

rule, larger
, the York-
ears, given
form, by
specimens,
exercise of
eeding less
re of such
ith shorts
means the
his object,
the breed,
me dished
he bane of
as well in
at the ex-
ten associ-
z, liability
throw off
improve-
g smooth-
the ideal
the body,
ent is the
not desir-
medium
, and the
se points
the best
al adapt-
the Berk-
ll the im-
heir color
ot blister,
re hardy,
having a
mature
but will
an fatten
ers, their
s enable
t-quality
so weigh
ll in pro-

G.
en found
ssing on
ts to the
hey have
er breed
the lean
ir breed-
probably
as some
he vary-
d, as do
that are
ntinued
become
ange of
g, rather
ers and
f Berk-
itters of
a birth,
e Berk-
gth and
e power
ractive,
d qual-
strong,
in the
Head
es, face
ium to
ize, in-
t wide,
in the
p, and
e; back
slightly
and of
; flank
ull and
ll down
gs and
apart,
olding
ut loss
irited,
utional
part of
on one
splash
n any
al ap-
y com-
e, and

FARM

Some Testimony Re Seed Selection.

The Canadian Seed Growers' Association has issued a catalogue of 'Selected Seed' for 1906, which contains some testimony re the work which should result in many recruits.

"On April 15th, 1905, I sowed 10 bushels of Improved Red Fife wheat which yielded 42½ bushels per acre, and graded No. 1 Northern. The ordinary wheat which was grown on the same kind of land and under similar conditions yielded 36 bushels per acre and graded No. 2 Northern. This shows a difference of 6½ bushels per acre and one grade in favor of the crop form improved seed." (Signed) W. A. McIntosh.

"I was favorably impressed by the returns from registered seed as compared with ordinary seed wheat as grown on my farm during the past season. The registered seed was sown in April on breaking at the rate of 1 bushel per acre, while the adjoining land was sown with ordinary wheat at 1½ bushels per acre, so that I have no figures which show returns from exactly similar conditions. Both crops showed an excellent stand of straw. Those who saw the two side by side favored the crop from registered seed commenting upon the uniformity and size of the heads and its freedom from other varieties. The yield from the registered seed was from 10 to 15 bushels more per acre than that obtained from ordinary seed in this district as it yielded 40½ bushels per acre, threshers' measure."

(Signed) JOHN A. MOONEY.

PROFIT PER ACRE FROM GROWING A CROP OF RED FIFE WHEAT FROM REGISTERED SEED.
Breaking, disking, harrowing, and seeding.. \$10.00
Seed—1 bushel 2.35
Cutting and stooking 1.00
Threshing 40½ bushels in stock at 8 cts. per..
bushel to cover expenses for board of men
and teams..... 3.25

Expenses.
40½ bushels at \$1.50 per bushel... \$60.75
Expenses 16.60

Net profit per acre..... \$44.15

(Signed), JNO. A. MOONEY.

"We sowed 19 bushels of Registered Red Fife Seed Wheat last spring on 17½ acres breaking. The yield was 36 bushels to the acre while the adjoining breaking on which was sown 5 pecks to the acre of our best seed yielded but 28 bushels per acre and was of inferior quality."

(Signed) LUMB BROS.

L. H. Newman, B.S.A., is the Secretary of the organisation, his address is Ottawa.

Can Estimate a Good Profit.

EDITOR FARMER'S ADVOCATE:

Being an almost exclusive grain grower and much interested in the discussion of Mr. Benson's statement re grain farming, by subscriber, in your January 17th issue, I give my criticism and experience for what it is worth.

In the first place I take exception to your assertion that Mr. Benson's statement is a strong argument in favor of mixed farming; for if the 20 acres or more used to pasture those eight head of cattle had been sown with wheat the returns would have been \$260.00.

Seed for 20 acres—
33½ bus. at 65 cts..... \$21 66
Twine..... 5 00 \$ 26 66
Profit..... \$233 34
Profit on 8 head of cattle . 50 00
Profit on wheat over cattle \$183 34

Then there would be the extra expense of fencing pasture field and building extra stabling for cattle. As for the hogs mentioned in Mr. Benson's capital account, they either just came out even at the end of the year or died of hog cholera too early in the game to be mentioned in the finals.

