

### Why it Pays to Read an Agricultural Paper.

The following reasons why it will pay any farmer to take and read "The Farmer's Advocate," are the convictions of our editors, all of whom subscribed to and carefully read "The Farmer's Advocate" long before they had any idea of joining its editorial staff. The points are presented in logical sequence, rather than order of strength:

1. "The Farmer's Advocate" anticipates the cycle of the seasons by presenting, in time to be of greatest service, a digest of the information gleaned from previous seasons' work. As a reminder and seasonal calendar of operations and recipes, we consider the paper is worth many times its subscription price to any wide-awake farmer.

2. We keep our readers abreast of the times in all matters germane to agriculture. Times are changing, and farm practice must change with them. New pests and difficulties are continually appearing, and they must be grappled with as they occur. On all such points we endeavor to secure promptly the advice of the best experts. No man is up-to-date unless he is constantly learning.

3. The reading of an agricultural paper is necessary to enable one to retain what he knows. No man's memory is perfect; therefore, unless it is constantly refreshed, and his mind replenished with new knowledge, his stock of information becomes rapidly less. We must read to remember, as well as to learn.

4. We must read in order to obtain food for thought, and to command the comprehensive view which enables us to draw correct conclusions from our own limited experience. As a man reads, so do his thoughts run, to a very considerable extent. If he reads only politics and "news," his thoughts will take that channel, and he will quickly become rusty—if he ever was bright—on agricultural matters. The regular reading of a first-class agricultural journal is essential to progress in farming.

5. A mine of information is contained in our "Questions and Answers" department, and any subscriber has the privilege of asking questions. This department involves more painstaking editorial labor than any other in the paper, but the work is done cheerfully in the consciousness of its value.

6. Our editorials are calculated to broaden and inform on subjects concerning which the newspapers are either silent or prone to superficial and perfunctory utterances. There is, in modern journalism, a great deal of space-filling by men who will write on any side of any subject, according to the policy of the paper, rather than on their own deep personal convictions. No one can accuse "The Farmer's Advocate" of uttering aught but sincere opinions.

7. We fight for the farmers' rights, and are alert to resist encroachments. We do not indulge in "hot air" for the sake of currying favor, nor do we snatch eagerly at every semblance of a chance to make editorial capital, but when we find real abuses existing we speak out. As a case in point, recall the hog controversy, and our position on the importation of American hogs.

8. The remarkable improvement in the Home Magazine department of late years has been patent to all. It is carefully edited, with a view to practical benefit in improving the household features of farm life, arousing our young people to appreciate the beauties and advantages about them, and providing wholesome matter to cultivate the taste of the family for art, literature, right living, and the higher things of life. We believe that our Home Magazine now fills a place in the Canadian farm home which is not catered to so well by any other periodical, and we intend that it shall further improve.

9. Our illustrations are numerous, pleasing and instructive. Our live-stock portraiture has done an immense amount of good in stimulating the interest of youth in the subject of stock improvement, and educating young and old to a conception of what is best in live-stock ideal types.

10. The whole paper is clean and free from objectionable features.

We might add many reasons to the above list, but we believe any one of the first nine that we have enumerated makes "The Farmer's Advocate" well worth the subscription price. Indeed, to the energetic, intelligent, level-headed man who will read the paper carefully, and practice its teachings as fully as possible, we believe the paper may be worth a hundred dollars a year. It is almost impossible to estimate its full value. Think of the difference in the lives and farms of those who have been life-long subscribers and those who have never taken the paper! "The Farmer's Advocate" is a part of the life of the best Canadian farmers. It makes the fields worth tilling, the stables interesting, and life better worth living.

The character of a man may be gauged by the literature he chooses. Cheap farmers read cheap literature. The best ones read "The Farmer's Advocate." To which class would you belong?

## HORSES.

### Information for Judges.

I have attended one or two shows lately at which there have been classes for young horses of mixed ages, and have, in connection with these, heard a good many opinions expressed that in such cases the judges should be informed of the year in which the different animals had been foaled. On the face of it, the contention appears

ity, as a fairly well made-up horse of a slow-maturing family, he may argue, is really superior to a more forward one of a quick-maturing family, and is, perhaps, likely to turn out the better animal in a year's time.

