

FARM AND DAIRY

AND RURAL HOME

Published by The Rural Publishing Company, Limited.



1. FARM AND DAIRY is published every Thursday. It is the official organ of the British Columbia, Manitoba, Eastern and Western Ontario and Bedford, Quebec Dairywomen's Associations, and the Canadian Institute, Ayrshire and Jersey Cattle Breeders' Associations.

2. SUBSCRIPTION PRICE. \$1.00 a year, strictly in advance. Great Britain, \$1.25 a year. For all countries except Canada year's subscription free for a club of two new subscribers.

3. REMITTANCES should be made by Post Office or Money Order, or Registered Letter. On all cheques add 30 cents for exchange fee required at the banks.

4. CHANGE OF ADDRESS — When a change of address is ordered, both the old and new addresses must be given.

5. ADVERTISING RATES quoted on application. Copy received up to the Friday preceding the following week's issue.

6. WE INVITE FARMERS to write us on any agricultural topic. We are always pleased to receive practical articles.

CIRCULATION STATEMENT

The paid subscriptions to Farm and Dairy exceed \$500. The actual circulation of each issue, including copies of the paper sent subscribers who are not slightly in arrears, averages 3,000 copies, varying from 3,000 to 18,000 copies. No subscriptions are accepted for less than the full subscription rates. Thus our mailing lists do not contain any dead circulation. Sworn detailed statements of the circulation of the paper, showing its distribution by countries and provinces, will be mailed free on request.

OUR PROTECTIVE POLICY

We want the readers of Farm and Dairy to feel that they can deal with our advertisers with our assurance of our advertisers' reliability. We try to admit our columns only the most reliable advertisers. Should any subscriber have cause to be dissatisfied with the treatment he receives from any of our advertisers we will investigate the circumstances fully. Should the reason be believed that any of our advertisers are unreliable, even in the slightest degree, we will discontinue immediately the publication of their advertisements. Should the circumstances warrant, we will expose them through the columns of the paper. Thus we will not only protect our readers, but our reputable advertisers as well, in order to be entitled to the benefits of our front-page advertising, we will only include in all letters to advertisers the words, "I saw your advertisement in Farm and Dairy." Compliances must be made to Farm and Dairy within one week from the date of any unsatisfactory transaction, with proofs thereof, and within one month from the date that the advertisement appears, in order to take advantage of the guarantee. We do not undertake to adjust trifling differences between readers and responsible advertisers.

FARM AND DAIRY

PETERBORO, ONT.

ANOTHER MARKET FOR OUR PRODUCE

Another market such as we are likely to have for our natural products will advantageously affect more people in Canada than would improved markets for any other line of production. In 1910 Canadian exports of agricultural products amounted to over \$90,000,000, and of animal produce \$24,000,000, a grand total of over \$114,000,000, exported from Canadian farms last year. Next come the products of the forest, other natural products, the exports of which amounted to over \$47,000,000. Next, the mines, the exports from which brought Canada over \$40,000,000 in cash. To this add \$15,500,000 for fish, which brings the total value of natural products exported from Canada last year to

over \$246,000,000. All of these products are on the free list of the proposed trade agreement with the United States; the value of all will be increased by access to their markets.

Compared with the great value of our exports of natural products, the exports of manufactured goods sink into insignificance. In 1910 the value of exported manufactured goods from Canada was only \$31,491,916.

In the light of these statistics, is it not evident why we farmers are demanding access of our products to the United States? What effect can a protective tariff have on the price of natural products produced on our farms, our forests and our mines when we have such a surplus for export? It must be evident to the dullest intellect that the price of our produce is set in foreign markets and the wider these markets are the better the price is bound to be. And what better market could we gain entrance to than that of the 40,000,000 people, our neighbors to the south?

There can be no question as to the value of the United States markets for Canadian farm produce. The strongest argument that can be advanced in support of our position on this question, is to give market quotations at United States and Canadian centres. Just now United States markets are dull and quotations are lower than usual. Nevertheless a comparison of Toronto and Buffalo markets last week show that when prime steers were selling at \$5.80 to \$6 in Toronto, they were bringing \$6.40 to \$6.60 for the same quality in Buffalo. Hogs were \$6.75 in Toronto and \$7.30 to \$7.75 in Buffalo. The average price for cheese in Canada last season was 10% cents. In the United States it ruled three and even four cents higher. Farmers who were exporting cream across the line practically free of duty were realizing 10 to 12 cents more a hundred for milk than they would have had it been manufactured into cheese or butter in Canadian factories. One of our leading apple men tells us that free access to the United States markets will mean 50 cents more on every barrel of apples produced in Ontario. We all know from past experience what it will do for barley.

The trade agreement as proposed does not injuriously affect our manufacturers; yet it opens to Canadian farmers one of the best markets of the world, and one moreover, which is near at hand. Little wonder that our farmers hail with satisfaction the opening of the United States market to Canadian natural products.

WEATHER INSURANCE AND FAIRS

The Ontario Association of Fairs and Exhibitions in annual meeting in Toronto recently approved of a plan, submitted by the secretary, Mr. J. Lockie Wilson, Superintendent of Agricultural Societies for protection against rainy weather or storms at their exhibitions. The Legislature will shortly be asked to amend the Act to include this proposal.

