

individuals out of one boat load is deplorable. But we do not want undesirables in Canada. We are beyond the stage when quality needs to be sacrificed for numbers. We do not want paupers; neither do we want those who are not well equipped physically, mentally or morally to become good citizens.

Since these individuals were not deported because they fell below the standard of "cash on hand" shows that the officials are carrying out at least in part the intent of our editorial in a recent issue. Canada does not want paupers, but she cannot accept imbeciles or degenerates, no matter how much money they have in their pockets or what occupation they express a willingness to follow. The fact is able-bodied, intelligent individuals who are willing to work will not become paupers in Canada, no matter what they would work at by preference, or how little cash they have on reaching their destination. A man will change his occupation before he will become a pauper.

Deportation seems to be the only resort in some cases. But it is too bad that such specimens cannot be caught before they come across the water.

* * *

America is to have some college trained agricultural journalists. Out of over one hundred students now taking a course in in journalism at Wisconsin University, twenty-six are in the agricultural branch.

MY OPINION ON SOME MATTERS NUMBER 4

I SEE LOVELY RURAL HOMES.

As I go about different parts of our glorious West I wonder why some of these ramshackle homes are not made at least nearly as good as those of more progressive individuals in the neighborhood. Not long ago I was in a district that had been settled for at least two or three decades. The soil was good and most of the farmers were prosperous. Only a few, however, had homes that could be referred to as in keeping with the prosperity of the proprietors. For some reason or other they neglected to build a respectable residence. Decent stables were conspicuous in their absence. Some, however, had displayed the fact that they had some wisdom in not having cut down trees that Dame Nature had provided as a protection against wind or storm. That seemed to be the only advantage they had taken of their opportunities.

More recently I spent some time in a district that was not referred to as well settled until 10 or 12 years ago. In it good residences and out-buildings were sufficiently in evidence to attract the attention of anyone who is interested in rural life. Natural bluffs were not so plentifully provided as shelter, but efforts were being made to grow shelter belts and windbreaks. Vegetable gardens and something in the fruit line were common, although soil and climatic conditions were not as favorable for this line of work as they were in the other locality.

My natural tendency to enquire into the why and the wherefore of things led me to wonder what was the reason for the lack of progressiveness in district number one and the general evidences of true progressiveness in district number two—for I consider that progressiveness shows itself in providing where possible comforts for the home life. On studying the two districts I found that no man had settled in the locality first referred to whose mind was bent on providing a cosy home with conveniences and comforts. All were eager to spend what money they had to spare—and sometimes more—on buying more land. District number two about

15 or 16 years ago had been blessed with the arrival of a man whose love of home outweighed his greed for land. First he built a good house. Gradually other buildings were provided, and the entire surroundings were kept in condition similar to some of those shown in your special issue of June 29. Moreover, he was a thorough farmer, who made a study of farming, and was conversant with all important matters relating to agriculture.

The efforts of this one man had good effect. In a couple of seasons two or three neighbors undertook to provide homes as good or better. The infection spread to new settlers as they came, and now the locality can boast of many sensible and attractive homes.

Now, I realize that it would be folly to advise any farmer to go head over heels in debt to equip a home as good as, or better than, a neighbor, but those who can afford it should not waste any time in having things cosy and nice. Too many forget that a comfortable home and a happy home life are things more worthy of consideration than vast areas of land and a big bank account.

"AIRCHIE McCCLURE."

Immigration Restrictions

EDITOR FARMER'S ADVOCATE:

Your comments on the new immigration regulations make one realize how far-reaching any restriction imposed by a government may be, and therefore how necessary it is that all such restrictions should be considered, not from the "class" or special industry point of view, but as to how they will effect the country as a whole. It seems to me our government must have been influenced more by the possible representations of the labor unions than by the present need of the Dominion—of the West in particular—when they authorized these new regulations.