In judging young horses, we all know the lottery that is going on, for we have seen many superb yearlings degenerate into very moderate adults, and vice versa; and even when we come to classes of adult stallions and mares, we often see a veteran looking almost as fresh on the joints, level in the back, and free in action as an opponent of half the age. Yet there is that qualifying expression "almost" to be got over. The old animal is not quite so fresh, and no one could expect him or her to be; but should the fact that an animal has worn so well be regarded in its favor? If so, the mental handicap comes in again.

These shows, we are told, and some of us believe it, are institutions whose sole object is to improve the race of horseflesh; and if we accept this view of the case, there is a tough task before the thoughtful man who sits down quietly to solve the problem as to whether a really good youngster who may be giving away a couple of years is better or worse than a better-grown and more forward older one, or whether a veteran who may be almost as good as a far more juvenile opponent which is presumably at its best, should have the prize. In either case there is a possibility of a change occurring to upset the probabilities of the future—the yearling may not turn out as well as he or she promised, and the younger of the adult horses may go on and flourish until he attains a greater age than

the evergreen senior which opposes him. This, of course, is obvious; but even then we get back to the question which is the better horse on the day, and how are judges to decide the point? Is it by their calculations of the market value of the animals as they stand before them? If so, it is ten to one in favor of the yearling which is almost, but not quite, as good as the three-year-old; but in the case of the older horses, very possibly exactly the reverse argument would obtain.

Then, too, there is the question of the get of stallions and the produce of brood mares. How often, may I ask, has a horse or a mare kept on winning prizes in breeding classes for looks, when it has been notorious that he or she has been a dead failure at the stud? It seems difficult, in

fact impossible, to suggest a satisfactory remedy, but is it not a farce that an animal which is known to be worthless for breeding purposes should be held up to the public as an animal to be bred from? Is it not, at all events, in the case of a stallion, diametrically opposed to the theory of the improvement of horseflesh? And here, once more, the question of a mental handicap obtrudes itself upon us. For my own part, I believe that a horse which consistently gets bad stock is as dangerous to the community as an unsound one, as he is equally liable to transmit his imperfections to his descendants, and therefore helps to get the breed to which he belongs a bad name.

Assuming that there are people who favor the idea of providing judges with information regarding horses' ages, and unless some ringside acquaintances have entirely changed their minds, it is quite within the limit of possibility that there will be others who are prepared to go further, and so there is a prospect of a suggestion being forthcoming to the effect that they should have catalogues given them. If so, I must say that I cannot see that any harm would come of the change; probably it would do good in many respects. As things are, the majority of our judges know by sight not only most of the leading show horses, but their owners and the servants of the latter as well, and, therefore, in such cases any information would be unnecessary, and, therefore, it is only unknown exhibitors who may suffer by the present arrangement. Besides, is there any harm in a committee treating their judges as upright, impartial men? If committees were not



Scottish Crest (13182).

Two-year-old Clydesdale stallion. First and champion, Highland Society's Show, 1906. Exhibited by Messrs. A. & W. Montgomery, and sired by Baron's Pride.

to be unanswerable, and I believe such information is supplied to the judges at some shows; but the question arises, if ages are given, why not other information? In fact, so long as the present system of quasi-secrecy prevails, there appears to be quite as much to say against the suggestion as for it. An exhibitor who enters a yearling in a class in which two or three-year-olds are also eligible to compete, is fully aware that he is giving away age, which fact, I think, may properly be referred to in a criticism on the class; but the question is, "Should a judge be expected to make a mental handicap of the class and grant allowances for age, or is he to base his decisions on how the competitors appear before him on the day?" The answer to this enquiry, whatever its nature may be, to my mind practically decides the propriety or otherwise of supplying the judge with information, for if he is supposed to make the aforesaid mental handicap he must be told the ages of the horses, whilst if he is not, it would be of no use to him if he got it.

Then comes the question of pedigrees. Should a judge receive any information on that point? If not, judges have no business to put the enquiry to a man in charge, "How is that horse bred?" and yet a good many of us have heard them do so in young classes. Possibly the information was only asked for out of curiosity; but, on the other hand, we must not forget that the stock of some horses are later in making up than others, and consequently it is not unreasonable to assume that in some cases the judge may be attempting the mental handicap idea, so as to try and put all the competitors upon terms of equal-