The suggestion is that in case of loss sustained by an agricultural society by rainy weather or snow storms, the Department of Agriculture may, on satisfactory proof, pay the society so affected an additional grant equal to 50 per cent. of the loss sustained; this grant shall be payable out of the annual grant to agricultural societies, and the total sum thus given shall not exceed \$10,000 in any one year. The amount of loss shall be based on the average gate receipts for the three previous years but in no case shall a grant to a society for this purpose exceed the sum of \$300. The \$10,000 apportioned for this purpose is to be taken from the \$75,000, which is now the legislative grant to agricultural societies.

The object sought in this proposition is a worthy one and Mr. Wilson is to be commended for having presented it on a workable basis. It is an exceedingly difficult one, however, to regulate, so as to be of equal benefit to all. For instance, one objection is the limit of \$300, which may be paid out to any one society. A large society might easily be lost through bad weather, \$1,200, or more, yet they can only receive benefit from the scheme to the extent of \$300. A smaller society on the other hand might lose a much smaller sum and receive from the Government the full amount or the limit to which they would be entitled. However, the proposal is a worthy one and can be improved from time to time.

CROP ROTATION PRINCIPLES

Rotation is a problem for each man individually to work out and adopt to meet his special interests. The question involves much more than simply following one crop after another and while probably most of us practise something in the form of crop rotation it is abundantly evident that "we of the rank and file" have much to learn in regard to how to rotate our crops that we may secure maximum yields and at the same time maintain or perchance improve the fertility of our soil. Those who are out to "mine" their soil are not so much concerned with the question of crop rotation. Even such farmers, however, can work out rotations suited to their requirements that will be of decided advantage.

A rotation requiring more than five years to complete the cycle, save under exceptional circumstances, is not likely to be advisable. A four year rotation is being adopted by many progressive men and a number of farmers with lighter soils are working wonders thereon with a rotation covering three years.

Clover and other legumes, corn, roots and farmyard manure are the important considerations in maintaining and improving soil fertility and in keeping the land free of weeds and in good mechanical or physical condition. Each of these entering at least once in a rotation of three or four or five years duration are sure to give tolerably satisfactory results. The placing of them and what other crops to grow are questions that each

farmer must decide for himself. The article on crop rotation, page three this week, by Mr. W. C. Good, a prize-winning farmer, is worthy of your careful consideration. It contains many points that may be of interest and of money value to you. Questions in regard to rotation and similar subjects asked of Farm and Dairy will be cheerfully answered by our experts in our farm management columns. Write us of your difficulties in this connection that you have not yet solved satisfactorily.

OUR LOYALTY

It is a significant fact that opposition on economic grounds to the proposed trade agreement has practically ceased. The advantages to the class that it affects, the farmers, are so evident that there can be no disputing them. The growers of tender fruits, it may be said, are determined that this measure shall not go through and have petitioned the Senate to throw out the measure. The fruit growers, we must remember, however, are a very small class in the community and even amongst themselves they are not unanimous; many of them claim that the advantages following upon the proposed agreement will outweigh the disadvantages. The opponents of the agreement unable to oppose it on economic grounds are now calling on patriotic grounds for us farmers to have nothing to do with it. We should, so we are told, trade in our home market, or with the mother country. They tell us that freer commercial intercourse with the United States will eventually lead to political union.

Patriotism has been defined as the last refuge of the scoundrel; many of those who are now making such a noise about loyalty to the empire and so forth are much more concerned about the dollars and cents that they are now enabled to make but may not be able to do should the proposed trade agreement be carried, or worse still, should we, encouraged by our success, carry the fight still further into the territory of the privileged interests.

We once had reciprocity with the United States. The reciprocity bill of 1854 passed the United States Senate because the southern Democratic senators feared that if Canada was not given freer trade with the United States they might wish to enter into political union for the benefit of the United States markets. Such a union those southern senators feared would add to the strength of the northern and anti-slave party, which was at that time fighting for the abolition of slavery.

Reciprocity accordingly was granted to keep Canada from annexing herself to the United States. Notice the inconsistency. We are now told that free trade will lead to annexation. Has human nature changed entirely since 1854?

When is a man more loyal,—when prosperous and contented, or when chafing under the burden of restricted markets for his products? When are Governments strongest in a country? Is it not when everything is going

well and people are living? The ter markets loyal is also to humpricity with not lead to

"Oh, my are quite as they are as Do you feel Remember that we can

Whitley's, a made as much cows, which Farm and 19th? That ed, was onl She is typi Ontario kno much profit she is in a 5,000 cows a tricts of Onta is. We ought at least up to only a profit which she w ley's chart nly 82 cent a cow for ceats! Thir milking that for a period much profit good average.

This covt looking into actual net pdividually, which ones a that kind of to make as i one cow in

The practi coming more year sees more ed in the vo popularize cement of Ag enlarging on during recent centred Centres One of these weeks ago was launched and the thir Quebec, prob The men in will interest and will gat on for the bo at large.

This new d work bids failable. We wh however, ne formation th these contres practical, mo possibilities o as developed convince anyo lie in knowin fit each of h ally. Let ea who has recor dults will the trouble.