

FARMER'S ADVOCATE

AND HOME MAGAZINE

* AGRICULTURE, STOCK, DAIRY, POULTRY, HORTICULTURE, VETERINARY, HOME CIRCLE. *

VOL. XI. REGISTERED IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE COPYRIGHT ACT OF 1875. NO. 693.

WINNIPEG, MAN. JANUARY 3, 1906. LONDON, ONT.

Editorial.

The M. A. C. will help out the bottle babies in Winnipeg by supplying the real article.

A new idea for the phonograph records—the seed-train fifteen-minute lectures!

"The farmers are a pesky lot of kickers."—A. Lumberman, Esq.

The packers would feed our unsuspecting brethren at home with Canadian (!) bacon made from U. S. hogs. Squeals are now heard.

The Alberta sheepmen tried to pull the wool over Mr. Fielding's eyes; since which time he has hardly been able to tell the sheep from the goats.

Now starts the school trustee on troublous times—he must save money for the section, and yet must not let the school district be loaded up with a school marm of inferior attainments.

The Canadian Northwestern flyer—otherwise, the "Seed Special"—makes short stops and fast runs. No baggage will be allowed to pile up in the aisles, and there will be no compartment for smoking.

A Montreal debating club found in the affirmative for the question, "Does early marriage hinder a man's chances of success?" The question might well be asked, what is success—is it a childless, loveless old age? Debating clubs to the contrary: A man's success on the farm depends on his early marriage to the right woman; without her he can exist, but not live.

The lady help, even if a little short on muscle for the roughest work, is considered by many a thoughtful mother as a better charge for her priceless children than the rough foreigner or the coarse-tongued, illiterate Bridget that often passes under the title of "hired girl." Children's minds are as plastic as clay, and the well-educated Old Country young woman is preferred by the woman who wishes her children to be well-mannered.

We are Not Dismayed by Threats.

The letter published in another column, threatening this paper with loss of patronage on account of our advocacy of clean fairs, is, we take it, a high compliment to our efforts, and will only serve to rally more firmly to our support the great bulk of the population—farmers and townsmen—who, we know, stand for clean fairs, and who will not tolerate indecency. It might be worth recalling to the attention of our readers that this paper carried advertising of two larger fairs than the one referred to by our correspondent, yet this paper did not hesitate to stand for what we know is right! Our information and statements were absolutely correct, and if the directors of any show are as ignorant regarding what transpires on their grounds as the writer of the letter claims to be, then the public, to whom they are responsible, cannot dismiss them too quickly. Many of the fairs of Canada are needing more careful scrutiny as to their methods, cost of running, benefits to the community, etc., and it will be a good day when the sideshow is banished from all fair grounds.

A Prayer for the New Year.

For all Thy royal largeness, Lord,
Out-rolled in mellow splendor,
Upon a thousand harvest floors,
Our thanksgiving we render;
Thou dost awake the slumbering land,
From green to gold unfolding
The punctual pageant of the year,
Thy breath its beauties moulding.

O Giver, gladdening our days,
We hear through all creation
One Temple-chorus deepen on
In awe and adoration.
Thine ancient promise never fails;
The hills with joy are ringing,
The valleys rustling thick with corn
Wave into sudden singing.

Long summer noons, and starry nights,
Winds, snows, at Thy word blowing,
Have wrought a myriad miracles,
Set tides of bounty flowing,
Sent mystic signs to summon life
Sealed in its sunless prison,
And made the face of every field
God's table new uprisen.

O crown our souls with rich increase,
Shower down Thy gifts supernal;
Thou who dost give the amber sheaf,
Grant us the bread eternal;
Bring us into Thy garner, Lord,
At last in heavenly gladness,
Beyond the changing season's scathe,
Beyond the blight of sadness.

Amen.

Mr. Gray and the Embargo.

We give space in this issue to a letter from Mr. Patrick L. Gray, Secretary of the Edinburgh (Scotland) Branch of the National Canadian Cattle Admission Association, in which he takes objection to an article on the subject of the British embargo on imported cattle, published not long since in the "Farmer's Advocate."

