

generous scale, and when finished will be one of the handsomest and best of its kind, and will add greatly to the beauty of the grounds and the facilities for displaying exhibits. In case of a Dominion exhibition being held on these grounds, next year or the following year—a contingency which is now among the probabilities—it becomes more than ever necessary. The displays in the fruit and other departments were magnificent.

The live-stock department of the show, always one of its most interesting features, was this year, on the whole, fully up to the usual standard of excellence, while the exhibit of horses was distinctly in advance of that of any former year in the history of the Exhibition, all sections being well filled with high-class animals both in the heavy draft and in the lighter classes of harness and saddle horses. This is the result of the great demand and good prices ruling for the best class of horses, a demand which breeders, importers and dealers have, with commendable enterprise and success, combined to meet and provide for. The beef and dairy breeds of cattle were well represented in all classes, as were also sheep and swine, a considerable number of new exhibitors in all departments contributing to the display and showing an ever-increasing interest in the greatest of the Dominion's assets—its live stock, the general improvement of which is its most important material problem. Complete reports and prize lists will appear in our next issue.

The total attendance at the show was for the ten days, 394,676, as against 249,016 last year; Breeders' Day attracting the largest crowd, 82,457.

### Judging Competitions at Toronto Industrial Exhibition.

These competitions, the prizes for which were given by the Massey-Harris Co., and the competition restricted to farmers or farmers' sons not over 25 years of age, resulted as follows:

Dairy Cattle.—1st, Percy F. Clemons, St. George, 234 marks; 2nd, C. J. Bray, Guelph, 188 marks; 3rd, B. C. Gilpin, Guelph, 185 marks; 4th, R. H. Williams, Berlin, 184 marks.

Beef Cattle.—1st, W. J. Gardhouse, Highfield, 110 marks; 2nd, J. M. McCallum, Shakespeare, 104 marks; 3rd, R. J. Deachman, Guelph, 98 marks; 4th, A. S. Gardhouse, Highfield, 94 marks.

Sheep.—1st, R. G. Baker, Guelph, 120 marks; 2nd, Jas. A. Telfer, Paris, 115 marks; 3rd, A. Gardhouse, Highfield, 103 marks; 4th, W. J. Gardhouse, Highfield, 102 marks.

Swine.—1st, Wm. MacRae, Guelph, 145 marks; 2nd, J. M. McCallum, Shakespeare, 141 marks; 3rd, R. H. Williams, Berlin, 135 marks; 4th, Alf. E. Shore, White Oak, 127 marks.

### Farmers' Telephone.

To the Editor "Farmer's Advocate":

For some years I have felt the need of a telephone to connect my farm with the City of Brandon. Over two years ago I applied to the Bell Company's agent at that place, and he requested me to wait until the Company's new line was built, and they would put one on my premises. Since that time he requested me to state what I would pay and he would submit my offer to the Company. Accordingly, I offered thirty-five dollars per year for the term of three years, and several other farmers of this township made the same proposition at that time. My farmhouse is one mile from the Bell Company line and about nine from Brandon. The Company replied to my offer, stating that they would put me in the instrument and connections for \$60 per year for five years' contract.

Every one will admit that the progress which this country enjoys has been brought about by the farmer, and I do not know of any way that a farmer in this township can enjoy the advantages of a telephone at the present time except by paying five times more than it should cost, and I expect it is the same in other places in this Province. Some years ago I drove for some distance from Spring Valley, through the south-east part of the State of Minnesota. Farmers there were well supplied with telephones, and any farmer could get one, by signing a three years' contract, for \$12 per year. This included local use, three towns as large as Brandon being within that limit. For longer distances a small additional fee was charged. The farmers there also have free mail delivery. We have as good a country, with, I believe, more prosperous farmers. In many parts it is as well settled, and we have better buildings. It is, I think, high time that we in the thickly-settled districts should have some of the home comforts that our cousins enjoy across the line. We are willing to pay a reasonable rate for a farmers' line, believing that it would be money in the pockets of the business men, as well as of untold value to the farmer in case of sickness, etc. This, I believe, would prove a good investment to any company that would take hold of it. I don't mean the Bell Company. I would like to hear the opinions of farmers on this matter through the leading agricultural journal of Manitoba. JOHN BROOKS.

### Why Toronto Cattle Prices are Lower Than Chicago.

[From the Toronto World.]

I have noticed in your columns the last few days a good deal being said about why live cattle sell so much higher on the Chicago market than they do on the Toronto market. The difference is due not so much to the breeding as to the feeding. These Chicago cattle you see selling at from 7c. to 8½c. per pound have been fed all the corn they could eat for from six to ten months, running loose. This mode of feeding produces beef with the fat well mixed with the lean, which is of the very best quality and is the kind of beef that is sold in all the large American cities. But none of these high-priced cattle are exported. This long feeding is very expensive.

The Canadian cattle are, with few exceptions, short fed, which means the farmers only feed them from two to three months, and not all that time on grain. This process is not nearly so expensive and the cattle can be sold much cheaper. I have no doubt if the Canadian feeders had as good a market for the very best cattle as the American feeders have, they would soon produce the quality. But they have not got the market for the very best cattle, consequently they would not bring as high a price if they were equally as good.

It has been proved time and again by exporters that it does not pay to ship these high-priced cattle. The main advantage the American feeder has over the Canadian is the cheap corn. In your issue of yesterday you quoted figures showing that the Americans exported a great many less cattle and a great deal less dressed beef during the last seven months than they did during the previous seven months. This was caused wholly by the partial failure of their corn crop last year. With the crop of corn they have this year, their exports will equal or exceed other years again. I have no doubt their exports of beef and cattle will increase instead of decrease.