Again in my opinion 15 per cent. depreciation is too high on implements and stock. Subscriber has clearly shown why too high on the former, let me deal with the stock. Now I have a mare over twenty years old and three others about twelve, which do just as much work as six years old horses are doing, yet according to Mr. Benson's summary they would be useless or valueless be-

fore they were ten years old. Again with horses selling at present high prices, should there not be a profit on those six horses raising colts from them?

In ascertaining the loss or gain on any business, it is not customary to allow interest on the capital invested and is not 7½ per cent. almost a speculation rate of interest?

My experience in farming, which covers some eight years, has been more or less successful, and I could mention dozens of farmers between the boundary line and as far north as Dauphin, who have been equally successful in grain growing.

According to government statistics, it costs 35 cents to raise one bushel of wheat or \$7.00 per acre and the average yield for the last fourteen years is 20 bushels per acre. Careful estimates and tests in wheat raising give a cost of \$6.64 per acre in Minnesota. These tests allow for depreciation in horses and implements.

Let us look at Mr. Benson's statement under the Canadian test, which is the higher of the two.

Profit on 150 acres wheat
@ \$6.00..... \$900 00
Profit on 70 acres oats
@ \$6.00..... 420 00
Profit on 20 acres barley
@ \$4.08 81 60
\$1401 60
Profit on Cattle 50 00
Profit on Fowls..... 15 00
Profit on Garden..... 40 00
105 00

Total receipts from farm \$1506 60

Expenditures—
Taxes..... \$ 50 00
Incidentals 50 00

Total Expenditure
not included in lists . \$ 100 00

Net Profit..... \$1406 60
Man. A. O. MCKINNON.

A Wide Open Field.

The loss from smut this year, is generally conceded to be pretty heavy. There are a good many opinions on the subject. Some claim that the inspection got far too severe during the latter end of the season, and wheat that would have passed as straight grade early in the season, got rejected later on. Others again, who treated their wheat with bluestone or formalin have had poor results. Personally, the writer saw threshed on a neighbor's farm one of the worst cases of smut that could be seen anywhere. The threshing crew, when the job was done, looked as if they had crept through a factory flue, yet the owner of the wheat stoutly maintains that he treated his seed grain with bluestone (so called) and treated it in the regular way. In theory we can get rid of smut but it does not always work out satisfactorily.

Some studies are being undertaken at the farm (Central) in regard to rust, and of producing a rust resisting wheat. Yet rust is not always with us and smut seems to be. Then why not try to produce a smut resistant wheat. Some good practical farmers claim that if Red Fife is pure it will not produce smut, they say it is the softer wheat mixed generally with Red Fife that produces smut. I do not think such a position is tenable. To have a smut resistant wheat we must breed for immunity from smut. I think the subject has got a good deal less attention than it deserves as far as I am aware. Now that we will soon have the Manitoba Agricultural College in working order, it should have a wide open field in this matter. If a plot of ground was reserved for experiments in breeding a strain of smut resistant wheat and if the experiment was successful it would be worth more to Manitoba in one year than the cost of the college for one hundred years. If thoroughly smutted grain was used on a plot for seed, and from the grain grown on the plot that which showed power of developing plump perfect seed in spite of smut was selected for seed and when seeding the following year the grain was thoroughly smutted before seeding, and was selected again on the same principal, it would only be a question of time before we would have a wheat smut proof. And I believe the wheat bred for smut resistance would resist rust to a considerable extent. So far as I know it has not been definitely proved that if a field grew a very smutty crop of wheat, and the next crop was wheat, and the seed had got a liberal treatment of pure bluestone, the resultant crop would be free of smut or smutty. In

my humble opinion this problem is treated far too lightly. The usual advice is: treat the seed with bluestone or formalin and we let it go at that.

Man.

L. BROWN.

Think Mixing Should Be Made Legal.

