

THE FARMER'S ADVOCATE AND HOME MAGAZINE.

THE LEADING AGRICULTURAL JOURNAL IN THE
DOMINION.

PUBLISHED WEEKLY BY
THE WILLIAM WELD COMPANY (LIMITED)

JOHN WELD, MANAGER

AGENTS FOR THE FARMER'S ADVOCATE AND HOME JOURNAL,
WINNIPEG, MAN.

1. THE FARMER'S ADVOCATE AND HOME MAGAZINE is published every Thursday.
It is impartial and independent of all cliques or parties, handsomely illustrated with original engravings, and furnishes the most practical, reliable and profitable information for farmers, dairymen, gardeners, stockmen and home-makers, of any publication in Canada.
2. TERMS OF SUBSCRIPTION.—In Canada, England, Ireland, Scotland, Newfoundland and New Zealand, \$1.50 per year, in advance; \$2.00 per year when not paid in advance. United States, \$2.50 per year; all other countries 12s.; in advance.
3. ADVERTISING RATES.—Single insertion, 25 cents per line, agate. Contract rates furnished on application.
4. THE FARMER'S ADVOCATE is sent to subscribers until an explicit order is received for its discontinuance. All payments of arrearsages must be made as required by law.
5. THE LAW IS, that all subscribers to newspapers are held responsible until all arrearsages are paid and their paper ordered to be discontinued.
6. REMITTANCES should be made direct to us, either by Money Order or Registered Letter, which will be at our risk. When made otherwise we will not be responsible.
7. THE DATE ON YOUR LABEL shows to what time your subscription is paid.
8. ANONYMOUS communications will receive no attention. In every case the FULL NAME and POST-OFFICE ADDRESS MUST BE GIVEN.
9. WHEN A REPLY BY MAIL IS REQUIRED to Urgent Veterinary or Legal Enquiries, \$1 must be enclosed.
10. LETTERS intended for publication should be written on one side of the paper only.
11. CHANGE OF ADDRESS.—Subscribers when ordering a change of address should give the old as well as the new P. O. address.
12. WE INVITE FARMERS to write us on any agricultural topic. We are always pleased to receive practical articles. For such as we consider valuable we will pay ten cents per inch printed matter. Criticisms of Articles, Suggestions How to Improve THE FARMER'S ADVOCATE AND HOME MAGAZINE, Descriptions of New Grains, Roots or Vegetables not generally known, Particulars of Experiments Tried, or Improved Methods of Cultivation, are each and all welcome. Contributions sent us must not be furnished other papers until after they have appeared in our columns. Rejected matter will be returned on receipt of postage.
13. ALL COMMUNICATIONS in reference to any matter connected with this paper should be addressed as below, and not to any individual connected with the paper.

Address—THE FARMER'S ADVOCATE, or
THE WILLIAM WELD COMPANY (LIMITED),
LONDON, CANADA.

blood in the effort to improve a herd of common or grade stock by the use of pure-bred sires. A sire bred for many generations for an especial purpose, without the introduction of alien blood, becomes strongly prepotent, and his progeny, from females of common or mixed breeding, having no particular characteristics, are almost certain to inherit, in a marked degree, the peculiar qualities of the sire, or of his immediate ancestors. It has, therefore, been by the persistent use of pure-bred sires that improvement and the fixing of types and functions in all lines of live stock has been achieved, maintained and perpetuated. The resulting produce of the first cross of a pure-bred sire mated with a common or mixed-bred female is, as a rule, a more marked improvement upon the dam than that of succeeding generations from sires of the same breed, for the reason that in the first cross the stronger blood of the sire predominates in overwhelming degree, the produce often having nearly all the appearance of a pure-bred, while in following crosses the influence of the sire is less noticeable proportionately. Still, it is only by continuous use of sires of the same breed that animals are graded up and acquire fixed characteristics, and become eligible for registration as pure-bred.

