

THE FARMER'S ADVOCATE AND HOME MAGAZINE.

THE LEADING AGRICULTURAL JOURNAL IN THE
DOMINION.

PUBLISHED WEEKLY BY
THE WILLIAM WELD COMPANY (LIMITED)

JOHN WELD, MANAGER

AGENTS FOR THE FARMER'S ADVOCATE AND HOME JOURNAL,
WINNIPEG, MAN.

1. THE FARMER'S ADVOCATE AND HOME MAGAZINE
is published every Thursday.

It is impartial and independent of all cliques or parties, handsomely
illustrated with original engravings, and furnishes the most
practical, reliable and profitable information for farmers, dairy-
men, gardeners, stockmen and home-makers, of any publication
in Canada.

2. TERMS OF SUBSCRIPTION.—In Canada, England, Ireland,
Scotland, Newfoundland and New Zealand, \$1.50 per year, in
advance; \$2.00 per year when not paid in advance. United
States, \$2.50 per year; all other countries 12s.; in advance.

3. ADVERTISING RATES.—Single insertion, 25 cents per line,
agate. Contract rates furnished on application.

4. THE FARMER'S ADVOCATE is sent to subscribers until an
explicit order is received for its discontinuance. All payments of
arrears must be made as required by law.

5. THE LAW IS, that all subscribers to newspapers are held respon-
sible until all arrears are paid and their paper ordered to be
discontinued.

6. REMITTANCES should be made direct to us, either by
Money Order or Registered Letter, which will be at our risk.
When made otherwise we will not be responsible.

7. THE DATE ON YOUR LABEL shows to what time your
subscription is paid.

8. ANONYMOUS communications will receive no attention. In
every case the FULL NAME and POST-OFFICE ADDRESS MUST
BE GIVEN.

9. WHEN A REPLY BY MAIL IS REQUIRED to Urgent
Veterinary or Legal Enquiries, \$1 must be enclosed.

10. LETTERS intended for publication should be written on one
side of the paper only.

11. CHANGE OF ADDRESS.—Subscribers when ordering a change
of address should give the old as well as the new P.O. address.

12. WE INVITE FARMERS to write us on any agricultural topic.
We are always pleased to receive practical articles. For such as
we consider valuable we will pay ten cents per inch printed
matter. Criticisms of Articles, Suggestions How to Improve THE
FARMER'S ADVOCATE AND HOME MAGAZINE, Descriptions of
New Grains, Roots or Vegetables not generally known,
Particulars of Experiments Tried, or Improved Methods of
Cultivation, are each and all welcome. Contributions sent us
must not be furnished other papers until after they have
appeared in our columns. Rejected matter will be returned on
receipt of postage.

13. ALL COMMUNICATIONS in reference to any matter connected
with this paper should be addressed as below, and not to any
individual connected with the paper.

Address—THE FARMER'S ADVOCATE, or
THE WILLIAM WELD COMPANY (LIMITED),
LONDON, CANADA.

fact, it appears to exercise a great deal more in-
telligence than some hired men sent out to the
fields. If one has not a weeder, harrows and
cultivators may be used instead, though at an ex-
penditure of much additional time. But, what-
ever the implement, do not wait till the weeds
show above the ground. Destroy them, if pos-
sible, before they appear.

In the warfare with weeds, delay means diffi-
culty.

Lead Arsenate for Spraying.

In many districts lead arsenate bids fair to
take the place of Paris green as a poison for
spraying mixtures. Those who adopt it as the
best arsenical poison for insect-destruction,
should exercise care in its application. The
article in this issue, from Professor Harcourt,
should be studied carefully by every orchardist.

To those who have made no particular study
of chemistry, it may seem strange that lead ar-
senate is non-injurious in some preparations, and
extremely hurtful in others. It must be remem-
bered that the mixing of compounds, especially in
solution, results in various chemical changes.
Lead arsenate dissolved in water may be an ideal
mixture for combating insect pests on all kinds
of orchard trees. On the other hand, lead arse-
nate, when put in a mixture in which there is
lime and sulphur may undergo changes forming new
compounds that would work havoc on leaves and
young tissue of fruit trees. Professor Harcourt
also points out that, with Paris green and other
arsenical poisons, there is danger of damage to
the foliage when these arsenical preparations are
mixed with lime-sulphur.

