

A P. E. Island Farmer's Views on the Tariff.

To the Editor "The Farmer's Advocate":

We read the arguments laid before the Tariff Commission in Ontario by a few representatives of the farmers' associations, which we consider misleading, and not the best policy for a new and growing country like Canada. Now, it is plain to all deep-thinking statesmen that every class of producers must be protected, as far as tariff legislation can do it, before we can hope for a general and lasting prosperity. What the farmers of Canada require now is a steady, sure market that will pay them the cost price for everything they produce on the farm. It is hard to see how a low tariff would raise the price of farm produce, while the United States and other countries have a high tariff wall against us, and as we have to compete with the world in the free markets of England, we cannot be any better off than we are, except by a preference, which they are not willing to grant us. The best market for us is the "home market," for every consumer added to our population that doesn't farm, adds to the home market for farm produce. Those who spoke before the commission seem to think very little of the home market; but, according to the census of 1901, the value of the agricultural products produced that year was three hundred and sixty-three million dollars; and only eighty-five millions six hundred and ninety-six thousand found a market abroad, while nearly three hundred millions found consumers at home. This shows the great importance of the home market. The greatest menace to the Canadian farmer to-day is the ever-increasing number of competitors who are settling in the Northwest, and who will surely raise the supply far above the demand, until such time as the manufacturers and other consuming classes will balance the farming population, so that all classes of producers will find a good home market.

This is what a high tariff has done for the United States for the last forty years, and it is as popular to-day as it ever was. Those who spoke before the Commission believed that a high tariff brought the price of goods manufactured in Canada up to the percentage levied on foreign goods; and if this be so, how could the United States sell us goods to the value of one hundred and fifty million dollars yearly, after paying freight and a thirty-per-cent. tariff cheaper? We also find that United States cheap goods are driving English products out of the markets of the world. Now, if a low tariff or free goods made those products cheaper, why do we have to pay so much for binder twine, coal-oil, corn and breeding stock, as we did when those products were imported under a tariff? The very fact that the present Liberal Party, who were elected on a low-tariff policy in 1896, could not run the Government without falling back on the high-tariff policy of protection, is clear proof that a low tariff will not do for Canada, until such time as the United States is willing to give us reciprocity. We believe that more protection will invite capital into the country that will utilize and manufacture all the minerals and raw material in Canada, consequently bringing millions of consumers of farm products that will be an everlasting home market for the farmer.

Now, if the two hundred and fifty-seven million four hundred and fifty thousand dollars' worth of goods we imported into Canada in 1904, or the greater part of them, had been manufactured in Canada, see what an immense amount of capital and labor it would bring into our country, besides the home market it would create for the farmer.

There is no reason why Canada, with her great water-power, immense supply of coal and raw material, should not become one of the greatest manufacturing countries in the world. What the farmers of Canada to-day need is more co-operation to sell the products of the farm, and get cost price for everything they have to sell, then they will be able to pay the cost price for everything they have to buy from the manufacturers; they will also be able to pay as much wages to their hired help as do the manufacturers.

P. E. I.

Timely Hints.

To the Editor "The Farmer's Advocate":

In the lull that follows the holiday season and that precedes the busy spring-time, it will be well if the farmer should give attention to a few matters that he will have little time for later on. First of all, the farmer will do well to look up the pedigrees of the sires he proposes breeding from during the coming summer. The average farmer cannot afford to purchase expensive or pure-bred dams, and so his best plan is to "breed up" by using sires that will help to bring his herd up to the standard he aims at. In the hurry of spring and summer work he has little time to study these matters. It takes time to look up a pedigree, and it is time that is lacking during the farmer's busy season. Sires

should be carefully examined now, and their history gone into thoroughly. A little attention to this matter may save a deal of time and worry later on. Then there is the matter of fences. How much loss and annoyance, to say nothing of the making of bad neighbors, has been incurred by the neglect of fencing. Now that the wire fence—put in place by skilled labor—is the order of the day, the farmer will do well to decide upon the fencing he purposes doing, and to secure a man, with day and date for having it done. This same applies to any building or repairs. A little foresight will save a deal of annoyance. These are the days, too, to see that the implements are put in good repair. The harrows or the plow or the binder may require a little repairing, and now is the time to have all such attended to. In the rush of the season the repairs agent seems to be required in a score of places at the same time. Just now he has more leisure. If he is procured in time he will have the leisure to do his work properly, to the saving of time and temper, and of good money to the farmer, to boot.

This is a good opportunity, too, to go carefully over the year's earnings to discover the various profits and losses. It is simply astonishing how many of us do a deal of work at a loss, not because we intend to do this, or because we can afford to do so, but because we do not keep account. There are too many cows that are eating up the profit of their thrifty neighbors. Too many fields are sown with crops so unsuited to the soil that they are simply cumberers of the ground. In a word, too many farmers are not getting the profit they should, and this is the season for a little solid thinking for the man who wishes to farm at a profit. Hard work of the right kind is the best work that any farmer does. Little leaks will sink a ship. Little losses will swamp any farmer in time, while little profits gradually increased and thoughtfully invested mean prosperity.

Now, this letter may not have indicated the special line your thinking should take, but if it only stirs you up to hard thinking about how you may do better in your own way, it will not have been written in vain.

Wentworth Co., Ont.

A Small Farm Well Managed.

