

FARMING

VOL. XVII.

OCTOBER 3rd, 1899.

No. 5

Balance of the Year Free to New Subscribers

Special attention is directed to our great premium offer on the inside of back cover in this week's issue. Any subscriber without very much effort can secure any of these splendid premiums at no cost to himself. They are for old and new subscribers. Talk to your friends and neighbors and remind them that the balance of 1899 is given free to all new yearly subscribers. A person subscribing now will get FARMING every week till January 1st, 1901, for \$1.00, or sixty-five issues in all, including all special numbers. Subscribers in arrears are urged to send in their subscriptions early. The new postal regulations requiring postage to be paid on all newspapers makes this request more urgent than ever before. Examine your address label on this week's issue. It will pay you to remit at once and get the full benefit of our premium offers.

That (Forced) Udder Affair

We had not intended at this juncture discussing again the now notorious case of tampering with the udders of Jersey cows shown at the Industrial Fair, but the following comment on the subject from our esteemed contemporary, *Hoard's Dairyman*, is too misleading to be allowed to pass by unnoticed:

"It has been an open secret for some days that the Miller & Sibley herd of Jerseys at the recent Toronto Fair and Exposition were 'jockeyed' by one of the employees that were caring for them. An erroneous scale of points and a fallacious method of judgment, whereby enlarged udders are given undue weight and prominence, was the temptation which led this super-serviceable employee to commit the offence which caused his employers such heavy financial loss and deep humiliation."

What strikes us as somewhat strange is that the gentleman who came to Toronto in charge of the Miller & Sibley herd and who acknowledged the wrong-doing, should be classed by the members of the firm and by the above journal as merely an employee. Since ever we heard of the Miller & Sibley Jerseys the name of that gentleman has been so closely associated with them that it is difficult to think of the business being carried on without him as it will now, no doubt, have to be. Practically speaking he has been the manager of this herd for years, and while the members of the firm may not have known anything about the Toronto trickery, yet it seems a small piece of business to shift the whole blame onto a mere employee. A mere employee in the proper sense of the term would hardly stoop to such low down business of his own accord.

But the statement to which we take strong exception is that contained in the last sentence of the paragraph quoted. We know for a fact that no scale of points for judging cattle in the show-ring has been authorized by the Industrial Fair Association. It was tried a few years ago in the case of the Jerseys, but was unsatisfactory. The judge is given "carte blanche," so to speak, and is allowed to use

whatever method he pleases in deciding which animal before him is worthy of a prize. The judge this year was an American, and, we understand, in no way antagonistic to the Miller & Sibley herd, and there was no need whatever, and not the least excuse, for resorting to the despicable practices which an American exchange aptly characterizes as a "scandal of the show-ring."

But, supposing the *Dairyman's* contention is correct and too much prominence is given to large udders in awarding prizes, it is in no way an excuse for such nefarious methods. Though the temptation be ever so great, it is no excuse for other than legitimate means to be used in fitting animals for the show-ring. As we pointed out in last week's issue, there is a danger of this fitting and fixing animals for the show-ring being carried a little too far, and it will not be an unmixed evil if this whole affair, though causing a large financial loss and a possible injury to the reputation of one or two breeders, results in moderating somewhat the too eager desire on the part of many exhibitors to "doctor" their animals before entering the show-ring.

Rumor of Another Big Wheat Corner

Another big wheat corner is talked of in New York of far greater dimensions than the one attempted by Joseph Leiter a year ago. It is stated by the *New York Herald* that this new corner is being quietly inaugurated by the Weares, heads of the Weare Commission Company of that city, backed by P. D. Armour's millions, thus making a combination many times stronger than that at the back of the famous wheat corner of 1898. It is also stated that this new "corner" will be founded on commercial common-sense, and may, therefore, be more successful than the former one.

If this rumor has any foundation this country may experience a condition of affairs similar to that of last year when wheat in a few weeks' time ran up over the dollar mark, only to fall flat again as soon as the "boom" had collapsed. But it is hardly likely that there is much foundation for the story in regard to this new "corner." It is not likely that the persons mentioned in connection with it would undertake such a task in a year of plenty. Besides, they would not be likely to let the affair leak out so early in the game, and when so much of this season's crop is still in the hands of the producer.

The *Montreal Trade Bulletin* in referring to the *New York Herald's* statement, says: "We are very much inclined to doubt the above despatch to the *N. Y. Herald*, for the reason that the Armours and the Weares would scarcely select a year in which the supply of wheat is plentiful, for if Joe Leiter made such a failure of his wheat corner on a short crop, how can it be expected that the Armours, etc., can run a successful corner in a year of plenty? Of course, we must admit that with sufficient capital, enough wheat can be bought up and withheld from the market to create an actual scarcity, but even then it would be doubtful in a year like the present if the manipulators of the corner could get rid of all their big holdings without sustaining an eventual loss. Besides, if Armour intended to corner the market, the chances are ten to one that his intentions would never leak out in its initial stage."