Mr. Gray's letter seems to be divided into two sections: First, special pleading for the British feeder; and, second, assertions not in accordance with facts to try to prove his case and establish the position that Canadians would be advantaged by allowing the British feeder to do the finishing of beef cattle for them. At the outset let us assure Mr. Gray that we are not "opposing" embargo removal, because we believe the fewer restrictions imposed by either Great Britain or the United States upon live stock and its products from Canada the better for the Canadian farmer.

We need not quibble over the constitutionality of the embargo legislation—it has been the law of the Old Land since 1896, and will require an Act of Parliament to replace—that will be work for Mr. Campbell-Bannerman when he succeeds to power. There is certainly no excuse for continuing the embargo on the score that Canadian cattle are diseased, but we are not so sure that the British Government will take the ground that there is no risk of animal disease from abroad with open ports. That is their lookout.

If we except the great Province of Ontario, Mr. Gray is right in saying that Canada is not a maize (corn) growing country; but our corn area is extending, and we lie right alongside the world's greatest corn-producing area, upon which for feed we freely draw, and, moreover, there is practically no limit to our capacity to grow barley, oats, peas, flax, roots, and other high-

class cattle foods. Mr. Gray need not worry about our running short of cattle feed.

When Mr. Gray asserts that Canada has only a comparatively small proportion of tillage land for growing cattle-food stuffs, he is either ignorant, or is misrepresenting this great "Dominion beyond the sea," where just such land can be measured by millions of square miles. Had Mr. Gray enjoyed the privilege of reading the "Farmer's Advocate" more attentively he would have known better, and also that Western grazing country is being rapidly cut down by the inrush of farmers who are introducing a different system of farming and cattle-feeding, by which it is quite possible to finish cattle on grains; and not only that, but the cultivated land now produces many more than the prairie would. If Mr. Gray was as well posted as he ought to be, he would realize that the system of agriculture on the "boundless prairie" is rapidly changing from ranching to grain-growing and mixed farming, and in the Province of Manitoba the fact is being fast borne home upon farmers that they must feed cattle if the fertility of the soil is to be maintained. Mr. Gray will have to argue for a long time to convince the thinking farmer of Canada that he will improve his soil by sending his stockers to Great Britain to be finished, and sell the feeding stuffs for that purpose.

The British feeder who wants to get cheap store cattle, as Mr. Gray himself confesses, is simply another middleman between the British consumer and the Canadian producer, scooping in profits that the latter ought to have.

Mr. Gray is correct about the condition in which many of the range cattle reach British ports, largely by reason of the 2,000-mile rail haul before going on shipboard. Our editors have personally examined the cattle on arrival at the British ports, and this has been frequently referred to in the "Farmer's Advocate" as an argument for the establishment of a chilled-meat industry in the West, but at the same time, stalled Canadians reach Britain fully equal to the best Americans. If our Canadian Cattle-admission friends were as anxious for the Canadian cattle-raiser, they would be advising him to finish more well-bred cattle at home, and would be arranging companies to start the chilled-meat industry in Canada, thus effecting a big saving in the freight on offal and providing for additional new Canadian industries. Everybody sympathizes with the gentlemen who locked up their capital in Old Country feeding pens and lairages—unremunerative under the present system. Gentlemen on this side of the Atlantic interested in the cattle-carrying trade naturally want to see more cattle moving, no matter whether fat or lean, and our statesmen sometimes indulge in political rhetoric.

If the British Government see fit to remove the embargo, that's their business; but if done for Canada alone, to be any good, it would necessarily be followed by the reimposition of a rigid quarantine against the United States along our entire 3,000 mile International Boundary Line, entailing enormous expense, and doubtless resulting in a similar U. S. wall against Canada. Our quarantine would at once check the incoming rush of American farm settlers with their stock into Canada. Are we prepared to do that? Hardly! Another thing, an embargo removal for Canada only would stop our export shipment to Britain by such ports as Portland and Boston. Restricted competition in cattle carriage might suit Montreal, but it would be hard for the Canadian cattle man. Were British ports opened to all-comers, with no preferential treatment for Canada, then there would be a rush of stockers from all