I have been working a small farm the past ten years—just fifty acres of workable land, ten acres pasture. The soil is a clay loam, nearly level and well underdrained. I do nearly all the work myself, hiring only in haying and harvest by the day. My hired help averages about \$50 a year. I raise mostly spring grain, and I endeavor to get the best seed I can. I clean all the small grain out, for what we sow we reap, and endeavor to sow only the large kernels. There is no better way to invest a few dollars than in good seed grain. There are too many men who never think of what they are going to plant until the time comes to sow, then whatever they can get handiest has to do, and when harvest comes round they wonder how it is they have only 25 bushels to the acre when others have double or treble that amount. I give you below my crop report for this year (1905). Some crops are a little above the average for the ten years, while others are below:

Acres.	Crop.	Yield.
11	Hay	30 tons—15 bush. clover seed
14	Oats	985 bushels.
9	Barley	460 bushels.
7	Wheat	190 bushels.
7	Corn	420 bushels.

The oats are Twentieth Century, and the barley Mandshuri. What I sell is for seed, and I have received as high as 50 cents for the oats and 60 cents for barley. I treat all my spring grain for smut. I took two half barrels, bored a hole near the bottom of each, put in a plug, put liquid in, then a bushel of barley, stir well, leave in ten minutes, skim off all the light grain as it comes to the surface, pull out the plug, let the water off (there must be a piece of wire net tacked over the hole on the inside, and left a little loose to allow the plug to fit in) in the other barrel, reversing the barrels each time. The great advantage is getting rid of all the small grain. I clean it as well as it is possible with the fanning mill first. The oats I dip in the sacks. What is true regarding seed grain is also applicable to clover and grass seed—that only the very best should find room on our farms, for what we sow we must expect to reap. If farmers would sell their inferior clover seed, and buy their seed of a good reliable seedsmen, there would soon be a marked difference in the quality of seed grown in this vicinity. Buy the very best to be had, and you will get no small seed.

I have had some excellent catches of clover seed on oats the past two years. I sow as early as I can get the ground in proper shape. I sow one bushel three pecks oats to acre. Where clover seed is to be sown I use seeder on the grain drill. The clover is cut for hay, then clover seed, and plowed down for spring grain. The stubble is plowed as soon as crop is off, and kept worked occasionally until November, when I ridge

it up with a ribber. One field of oats I sowed on land treated after this manner went over 80 bushels to the acre. One advantage of the ribbed land is that you can work it down earlier in spring. Thorough cultivation is a necessity, as much so as good seed; the best of seed cannot make up for negligence of the seed-bed. It seems to me that if we are observant, note where we ourselves and others fail, and avoid ever after the things we know can never prove ought but a failure, we could make rapid strides in farming in all other branches as well as grain-growing.

Norfolk Co., Ont.

L. R. B.

THE DAIRY.

Improving the Production of the Dairy Cow.

The aggregate production of the dairy cows of the country is large, bringing much business and wealth to the various people engaged in handling the product. But thoughtful dairymen know well that the great majority of the "men behind the cows" are not getting anything like the profit they might, could, would and should, if they gave their cows better care and kept better cows. Some patrons of cheese factories get returns of 25 to 50 per cent. per cow more than others, due to better care and weeding out the poor cows. "Feed and Weed" is good, but "Feed, Breed and Weed" is better. I put feed, which includes good care, first, advisably, because "breed without feed to success will not lead." All improved breeds have made good by good care and feed, with judicious breeding and mating. Instead of keeping cows that average from 3,000 to 4,000 pounds of milk during each season, dairymen can easily, and in a very few years, bring the production of their herds up to 6,000 and 8,000 pounds of milk each season, and many who have special fitness for the business will go beyond this. But whilst this end is so much to be desired, and a veritable gold mine lies right before dairymen, the progress made in developing this mine is not as fast as could be desired. It has been shown that, by weighing milk daily, the production of a herd can soon be increased and the poor cows weeded out. While this is a good plan, very few even good dairymen will take the time to weigh milk daily, and the great majority of dairymen could not be induced to do so. To me, the trouble has always seemed to be how to get at those dairymen who keep the poor cows; it is they rather than the men with the good cows that need to improve. We can write and talk till doomsday and do no good to this class, because the information does not reach them or is not driven home to them personally. After much thought, a very simple way has come to me, and it is this: It is recommended to weigh milk every day to know how much the cows are giving in a year. Well, we can tell from the factory books how much each patron sends to the factory; in fact, every patron can tell for himself how much his cows are giving by simply keeping his statements and totalling up the months. But only a few do this. How, then, can we expect those to weigh their milk every day? Now, nearly every patron can be reached at the annual meeting of the cheese and butter factories, and if the secretaries would simply prepare a statement showing the total amount of milk delivered by each patron, it would add interest to the meeting and be brought forcibly home to each one, and set them thinking. Each patron could easily see how much his cows are averaging him, and he cannot be offended, because no one else need know what each is doing, because the secretary does not know how many cows each patron has, but it will be well for the secretary to get permission from some of the patrons that are known to be the best—and the worst, too, if they are not likely to take offence—and a contrast can be made. But if only the average per cow for the best patron is given, other patrons can, by knowing how many cows they have been sending from, tell how they compare with the best without any publicity, will have the point brought home to them and will strive to do better; also the best patrons will be interested. Fact is required in dealing with the public, as factory officials know very well. There are also many ways that should suggest themselves in which the profit derived from cows can be enlarged upon by some one known to the factory official, and the meeting made very interesting and profitable. For example, if one patron sends 87,500 pounds of milk from twenty cows, and fifteen of those twenty cows average 5,000 pounds each, that would leave only 2,500 pounds for each of the others; and, multiplied by the price per 100 pounds received for the milk, would show the difference in profit between good cows and poor ones. Anyone who milks twenty cows every day does not need the scales to pick out five of the poorest producing cows out of the twenty; or, in other words, a man can cull out 25 per cent. without weighing the milk of each cow. But, when necessary to draw the line very close, it would require both scales and Babcock test. But, even with these,