EDITOR FARMER'S ADVOCATE:

In your issue of January 17th is an editorial headed "A Sample Market is Needed." This editorial deserved more than a passing notice from your readers, because of its great importance to every grower of grain in the West, and while your editorial is strong in its demands, it is weak in its arguments that follow; at least it seems so to me, and here are some of my reasons. But before taking up these different views, I would like to say a word or two to that committee of the G. G. Association, who went to Winnipeg to meet with the Grain Men to discuss this very question. The report they brought back was, as you state, that the persons charged with the carrying out of the wishes of the convention after considerable deliberation apprehended that if the resolution accomplished its end, *mixing* would result and the quality of our wheat be impaired and the reputation of the grain suffer on the British market. This is what some of the grain men told the G. G. delegation and this is what they swallowed whole, being a grain question I might say bolted. Preserve the purity of our wheat on the British market and have no scoured wheat in 1 Hard 1 and 2 Northern, and it carried almost unanimously. I am proud to say not quite unanimously, I with one or two others objecting.

Why did I object then and now? The proper way to sell wheat is on sample. This is how the British miller buys it. He does not care one cent for grades. He is an expert on milling wheat and he buys the wheat he wants on a basis of how much flour is there in it for him and how strong is that flour.

No scoured wheat must go in to the best grades of Canadian wheat. The high standard of our Western wheat must be maintained! Why certainly! In whose interest, the farmers? Certainly not! In the interest of the grain dealer. I claim that if that delegation of Grain Growers and that convention as well, had met to consider how they could place in the dealer's hands a club to beat the farmer down with, they could not have thought of any other plan that would have enriched the dealer and robbed the farmer like that one, when they said no scoured wheat should go into 1 Hard and 1 and 2 Northern, for this reason: Who raises the tagged or smutty wheat? The farmer. Who buys it? The dealer. And the farmers have had legislation passed that allows, or compels, the buyer when the farmer wishes to sell his load or car of wheat and it is tagged and grades 1 Hard or 1 and 2 Northern to make it go rejected. The dealer says; "Why this is a 1 Hard wheat, but smutty, I can only give you rejected for it," that is from 5 to 10 cents less than the grade demands. So the farmer sells at that. What does the dealer do? He carefully runs that wheat into a separate bin and ships it to his terminal elevator, either at Fort William or Port Arthur or at some county point. There it is scoured and goes into its right grade, 1 Hard. Oh but the law does not allow scoured wheat to go in that grade! "Rot." Go and make enquiries at terminal elevators, how many cars of scoured wheat go out; and if you are smart enough to find out, when found make a note of it. There are none. Terminal elevators are gold mines for lucky owners and while every grade of wheat goes in from 1 Hard to rotten only four or five grades ship out. Where does it go? Why expert mixers are kept at those elevators to skin the grades and work off in every shipment so much scoured wheat and so much low grade wheat, and the tagged wheat that the farmer sold for 10 cents less than its value, is what the dealer wants to help him skin the grade and bring up his No. 4, no grade, and feed, and every other low grade stuff he can get hold of, and is a clean 10 cent gain to turn over the cost of scouring. And this talk which was so successful with the G. G. delegates and the convention about maintaining the quality of our wheat, is pure and simple humbug put forward to fool the farmers. Why I venture to say there is no western wheat leaves terminal elevators for Liverpool that has not got more or less scoured wheat in it. Does it fool the English miller? Not much; he knows what he is buying, "and all millers scour their wheat before milling it," so the sooner this clause is taken out of the Act and the sooner the farmers realize that any suggestions that come from the Grain Exchange for our benefit, either through delegates or through the public press, be received with considerable caution and much suspicion, the less likely will it be for the farmers to make such a mistake in their own interest, as to have scoured grain shut out of the higher grade, and to be switched off from having a Sample Market. Why one company at Winnipeg already buys on sample, as they give, when the quality warrants it, differences between grades, and what is that but buying on sample?

Emerson.

T. W. KNOWLES.

(Mr. Knowles voices the opinion of many grain growers with regard to mixing but we fear he would have considerable trouble substantiating his statements. If he said that more of our smutty wheat went to the millers to be treated and manufactured into export flour rather than to terminal elevators for export, he would be nearer the truth. Ed.)