on which there is much need for more light; but before discussing it I would like to call attention to the causes that contributed to the growth of the woollen manufacturing business and sheep-raising in England as being probably suggestive of what a policy along somewhat similar lines might do for the Dominion.

In the twelfth and thirteenth centuries Britain depended on Flanders, or Belgium and Holland for her woollen goods, the wool being imported by these countries almost entirely from England, and practically all the world was clothed with English

wool made into cloth in Flanders. Edward the Third was the real creator of the English woollen industry. He imposed extreme measures of protection, prohibiting the export of wool from Britain, under penalty of death. At the same time he imported expert woollen cloth makers from Flanders. Thus from being an exporter of wool and importer of cloth, this policy soon brought England into prominence as a manufacturer and exporter of cloth, laying the foundations of the fabulous wealth-producing woollen industries of the country.

This policy, with some modifications, was strictly enforced down to 1845, by which time British textile manufactures were considered out of danger from foreign competition, and the era of free trade was inaugurated. It was a policy that probably meant dearer clothing for a time, until the industry was established, and the same would probably be true if Canada decided to establish a monster industry, and build for the future, producing our own clothing. A substantial duty on wool would probably cost us some money, but it is necessary to first spend money to make anything; either individually or nationally.

Before the civil war in the United States, 1861-5, the crude woollen industry of the republic almost collapsed before the well organized industry of Great Britain, but the war forced home to the people of the United States the conviction, that an essential part of its national



PART OF A BUNCH OF 3000 SHEEP IN THE STOCKYARDS AT LETHBRIDGE, OWNED BY THE ALBERTA SHEEP CO.