It would seem, therefore, that, for the aver-
age grower, the only safe plan is to do the bulk
of the spraying with standard materials, and ex-
periment on a few trees with such mixtures as
have not yet proven effective and safe.

Some breeders assert that the worth of the
feathers from a goose should nearly pay half the
cost of its feed for one year.

Strength of Union.

The greatest need amongst farmers of the pres-
ent day is more co-operation. The agricultural
class form the largest part of the population of
every country. Therefore, in any self-governing
country, such as Canada, farmers should rule the
land; their word should be law. But is it so in
Canada to-day? Decidedly not. This country
is ruled by everybody but the farmer. Large
corporations ask the Government for what they
want, and get it. Railways are subsidized, manu-
facturing concerns are protected, relieved of taxa-
tion, and pampered in various ways, and all this
comes out of the farmers' pockets, as the Govern-
ment is financed chiefly by the farmers. Think of
the little that is done to help agriculture; and if
the farmers ask for more they are simply laughed
at. And all this because we do not pull together
as we should. Even the laboring men are ahead
of us in this matter, as they have their unions
and societies to look after their interests; and
see what trouble they can put large companies to
with their unions. Of course, I would not for
one moment advise going to such lengths as they
do in some cases. Reasonable demands are all
right, but unreasonable demands are wrong, and
only work to their own hurt. But this serves to
show what can be done when men pull together,
and stand up for their rights. Why do not the
farmers co-operate in this way, and make reason-
able demands for what they want, and get it?

This spring the husbandmen hold the destiny
of the world in their hands. Think of what con-
sternation there would be if each farmer would
plant only enough for his own use! All business
would stop, and all but the farmers would simply
starve; or, they could sell their crops at famine
prices. Of course, this would be an entirely
wrong thing to do, but it shows of what impor-
tance the hard-working farmer is to the welfare
of the whole world. Therefore, if the farmers
would co-operate, their power would be fully
recognized in the political world, and they would
be treated accordingly. I do not know why they
do not co-operate more, unless it is because of
their inborn love of contradiction. If one man
takes up one side of a question, his neighbor
takes the opposite side; he does not know why,
only that he wants to be against the other fel-
low. And the farmers are also torn asunder by
party politics; they are ready to fight each
other, all because a few smooth-tongued politi-
cians, who promise them everything, and give
them nothing, get up and tell them their side is
right, and the other is wrong. This should not
be. Every farmer should think out the matter
for himself. And then, again, in the social world
the farmer would be treated as an equal, not
laughed at and called hayseed.

Last, but not least, in the business world,
farmers would profit by co-operation. See what
an example Denmark has set us in this matter.
By means of co-operation, she has taken the first
place as a producer of dairy products, bacon and
eggs. And the farmers of our own country who
have tried this manner of disposing of their prod-
ucts, have found it highly profitable. And where
it has not been so, the fault is with themselves,
because they would not work together as they
ought to do. If farmers would only think of and
profit by the familiar saying, "Union is strength,"
and forget all petty grievances, working together
for the common good, they would benefit them-
selves, as well as their neighbors.

Prince Edward Island.

FARMER.

"It Depends on How You State It."

Editor "The Farmer's Advocate":

In April 8th issue of your valued paper, "Pro
Bono Publico" undertakes to show us the im-
mense folly we are under in not trying and using
his style of protection. He says Canada is
flooded with American farm products, to the en-
dangering of agriculture in Canada. On the
other page, opposite his article, he will find an
answer to a good part of his letter. Farmers
tell me they cannot get help to harvest the crops
they now raise, let alone the 18 millions more our
friends say they should have raised and sold, if
the Yankee's goods had been kept out. His state-
ment in regard to the imports and exports of
agricultural products, I will put into another
form. He says we were only able to sell the
Americans 3 cents' worth of produce per head of
population, while they sold us \$3 worth per head
of our population. I say that the Americans
were only able to sell us about 20 cents per head
of their population—18 million from 90 million
people; while we were able to sell them 35 cents
per head of our population—2 million from 6 mil-
lion people. So that, looking at it from the
selling standpoint, we were ahead about 15 cents
apiece. All this quibbling over exports and im-
ports is nonsense, unless we have the exact knowl-
edge necessary of each individual transaction. Did
we get good value for what we paid for? Did
we get good returns for what we sold? The pres-
ent outlook of part of our American friends shows
the spirit of protection. They desire to get
tree all the raw material for the manufacture of

