

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 arrears must be made as required by law.
5. THE LAW IS, that all subscribers to newspapers are held responsible until all arrears 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.

there is more in this transpiration theory than he himself had been inclined to expect. This explains in part why a stone house is so cool in summer, especially if kept shut up and not provided with large windows to admit sunlight. So far as the summer is concerned, one might prefer stone houses and stables, but, by converse reasoning, we perceive the objections to masonry walls as winter stabling, particularly for hogs, but in less degree for other stock, also. A stone building, unless heated by artificial means, is inclined to be damp. There is no doubt but that masonry has certain distinct advantages as a material for construction of stables, but there is just as little doubt that walls of wood, paper and shavings or sawdust, insure a drier, pleasanter and more sanitary stable atmosphere. The important question is whether by any means we can bring about an improvement of the conditions in the stone or concrete stabling. By using hollow construction, we may lessen the amount of heat wasted by conduction, thereby permitting the admission of larger quantities of fresh, cold air to displace the damper and more or less foul respired air. Those who have yet to build will do well to weigh carefully the advantages of frame construction, with shavings between the scantling. Those who must build of masonry, should consider carefully the advantages of using cement blocks or building their slop walls with a core, and should not fail to provide plenty of windows and doors. Those who already have stone or solid cement walls may well consider the proposition of lining them with boards. Every consideration points to the desirability of well-insulated walls and free ventilation.

To many Canadians, the most disturbing argument against reciprocity is the fear that it may endanger Canadian loyalty. While respecting the fears of those who think this way, we would again point out that reciprocity worked the other way in the past. And why not? Does it endanger one's loyalty to his family connection to sell eggs and butter to a merchant who is not a relative when, by so doing, he can get a better price than by selling them to a cousin in a distant town?

Country and Town.

At the present juncture, when so much is being heard on the subject of rural life and rural prosperity, the appearance of a book entitled, "Rural versus Urban—Their Conflict, and Causes" (*), by an American traveller in Europe, John W. Bookwalter, is of timely interest. It is a study of the natural and artificial relations of these two great interests, with a view to reaching conclusions that will assist modern nations, such as the United States and Canada, in avoiding the perpetuation of errors that destroyed great historic states in the past. One conclusion is obvious, that the moral health and continued stability of the state is promoted by keeping agriculture at least on a par with town life and industries. In rural life rests the security of the future. He idealizes France, with its "elastic tariff," scientifically adjusted to preserve the balance between agriculture and town industries, and its communal centering of farming population in villages, whereby its voting or political power is preserved and made effective. In France, nearly two-thirds of the people find healthful occupation on the land, and, by preserving the supremacy of that industry, despite her periodic tempests of social and political passion, her onward progress is steadily maintained, and financially she is the envy of the nations. Mr. Bookwalter probably does not give sufficient credit to the thoroughness of the French system of agriculture and the natural thrift of the French country people, particularly the French housewives. He argues that extreme free trade and protection, respectively, in England and the United States, adversely affected agriculture, but seems to overlook the baleful effects of the land-tenure system of England, which has locked the people away from the land. It is shown that dire results followed the rapid settlement and expansion of grain production over the vast, fertile area of cheap land in the Trans-Mississippi basin. It must not be overlooked, of course, that the sudden increase in wheat production in the prairie belt was largely due to the advent of the self-binder and other machinery. "In its entirety, however," he says, "it would seem that it was the railways, with their affiliated interests, the manufacturer with his special advantages, the money-lender of the financial centers, and the speculator with his manipulative methods, which absorbed about all the wealth that the farmer's toil directly produced in the Trans-Mississippi territory, at least during its early history." If there is not in these statements of conditions and results a powerful admonition to the Canada of to-day, we would hardly know where to look for one more effective. While he seems to discern the possibility of a conserving, but not creative, quality in the protective principle, he is forced to acknowledge "the sinister presence therein of that easy perversion of economics that becomes the most formidable instrument ever wielded by cunning and avarice, not only to arrest the laws of nature and trade, but to divert them from their proper courses in order to promote the cause of special interests and to further the selfish aggrandizement of class. We refer, of course, to the high-protective and prohibitive tariff laws." "To what remedy alone," he asks, "are we driven to restore that just relation of the two capital elements of our national economy upon which the integrity and stability of the whole depends? The remedy is obvious, and approved by nature: Sweep away those legislative measures and fiscal agencies that essentially operate to produce an unnatural distribution of the nation's varied products, and let the diffusion of the fruits of the nation's increase be a natural and equitable one." And again, on his concluding page he says: "The agrarian rights and powers of a people should be ever more vigilantly safeguarded by holding urban aggression and power under salutary restraints, and thereby placing them both on the same common and enduring basis of equity."