The idea that a cross of two breeds, each having excellent qualities of a different character, would be a good thing, combining the excellencies of both in the produce, is fallacious. The idea is apt to be entertained that a cross of Jerseys and Holsteins, for instance, would be an improvement, because the resultant heifer will give large amounts of rich milk, combining the leading desirable characteristics of both breeds. But when two animals are mated, each one of which is the result of years and generations of breeding with a particular purpose in view, these purposes being different in the two animals, there is a clash of prepotencies, and the result cannot be predicted with any certainty. It is not unlikely to be the comparatively small amount of milk of the Jersey, and the poorer quality of that of the Holstein, or vice versa. Mixing different strong bloods is, therefore, largely a gamble, the chances being as likely the drawing of a blank as a prize, the offspring lacking in uniformity of type and color, as well as of production. On the other hand, when the sire represents many generations of mating of animals of a certain type of structure, color or performance, the result will be that the influence of the sire will be the strongest in

the descendants, that the general quality of the herd will be improved, and the probability of the improved animals being able to transmit some of their improvement will be increased.

Honest Pay for Labor Given.

Editor "The Farmer's Advocate":

Many of the young people plan and scheme to get rich—and enormously rich, too—without hard work. Our country is developing a popular mania for sudden wealth. Farmers' sons are dazzled by the glitter of wealth they read of, and the suddenness and ease with which these fortunes are made makes them discontented and restless, and the plow becomes too slow an implement of acquiring a fortune. The ten, or fifteen or twenty-five thousand which their plain, honest fathers have accumulated they think too little. "Millions! Millions!" is the mad cry of the age. Young people of the farm, if you value a good conscience, ease of mind, and health of body, keep away from this swirling, rushing, hissing, boiling maelstrom of commercial madness. Be honest, and willing to earn your living. Do not be deceived by the rogue's maxim, "The world owes me a living." This is wrong, because the world owes you nothing but a just return for your labor.

If the country youth could only realize what untold pleasures were to be found on the farm, they would never think of leaving it. The country was made by God, the city by man. Life in the country is more natural, and city life more artificial. Life on the farm is nearer an ideal life than anything the city can afford.

As a place to live, the farm has many advantages over the city residence. The skies are clearer, the air is purer, and the world is brighter. There is no smoke from ten thousand chimneys and furnaces to darken the heavens. Instead of the fumes of the factory, the farmer has the fragrance of flower and foliage. Instead of drinking the city water, whose purity is exceedingly questionable, he drinks from the brook, the sparkling spring, or the cool, deep well. Instead of the ceaseless rattle of wheels and hoofs on the stony street, the farmer lives in quiet and comfort, no sound to break the quiet save the lowing herds, the chirp of birds, or the soft music on the breeze.

Then, the farm presents substantial comforts. The farmer eats his own chickens and drinks milk from his own cows; he raises nearly all his own eatables, and knows just how healthy and clean they are. The farm, also, combines much pleasure with its severe toil. The pure air, plain diet and simple habits produce a robustness of health which makes it a luxury to live and work. Sleep is sweet, and the morning finds the farmer fresh for work.

The work on the farm is not now so severe as it formerly was. Inventive skill has lifted the burden from human shoulders, and now much of the work is done by machinery. Instead of wearily plodding after many implements, the farmer is now permitted to ride in easy comfort. The swift harvesters have taken the place of the keen, flashing sickle. Instead of the flail, we hear the buzz of the steam-driven threshing machine. Even the rustic simplicity of farm life has yielded to the revolutionizing power of this wonderful age. Instead of pumping water and pulping roots by hand, we may use the gasoline engine or windmill.

It is sometimes said that the farmer is the most independent man in the world, and this is undoubtedly true. When city inhabitants are glad to make a living, the farmer is living without feeling the cost, and laying up money, besides. At all events, his living is always sure. He always raises enough produce for that in the poorest year, and his life is accompanied with few of those cares and anxieties which harass men in other walks of life.

When we think of all this, why do so many farmers' sons and daughters want to leave the farm, and think any other occupation preferable to that in which they were brought up. Life on the farm is by no means incompatible with culture, refinement and comfort. Every station has its unpleasant features, but we should accustom ourselves to look on the bright side of farming, learn to appreciate its poetry, and to enjoy its spiritual ideal side. There is so much enjoyment in it that, to say nothing of the profitableness of it, it confers delights which alone repay the toil.

C. A. W.

Apropos of the suggestion discussed in "The Farmer's Advocate" of April 15th, under the heading, "Job Wanted," a Kent County Subscriber humorously volunteers his services as one of a commission to visit Denmark in the interest of the Canadian bacon industry, mentioning as a willing fellow member of the party a namesake on the faculty of the Ontario Agricultural College. So we already have a hog-raiser and a professor. A journalist now, then a grant, and—All Aboard!

