

Life is, after all, just what we make it. If we are going to value our lives by dollars and cents, then I claim we are not qualified to enter the ranks of the true, happy, open-minded tillers of the soil. While it is the duty of everyone to make a good comfortable home, with plenty stored away for the rainy days, yet I believe there is no class of people who are so willing and anxious to help their brother workman as the farmer; no class of people are more contented, and, while the young people do seem to have a desire to leave the farm, I think that desire is nothing as compared with the young clerks or employees of the many cities who spend their lives in looking with torturing envy at some (comparatively few) employees who are getting a princely salary.

To the boys on the farm I would say, I was once a boy, and know what boys' troubles on the farm mean. I am glad that I stayed on the farm and worked. I have travelled many miles to play football and baseball and hockey; and as a young man on the farm, I am willing to compare my life—so far as pleasures in the past and hopes for the future are concerned—with any of those high-salaried engineers, everything considered. While I may never be very rich, I know if I continue as I have done in the past, and am doing at present, I will be able, at the close of life, be it sooner or later, to look back with pleasure to the ever free and independent life lived in the country, and will again thank my friends who persuaded me to remain a

FARMER.

The Sinister Eagle Scream of Annexation.

Editor "The Farmer's Advocate":

In a recent issue of your esteemed paper I have encountered two pretendedly critical articles in which there is an attempt to minimize the fears I expressed a few weeks ago regarding the safety of our more important market, should the reciprocity negotiations with the United States be carried into effect, many of the statements made by the writers being so absurdly overdrawn, so incongruously misconstrued, as to be worthy of scarcely any serious refutation. Concerning the opinions expressed regarding our horse-breeding industry, little better can be expected, when we consider the sources from which they are derived, coming, as they do, from a "Beef King" of Huron County, and a "Yankee corn-dealer" of Essex County. Yet, beneath the mass of confused jargon they seem to vaguely express a sort of desire to help build up this nation. Magnanimous, indeed! But how? By supporting a scheme that threatens to cramp and ruin its leading agricultural, as well as commercial, enterprises? Poor, pitiful pipe-dreamers! They strongly suggest to my mind the example of the cow that gave the great big pail of milk, and then foolishly kicked it over.

Had our friend the "Beef King" studied the horse-breeding problem as closely as he claims to have studied that of producing cattle, he would scarcely have wasted ink or energies in an attempt to reconcile the farmers of Eastern Canada with the new conditions which must result from the proposed scheme of tariff tinkering by suggesting the preposterous impossibilities that Canada will still retain the big markets of the West, as well as gaining the best ones across the line, because of the preference of oat-fed horses to those fed on corn, and that only the inferior grades of horses will be cheapened. Now, everyone knows that, according to feeding experiments carried on in the corn belts of the United States, the horse fed largely on a ration of corn has proven, in point of stamina, to be equal, if not superior, to the oat-fed horse; while "The Farmer's Advocate," posing as a free-trade journal, simply endorses my fears that our horse market will be seriously menaced, in its feeble attempt to rake up data upon which to construct such a market across the line.

Now, in regard to the statements that only the inferior grades of horses will be cheapened—those the breeding of which no one should encourage—are they right? Let us see. Throughout the past few years we have noticed that as high-class horses have risen in value, so have inferior ones advanced accordingly. Is it not consistent with reason to predict that, if inferior horses decline, superior ones will follow suit? Then, everyone has heard of Herbert Smith, Manager of the Union Stock-yards, Toronto. In anger of the horses at the Winter Fair, Guelph, speaking of horses at the last December, and his words are recorded on page 2038 of "The Farmer's Advocate," he said that, while there was a scarcity of heavy-draft horses, yet the horse most largely in demand was the light-draft or agricultural horse, weighing from 1,300 to 1,400 pounds, and this was the type of horse he advised farmers to breed. Why? Because they were the horses used in the West, were the cheapest to raise, and sold for a big price, from \$200 to \$225 per head. Then, is the horse that will suffer, and is the horse which has been making many Eastern Canadian farmers prosperous. But is he an inferior horse? Mr. Smith, one of the most prominent horsemen in Canada, says not, or why should he advise

breeding him? Now, as Mr. Smith hints, this horse is undoubtedly the cheapest and easiest to raise. Why? Because of the manner of his production. He is got by the mating of a mare weighing from 1,300 to 1,400 pounds with a draft stallion, the mare helping to do largely of the work about the farm while suckling the foal, which, when weaned, is allowed to grow up leisurely on moderate feed until he is four years old, when he is ready for the Western market.

Now, if we compare the heavy, high-class draft horse, in the cost of his production, with the foregoing, it will be plainly seen why the agricultural horse is the most lucrative proposition.

In an editorial in the Christmas Number of "The Farmer's Advocate," headed "Draft-horse Opportunities," we read that the big transport companies demand horses weighing not under 1,500 pounds, rather preferring those that will tip the beam at from 1,700 to 1,800 pounds, and such horses are desired to reach these weights only in average condition; besides, they must be clean and sound, and are not wanted under five years old. Now, in order to get an 1,800-pound gelding, it is almost essential to use a 1,600-pound mare, and to mate her with a 2,000-pound horse; besides, the foals must have an extra-good chance, and be well fed summer and winter from start to finish, which period, unlike the agricultural horse, is not reached until the fifth year. Now, as to the risk of breeding these horses, it is a notorious fact to every horseman that animals from the soundest breeding stock are liable to blemish. Well, if the heavy-draft horse is by chance blemished, what is to be done with him? The transport companies won't have him; he is too heavy to suit the average farmer; so the outcome will be he will prove an encumbrance on his breeder's hands; while, if the agricultural horse is blemished, he will, under existing conditions, find an outlet at a fairly good figure on the Western prairies, where he will wear as long as though sound.