goods, but want the tariff kept up on the manu-
factured article. It is admitted by Canadians in
the "know" that, while they (Americans) charge
their own people the full price of the manufactured
goods, they will still sell in outside countries at
cost, almost. In other words, the American
people are paying more than they should, in
order that their manufacturers may "dump," as
it is termed, a part of their goods in some other
country—truly, a sensible way of building up a
country. If this principle of protection had done
so much for the United States, how was it so
ineffective a year or so ago, when people were out
of work by the hundreds of thousands in the
United States, and thousands were for months at
the point of starvation. Canadians were not in
as bad a stress as the Americans then, simply
because there were more of them at farming, the
mainstay of Canada, and the one that some
people think should be saddled with the burden of
imperialism, militarism, protectionism, and a hun-
dred other fads.

"AVALON."

Protection Depreciates Farm Values.

Editor "The Farmer's Advocate":

It is good to see that interest in the tariff
question, as evidenced by the spirited discussion
in your columns on the part of your correspond-
ents, is not lessening. Certainly, of all classes,
farmers should be specially interested, as they
bear the bulk of the burden of protective duties,
and derive the least benefit from them. There is
one phase of the question, with your permission,
I would like to touch upon; that is, the effect on
farm values of the tariff burden. In Mr. Drury's
letter, which appeared in your issue of April
22nd, the estimate is made that the average
farmer pays yearly on his purchases \$135 extra,
because of duties imposed, and, in addition, a
large expense which falls on him indirectly. Now,
as has been stated and restated in your columns,
while farmers in the neighborhood of factory
towns may receive enhanced prices for small prod-
ucts, yet, for the average farmer, who produces
for sale wheat, beef, pork, cheese and such like
export staples, the price is governed by the mar-
kets abroad, and the tariff on such products is of
no benefit whatever. But let it be for the mo-
ment admitted that the advantages coming to the
Canadian farmer under protection balance his ex-
tra expenses indirectly borne, and let \$35 be cut
off from the amount it is estimated he has to
pay on his purchases annually—for the supposed
good of his country—there remains still a neat
\$100 yearly extra tax. Most farmers will know
that this is a very moderate estimate. Many
business men, also, will be ready to admit that
much, but some may be inclined to pooh! pooh!
the amount, and say, What is \$100 a year to a
rich farmer?

If a farmer manages to clear 4 per cent. yearly
on his capital invested, after paying all expenses,
and deducting the value of the labor of himself
and family, he is very well satisfied, indeed.
Most farmers, it is to be feared, come much short
of this. At 4 per cent. per annum, \$100 is the
interest on \$2,500. According to this way of
looking at it, then, the income of the average
farm-owner is, because of the tariff burden, \$100
per year less than it would otherwise be, and the
value of his property is depreciated to the extent
of \$2,500. He is that much poorer than he
ought to be. The selling value of farm property
responds promptly to any rise or fall of yearly
income. If, for any reason, he sells his farm, he
has to accept that much less for it.

Middlesex Co., Ont.

T. BATY.

Brewer's Grains for Cows.

Milk producers in the vicinity of Toronto and
other cities and towns where breweries are in
operation, depend largely on brewer's grains for
feed. Uncertain supply and danger of spoiling
are the main objections to their use. Injudicious
feeding sometimes gives tainted milk, but if care
is taken, the cows are kept in good condition,
and the milk flow stimulated.

"Brewer's grains," says L. E. Annis, of To-
ronto, formerly a large producer, of Scarborough,
"are somewhat risky as feed for milking cows,
but they are one of the best feeds known. As a
rule, we get them at about 7 cents a bushel, and
at that price there is nothing cheaper. Half a
bushel a day is good feeding. For best results,
it is best to feed roots and hay, also. If fed in
large quantities alone, they give a distinct flavor
to the milk, just as red clover will. They are
superior to silage for milk production, but, of
course, the latter can be produced in large quan-
tities on the farm, and is always on hand. There
is a roughage in the grains that makes them take
the place of silage.

"But the grains must be fed sweet. They can
be got hot from the brewery. If hauled home
and tramped into a tank or vat, they will keep
for a week, but if left loose they may be in such
condition in 24 hours that a distinct flavor is im-
parted to the milk from the cows to which they
are fed."