

parts but in the older settled parts attention must be paid to humus supply before the moisture problem can be handled to advantage.

MY OPINION ON SOME MATTERS NUMBER 15

I HEAR OF CATTLE FEEDING WITH A VIEW TO SUPPLYING MANURE

One day not long ago I was talking to a farmer who had come from Ontario to buy a carload of cattle for winter feeding. He had found it almost impossible to get them in the central part of Western Ontario, and at Toronto the prices asked were considered too high. "What do you expect these animals will cost you placed in your stable?" I asked.

"Five and a quarter or five and a half cents a pound," was his reply.

"And what do you expect you will be able to get for them in the spring when you have them fat?" was my next query.

"Perhaps six cents a pound," he replied.

"Well, you can't make much money on that deal," I remarked.

"No, not on the cattle direct," he said, "but I must have the manure."

This man had been on the same farm for twenty years. It had been first cropped about twenty-five or thirty years before that. The land was a nice clay loam, he informed me. Up to ten or twelve years ago practically everything that grew on the land was sold direct. A slight exception consisted in the feeding of a few pigs and a small flock of sheep. The manure from these pigs and sheep, as well as from the horses needed to work the farm and a few cattle, had been spread on a field near the barn. He noticed that no matter what the season was like the crop on that manured part always was better than similar crops on other fields. He concluded that the farm needed barn-yard manure, and his first move was to provide stable accommodation and to increase his stock of cattle. He could not raise as many as he felt like feeding each year, but it was not hard to buy fair feeders in the neighborhood at low prices. Now he feeds about thirty head of big fellows each winter.

"Yes, and he's foolish for doing it!" remarks some grain grower. "Why doesn't he come West, where manure is not needed?" Another says: "It didn't pay him!"

The Eastern man admitted that there had been years since he started cattle feeding when he did not clear any hard cash direct from his cattle; but he made it clear that he never was able to swell his bank account until stock-raising was made a sufficiently important part of his work to provide a big supply of manure every year.

I know I have friends in the Canadian West who will laugh and ridicule what I have said as not being applicable to the West. But these are the men who are doing injury to our agriculture. They have made money on the prairies without using manure, and do not realize that the storehouse of plant food is running low in many districts. They have not learned that the most profitable plan is to keep this stock of plant food well replenished. Why should they be satisfied with five bushels or so per acre less than a neighbor? Why should they be satisfied with half a bushel less when wheat runs at one dollar per bushel?

It took ten to twenty years to show the Eastern farmer that his land needed manure—but he learned it, and his returns today are regulated by manure and cultivation.

—ARCHIE McCLURE.

Tariffs, Trusts, Prices and Wages

The minority report of the United States Senate committee on wages and the cost of living, which has been recently issued, takes the form of a reply to the majority report. The report, of course, has a political aspect, and is designed to serve political purposes, but the following three paragraphs are quoted for what they are worth:

"There are too trusts that could survive a

revenue tariff. So enormous have been their profits that we find organizations springing up all over the country, like the Elgin board of trade, the wholesale grocers, lumber dealers—associations that have contributed largely to the advance in prices and the frauds perpetrated by manufacturers of certain goods, in reducing the weight of contents of packages from 20 to 50 per cent. and maintaining the same price."

* * *

"It is difficult to understand how anyone can favor high rates of duty if he does not honestly believe that it will increase the prices to be realized by the manufacturers producing the article affected by diminishing or destroying competition, and thus necessarily increasing the cost to the consumer. Then, we were many times mournfully warned that any reduction in rates would flood our country with lower-priced German products, and that the smoke of American manufacturers would disappear from the heavens. Now we are informed that the tariff has not increased the cost of those articles entering into every household and administering to the health and comfort of every family."

* * *

"Great Britain is a free trade nation, and it is the most prosperous nation in the world, except our own. Shoals of emigrants from the tariff-ridden nations of France, Germany, Italy and Russia go to England to work. But Englishmen do not emigrate to those countries, because the standard of living is lower. The general testimony is that the rate of wages for all mechanical trades is substantially higher in Great Britain than in those protectionist countries, while the prices of necessities are lower, leaving the Englishman a wider margin to live upon. It is about sixty years since Great Britain adopted free trade, and, during that time, according to a table published in *Whitaker's Almanac*, wages have increased 81.7 per cent., and prices only 3 per cent."