The equal right of the unions to demand and obtain protection for their commodity, "labor," as their employers, the manufacturers, do for their goods, I admit. The question is: Is such protection fair or in the best interests of us all? Largely owing to a high protective tariff (more government restriction) the West has been denied cheap building material for providing barns, stables, etc., necessary for stock raising. Then when having decided to build even at the high cost, more or less delay is caused and considerable cost added by the scarcity of competent masons, carpenters, etc. This in addition to the chronic shortage of farm help. Are we to be still further handicapped? These conditions, coupled with the unsatisfactory prices paid for stock up to within the last twelve or fifteen months, are responsible for the present outlook. What is that outlook? The indications are that we will not have a heavy crop. That means little money to spend; then perhaps trade depression and unemployment. According to reports little stock is in the country. This branch which should be valuable to the farmer as an additional source of revenue at such times, therefore cannot be drawn on, while at the same time the city dwellers have to pay high prices for their meat, butter, etc.

The greatest need of this country now and for many years to come is labor. Thousands of acres now priced at \$35 to \$60 per acre could be made to show a return of half as much again profit, probably more, if help were available. If "King Wheat" should abdicate this year it will be once more seen how important a factor the prosperity of the West is to the welfare of the Dominion.

The worst point about these new regulations is that while causing considerable hardship and inconvenience to many they will still fail in their object. While keeping out hundreds of men and women, rich in all that goes to the making of a good citizen—but who happen to be short of the hard cash—hundreds will be allowed entry whose \$25 will be their most valuable asset. It is not being short of cash that makes a man a "pauper," but the lack of that persevering and independent spirit which makes a man, a man, if not a top-rounder.

Man.

E. B. C.

HORSE

Observations on Horse Subjects

As I was going along the road the other day I saw a pair of horses attached to a harrow, and what was intended to be a man on the end of the lines. I was almost persuaded that the man was not what he was intended to be, because of the way he abused those horses. Poor brutes, they were urged to go ahead; yes, scared into it, by a big stick, and then a lurch on the end of the line by this "man" brought one or both of them back more quickly than they had gone ahead.

This was not the first time I had seen "men" jerking horses. Such action is disgraceful—it should be a punishable offence. No doubt there now are laws on the statutes that make such cruelty to animals a misdemeanor, but in rural parts it is seldom if ever enforced. I know there are some horses who have to be shown their places by harsh means, but when poor brutes, who know more than the "men," are so brutally treated something should be done. The fact is these "men" become out of humor and they must vent their wrath on something. Luck has it that horses are under his charge, and they have to suffer the consequences.

* * *

As a rule horses driven by persons who abuse them show the effects of ill-treatment in the form of a superfluous amount of skin and bone and a dearth of flesh. How can it be otherwise? A few minutes' lashing about is harder on a horse than a whole day's work. Take a horse with some life in him and place him in the hands of a "man" such as is referred to above, and a few cuts with the line and a jerk or two unnerves or irritates him for the rest of the day. He not only wastes tissue in proportion to the actual labor he does, but also is nervous and sweats profusely—in short the flesh runs off him. Perhaps his mouth is made so sore that it is out of the question to drive him properly during the remainder of the season. If the line is tightened he throws his head in the air; he is a most unsatisfactory animal to handle.

* * *

As a rule the man who jerks a horse or otherwise abuses him is not a lover of horses. He is not at his right job. Perhaps he had not intelligence enough to draw wages at any trade and he decided to go to a farm. He stayed there because he had brute strength, and being there soon was put at work at which he had to use horses.

It is difficult to say what should be done with such persons. They should know that horses when properly broken in are more easily handled without abuse than with it. If they persist in ill-treatment they should be shown that such ill-treatment will not be tolerated. The horse is too useful an animal to be subjected to such slashing and jerking as some individuals prefer to impose on them without any real cause. A man who cannot control himself should not try to control sensible horses.

EQUITANT.

The Royal Show

OUR ENGLISH CORRESPONDENCE.

Just how rapidly the Royal Show has grown in a generation is shown by a comparison of entries at Liverpool in 1877, with the show of this year. In that year the total stock entries were 1,292—this year they were 2,757. Horses numbered 369 then—now 686. There were 373 cattle entries in 1877, and 938 in 1910. Sheep have increased from 411 to 772, and pigs from 139 to 364. There was no poultry class in 1877—now 1,195 entries are made. Produce entries increased from 191 to 701. This year's prize list totalled £11,000.

The Wavertree playground proved an ideal spot for a great show, the 108 acres giving ample scope for the premier exhibition of Britain's greatest industry. Fine was the show in every