(*) Publishers: The Knickerbocker Press, New York.

Opportunity of a Lifetime.

Editor "The Farmer's Advocate":

It is certainly amusing to notice in your columns occasionally the expressions of some, who really work themselves up to the pitch of believing that the present reciprocity agreement with our American neighbors, if carried into effect, will result injuriously to the Canadian people, and that your "undisguised friendliness" to the agreement surprises them.

The remarks of Mr. Scratch in your recent issue, is a very good sample, although I am pleased to pay him the compliment of discussing the question upon its merits, so far as he goes, which cannot be said of too many of the deliverances which we notice.

If there is one fact, more than another, of which the farmers of Canada should be proud, it is that all the leading agricultural journals of the country have effectively shown that their management is "big" enough to discuss this question from the broad standpoint of the national welfare; and that, from this exalted point of view, and without exception, they are enthusiastically in favor of ratifying the agreement.

Take, for instance, my friend's argument on the horse question. After telling us that the Western Provinces constitute the greatest horse market in the world, he goes on to try to make us believe that it will be ruinous to Ontario and the East if this agreement is ratified and our Western farmers can get their horses from the South. If that is so (and I dispute it), what does it mean? It simply means that our Western farmers will be able, then, to get better value for their money in buying horses across the border; and if my friend were a Westerner, he would be enthusiastically in favor of the scheme.

We, as agriculturists, must realize that the Government of this country is commissioned to legislate for the whole of Canada, not any sectional part of it. According to his own argument, he has shown that this will be a good arrangement for the Western farmer. If his argument proves to be true in any sense, it can only apply to the very medium and inferior grades of horses—classes of animals which no Government should encourage their farmers to grow. What about the best classes—the good drafters and gentlemen's good driving, saddle and carriage horses? These are the animals which always bring the profitable returns. He seeks to belittle the great horse market of the big cities of the Eastern States. If this agreement materializes, Ontario and Eastern breeders will still have the Winnipeg, Montreal, and other Canadian markets, and, in addition to these, they will also have the great cities of the Eastern States, which really is (speaking from the past experience of Ontario dealers, and for the years that are to come) the greatest market of the world for distinctly high-class animals of these two sorts.

Every old horse-dealer and breeder can well remember how we always looked for our best prices from the "Yankee" dealers, as we used to call them; and when these purchasers are again allowed the freedom of our market, and can step on the train in the evening, and be up into Ontario the next day, I predict (although no prophet) that they will again be welcome visitors.

Ontario horses, being reared in the harder climate, and nourished on the muscle-forming oat grain, used to have a distinct preference over American corn-fed horses in their own market; and, without doubt, they will command this preference again. So that, in the matter of free horse markets between the two countries, speaking broadly, Canada has everything to gain, and very little to lose.

Then he talks about fruit. If we only consult the last published trade returns (year ending March 31st, 1910), we find that 48,272 barrels of Canadian apples jumped over the American tariff wall of 75 cents per barrel into the American market. That shows how the free-trade wind will blow. Ontario can grow the best apples in the world, and the rich Americans are bound to have the best.

In small fruits and vegetables, prices will be equalized to the general consumer. They will get this early American produce (before similar Canadian products are ready to market) the duty less than they have to pay for such produce now, and Ontario producers will have the benefit of the big American market later on in the season.

When we come to high-class beef cattle, this is the line of which I have made a study. It gives me my bread and butter. I have taken a leading American live-stock journal, and carefully watched the trend of prices in both countries for years. To one who has done so, it is surprising what nonsense is being written and expressed by those who oppose this agreement. Had I been allowed free access to the American market for my season's turn-over of beef cattle for the year ending September, 1910, I am safe in saying that my returns would have been at least an additional \$1,000. This arrangement will, if effected, prove a Godsend to the Ontario grower of high-class baby-beef.

Every Canadian citizen, and more particularly