The Lesson of the Drought

What is the lesson to be learned from the drought which has affected in varying degrees parts of the Northwest this season? In what way shall we modify our procedure in future years in the light of our recent experience?

We have had it dinned into our ears from all quarters, including even a highly placed government official, that our lack of cultivation is at the bottom of all the light crops in the country. A traveller has only to see two crops of grain in close proximity, one giving promise of a heavy yield and the other showing merely a thin stand, and he immediately draws the inference that the one field has been well farmed and the other "scamped"; and not only does he draw the inference, but he must write to the papers about it and circulate this idea as much as possible. Now, if he would only take the trouble to make enquiries he would probably find that the difference in the condition of the two crops was not due to cultivation, or lack of cultivation, in any great degree, but that the heavy crop was on "new land"—breaking or fallow—and the light one was on land which has been cropped the previous season.

If the drought has more strongly emphasized one fact than another, it is that no amount of cultivation will give a good crop on stubble or stubble-plowing in a season such as we have just passed through. One may harrow and pack to any extent, and the result is much the same when there is no moisture to conserve. Probably the dry fall of last year must also be taken into account, for had there been moisture low down at the beginning of the season perhaps we should have had a different tale to tell, and a better reward for our labors.

I do not wish to convey the idea that there was no difference whatever apparent between stubble lands which had been properly worked, and those which had had the minimum of cultivation, for no doubt the better working of the land did give the grain a better start; but that the difference in the results was so slight as by no means to repay one for the extra labor.

In what way, then, shall we modify our procedure in the future so that we shall be better

prepared another time should similar conditions recur? No one decries good cultivation, although it has happened that on this occasion the results were so disappointing. On the other hand it would be manifestly absurd to advise the discontinuance of the custom of cropping stubble land. In the main, we shall go our way just as before, setting no less value on the getting of the land into good tilth, and treating the present season as an exception, as something standing apart from its fellows. If we do make any change in consequence, it will be merely to depend to a somewhat less extent on stubble land, and a little more on the fallow.

F. E. K. R.

HORSE

Horse Judging by Points

EDITOR FARMER'S ADVOCATE:

To the man who is interested in horses as a buyer or seller; to the man who works horses, and to the breeder of horses perhaps the best place to learn about horses is the show ring. By comparing the different animals we see the good points of each. But there are several objections to the present system of horse judging. The average farmer or horseman does not know why his or any other particular horse did not get a prize and why another one did. Hence in some cases the judge is branded as a man who doesn't know anything about a horse, a poor judge, etc.

About a year ago there was some talk of having the judge explain the good points and also the defects of the various animals judged. There were several articles in your paper on this point. However, the exhibitions and all the smaller summer fairs are over and no change has been made in the judging system. Now as a suggestion, why could not horses be judged by points and recorded on a score card the same as grains are judged? Take for example a Manitoba Agricultural College score card for seed oats. There are fifty points given for purity and fifty points for quality. These are divided into several divisions each, a score awarded according to the standard of the grain, the different awards totalled and the best grain invariably gets the prize. Could there not be a score card for horse judging and so many points given for weight, size, shape, etc., in the draft horse and so many for action, style and speed in the road horse? Thus a score card would be made out at the show ring and one given to each exhibitor. Then if interest in judging is shown by the crowd, as was so noticeable at last year's Brandon winter fair, the score might be marked up on a bulletin board.

The benefits derived from this method would be many. Some of the important ones would be: 1st, the man interested would look at the horse's good points instead of trying to pick a fault, as is very often the case; 2nd, the buyer would know just what he was getting and could not follow the plan of trying to depreciate the horse in the seller's estimation; 3rd, the seller would have his score card to show just what he was selling and would not be so tempted to stretch the truth with regards the animal's good qualities; 4th, the man who works horses would know their strong points and also weak ones, hence he would know exactly where to save his team and where he could get the best from them; 5th, and probably the greatest benefit would be derived by the breeders of horses. Instead of guessing, as many and most men do who have not a breeder's instinct, a man would have positive proof to what stock he was breeding and know what to expect. He would also breed with purpose of improving weaknesses. The qualities of the different stallions would be plainly set forth to the average farmer, horse owner and breeder.

Now this keeping of records of judging by points would entail a large amount of work and trouble. The question is: Is it worth while? At any rate the judge would have to earn his money even if the number of animals in the show ring was small. On the other hand, he would not be branded as a "poor judge." The