Regarding exports of dressed beef from Canada, a great change will have to be made in the feeding and handling after being killed, both on this side, on the ship, and in England, before it will be a success. Cattle can be procured only for a few months in the year of suitable quality, while they can be got in Chicago any week in the year. I don't consider Canada is losing anything by not having a dead-meat trade. She does not produce enough good cattle for exporting alive yet, and with ocean freight at 30 shillings live cattle can compete with dressed beef. Feeders are the best judges of how long to feed and the kind of feed to use. They are very intelligent on this matter regarding results. JOSEPH GOULD.

Boston, Sept. 4, 1902.

My attention has been called to your remarks with regard to the price of United States cattle in Chicago, compared with prices obtained for Canadian cattle in Canada. As I have been a long time engaged in the trade, I venture to give my opinion. In the first place, American cattle are better finished than Canadian. They never are allowed to lose their flesh from the time they are calves, and, consequently, they dress a greater percentage to their live weight. On the contrary, our cattle in the majority of cases are only skin and bone in the spring time and never get time to grow flesh, but are shipped away when in good condition, just when a little more feed would make them prime. Anyone can see by the British market reports that United States cattle sell for more than Canadian by at least one cent per pound. Very few, if any, of those fancy priced cattle in Chicago find their way to England, dead or alive. They have a better market at home. I note your remarks regarding Argentina. You seem to overlook the fact that live cattle from that republic are not allowed to be landed in Great Britain and Ireland, so that accounts for the increased shipments of dressed beef. There are people now in Toronto who were engaged in the dead-meat trade to Great Britain many years ago, and if they had found it remunerative they would likely have continued it. If I am rightly informed, it would take the proceeds of the Klondike gold mines to carry it on. The question is often asked: How do Americans make money by exporting dead meat? Because in the United States the trade is in the hands of a syndicate, who regulate the home market by sending away the surplus, even if they lose the freight and other expenses by doing so. Why, they will sell meat in London and Liverpool for less than they get in New York and Boston, just to keep up home prices. The Canadian exporter of dead meat who loses his money has not the opportunity of getting remuneration in that way, as the trade here in Toronto and Montreal is cut pretty close by competition in the wholesale business. During three months of the year Canadian stable fed cattle compare favorably with those of the States, but when it comes to grass time we are not in it with the States. DENIS O'LEARY.

Toronto, Sept. 5, 1902.

### FARM.

#### Weeds and Insects.

In view of the increasing trouble in combating insect pests affecting grain, root and fruit crops and animals, and the spread of noxious weeds, we desire readers in every county in Canada to write us at once on a post card:

1st. What insect pests have proved most troublesome during the present and previous seasons in your district, and are on the increase? What remedies are proving most effective?

2nd. What weeds are considered worst in your locality and are gaining ground? What method of extermination is found most effective with the particular weeds in question?

If you cannot put what you need to say on a card, put it in a letter. If you find any troublesome weed with which you are unacquainted, kindly forward us a sample, giving your name and address, mentioning its habits as far as you have observed them. Send a complete plant, in good condition, and we will undertake its identification.

#### Value of Early Plowing.

To clean a farm that has become overrun with noxious weeds, or insure cleanliness to one already free from such intruders, there is no more effective agent at the disposal of the farmer than the plow if used soon after the crop has been removed. The once prevalent idea that to clean a field of thistles, June grass, etc., required the whole summer and the absence of a crop has long ago been exploded, not but what the summer fallow affords an excellent opportunity of combating pernicious weed, but then it is an expensive operation and one not absolutely necessary.

Although we believe grain fields should mostly be sown with clover, yet circumstances arise on many farms requiring much of the stubble to be turned under in the preparation for a crop the next season. The early plowing should be rather shallow, but at the same time the entire surface should be cut so that no weeds having heavy roots may be permitted to escape. Four inches will be found about right on most soils; those of a loamy character, however, may do even shallower. For this operation there is no better and speedier implement than the modern gang plow. This two, three or four furrow implement has now reached a stage of perfection when work equal, almost, in finish to that of a single plow may be accomplished, and the speed at which a field may be covered makes its employment desirable in these days of scarce farm help. After the stubble has been upturned, the light harrow should go on to shake out the roots of all weeds which may have been growing and to close up the larger openings in the soil so that the moisture already present may be retained. Following this, the spring-tooth or shear cultivator may be used when the surface has become compact or the weed seeds have germinated and are showing forth a tiny plant.

If this method be pursued during the growing season of the fall, numberless seeds will be sprouted and killed which, if only late fall plowing were done, would come forth the next season to increase and so multiply in numbers as to retard the progress of the crop. There is no better plan of killing false flax, shepherd's-purse and other long-lived annuals than the one outlined. In some sections there is a custom of running the disk harrow or cultivator over the stubble land in hope of causing some undesirable seeds to germinate. While this is a comparatively speedy process, and very good as far as it goes, it by no means takes the place of the plow if used as described. But a short time will be required to turn the unsodded stubble fields on most farms, and no operation at this season will insure better returns in the future.

#### Manitoba's Harvest.

Hark to the merry noise—the joyous whirr  
Of driving-wheel and roaring cylinder;  
At night the camp-fires flush with ruddy glow,  
The blue above—the tinted wheat below.

God keeps His promise—He doth aye prevail;  
Seed time and harvest, they shall never fail.  
Behold the canvas that He doth unfold:  
Above, the blue; below, the cloth of gold.

—The Khan

The attention of all contributors of letters or articles for publication in the "Farmer's Advocate" is directed to the fact that the former one-cent rate on such has been raised to two cents for four ounces and one cent for each additional two ounces or fraction thereof. Any letters intended for publication weighing over one ounce must not be sealed, and must not contain any other correspondence. No letter intended for publication can be sent for less than two cents.