Hay from Equal Areas Alfalfa With Different Treatment.
(See article, page 645.)

Now, in reference to the breeding of fancy light horses, the average farmer knows the fallacy of an attempt in this direction, the risk being greater still, because, if a light horse carries so much as a scar he is turned down by the big dealers. So it is quite obvious that there are many ups and downs in the production of horses that the "beef man" and the "Yankee corn-dealer" must know little about. Now, will these visionaries who have been preaching a market in the Eastern States come forward and show us where this agricultural horse, the mortgage-lifter of our older Provinces, will find an outlet? It is quite plain that he is not a city horse, being too light for drayage purposes, besides the wrong type for van, express, livery, carriage or road. Then, it is apparent that his sphere of usefulness must be the country, and that country must be new and developing, where new farms and farmers are being created. Large numbers of these horses are now being shipped from Essex County, and from all over the Province, to find exit into the Canadian West, the only stable market for such horses on the American continent.

Again, as to the assumption of my critics, endorsed by "The Farmer's Advocate," that, being able to purchase cheaper horses across the line will prove an advantage to the Western farmer, and, therefore, to the country at large. Will this hold good in the long run? Let us reason a little. In a computation handed us a few weeks ago, the editor of "The Farmer's Advocate" estimates the cost of sending a horse from London, Ont., to Saskatoon at about \$40, and seems to take exception to this expense in a tone indicative that this \$40 were as good as lost. It seems to me that this is an extremely flimsy hook upon which to hang an argument. Supposing a farmer in Saskatoon purchases a horse from a

dealer at \$250, who, in his turn, has purchased it from an Ontario farmer, out of the \$250 the dealer gets \$10, the transportation company gets \$40 while the breeder gets \$200. Now, this \$40 transportation charge, that bothers some people so much, passes, it is true, into the coffers of the railway systems. But does it remain there? No; these companies employ thousands of men, the greater the amount of traffic, the more men are required. These employees must live. Where, and on what? Their homes will be found expanding our city limits, and the bread that nourishes their palates is made from Western wheat. Thus is the food-consuming public enlarged, and, consequently, the markets improved. Then, what about the \$200 that is caught in the pocket of the breeder? It is apparent that he is made more prosperous, hence in a better position in which to purchase the commodities of life. Where are these purchased? Here at home, from our own manufacturing establishments. Hence, these industries, owing to increased demand, will be stimulated to a greater output, consequently will help build greater food-consuming centers, and again the home market will be strengthened. So, in buying his horses at home, the Western farmer, even if he has to pay more for them is exerting a beneficial influence upon the whole commercial network of this country, and at the same time helping to build up a stable home market for his agricultural product. Now, supposing, on the other hand, he purchases a horse at, say, \$200, from a dealer who, in turn, has purchased it at Chicago, it appears that he has saved \$50. But what becomes of the \$200? This passes into the hands of an American farmer and American transportation enterprises, the latter's share being in accordance with the distance the horse has to be hauled. What is the outcome? The American farmers are made more prosperous, and consequently are better enabled to purchase the commodities of life. Where? From American establishments, which in turn are made more active.

The transportation lines of the United States, owing to increased traffic, will also be stimulated to greater activity, and the whole beneficial reaction will be felt among the commercial enterprises of that country. It is true the Western farmer has saved \$50, but the country has lost \$200. This, indeed, is more suggestive of trading a "steer for a cat," than "a cat for a steer."

The same argument can be especially applied to the wheat and cattle industries of Western Canada. Should the Western farmer, as Hon. Clifford Sifton asserts, get no more for his wheat under reciprocity, still, a large amount will

be purchased by American buyers, will be milled across the line, and will pass through American channels and American ports, over American steamship lines, to find a market in the free ports of Great Britain. John Bull foots the whole bill, the Canadian getting no more for his product than at present, while the extra money that is helping to make of Canada a nation of commerce will be diverted to enhance the commercial enterprises and prosperity across the border.

Again, Great Britain purchases the surplus cattle of both Canada and the United States, the American corn-fed cattle commanding a fraction of a cent more than Canadian cattle. Our export cattle are purchased in our markets by members of the "Big Four," and are shipped through our channels of trade to their destination. But, introduce reciprocity in cattle, and what is the outcome? The whole Western trade will be turned into American channels, again swelling them enormously, to the stagnation of our own. Even "The Farmer's Advocate" has the good grace to state that the consensus of public opinion throughout Canada is strongly in favor of Interprovincial and International trade.

Will we then stand passively aside, and see the precious volumes of our ever-increasing traffic diverted into American channels, to swell the commercial tide and enlarge the urban centers of that country, thereby deadening similar enterprises of our own? The leading diplomats of the United States are pointing to this. They are telling that people that reciprocity in farm products is the stepping-stone to unrestricted reciprocity, and, therefore, annexation; that, in refusing reciprocity to Canada, they are creating of her a commercial and a manufacturing competitor. This should be sufficient to make us sit up and think. It is true that at present we are an intensely agri-