An Inversion of Common Sense.

Editor "The Farmer's Advocate":

It is a welcome sign to see the question of tariff protection so much debated in your columns, and especially welcome, to perceive how rarely the irrelevant questions of partisan politics intrude themselves. You are to be commended for creating such an excellent "open forum," in which all varieties of opinion and argument find expression. For some months now I have been a very interested reader of the many articles and communications appearing in your columns, dealing with trade matters, and I am at last stirred to offer some suggestions by the letter of "Pro Bono Publico," appearing in your issue of April 8th. By the way, would it not be appropriate for "Pro Bono Publico" to write over his own signature? It would then seem that he had the full courage of his convictions. Let him discover himself.

"Pro Bono Publico" admits that free trade has some meaning when applied to "trading horses, hats, jackknives, etc., with the neighbors," but maintains that it is a misnomer when applied to international affairs. On the economic side, I challenge him to show one reason which would justify freedom of trade between the inhabitants of two counties in Ontario, which does not equally justify freedom of trade across international boundaries. So far as the advantages which arise from the ability to exchange commodities are concerned, international boundaries do not exist, and cannot exist. For political reasons, tariffs have been established, and are still maintained; and, unfortunately, have been discovered to be an excellent engine of extortion by certain privileged classes. As settled commercial policies, however, tariffs for protection or revenue are fallacious in theory, and pernicious or wasteful in practice.

It is quite true that many modern civilized nations maintain high tariffs, and that England, at her wits' end as to how to raise the money to pay huge war-debts and to build Dreadnoughts, has had recourse to more or less in the way of tariff or inland revenue taxation. But the fact that protection or taxation by means of tariffs is a very common practice, does not by any means justify it. Time was when intertribal warfare was incessantly waged, and even now the resources of nearly every nation are taxed to the utmost to maintain defensive or offensive armaments. The disappearance of incessant intertribal warfare will be welcomed, doubtless, by even "Pro Bono Publico," as an advance of civilization; and were modern nations somewhat more kindly disposed towards each other, so that they felt free to disarm and relegate all disputes to an international judicial tribunal, perhaps "Pro Bono Publico" would go still further, and admit that the energy and wealth thus freed for productive purposes might do not a little in making the desert blossom as the rose, and in banishing disease, poverty and vice from human society. It would be well for "Pro Bono Publico" to keep in mind, also, that one of the most common conditions which well-nigh compel customs taxation is the existence of huge war debts, and the fancied necessity for huge naval and military expenditure. Protection, as "commercial warfare," is very closely related, both as cause and consequence, to the warfare that involves bloodshed.

"Pro Bono Publico" cites many facts which prove how great were the import duties which England levied from 1787 to about 1850. But he forgets entirely to describe the conditions of that time, during two decades of which England was engaged in a titanic struggle for national existence with Napoleon. And he forgets, also, to keep in mind the conditions of the masses in rural England prior to the repeal of the corn laws. Let him read Kingsley's "Alton Locke," "Yeast," and "Two Years Ago," all dealing with conditions between 1830 and 1850, and let him bear in mind the continued references in contemporary literature to the press-gang, smuggling, and revenue cutters along the shore, and other brutal and miserable social conditions, and he will not state, with such evident complacency, that "Agricultural industries were regarded by English statesmen as transcending all others in importance, hence for centuries (?), by a high protective tariff, the home market was guarded for the British farmers."

It is a strange inversion of common sense, developed by a constant viewing of exchange wholly from the standpoint of the producer, that makes "Pro Bono Publico" and other protectionists lament the "flooding of the home market" with foreign commodities. In 1906, agricultural cereal products (exclusive of tropical or semi-tropical fruits, etc.) were sold in the Canadian markets by U. S. producers to the alarming extent of \$18,606,611 worth. Why alarming? I see nothing to be alarmed about, or to wonder at. I presume we got our money's worth in goods, or thought we did, at all events; therefore, the bargain may be presumed to have been a good one. Does "Pro Bono Publico" fear a driving of Canadian agriculture to the wall through competition with Yankee farmers? Such