

THE FARMER'S ADVOCATE AND HOME MAGAZINE.

THE LEADING AGRICULTURAL JOURNAL IN THE
DOMINION.

PUBLISHED WEEKLY BY
THE WILLIAM WELD COMPANY (LIMITED).

TWO DISTINCT PUBLICATIONS—EASTERN AND WESTERN

EASTERN OFFICE:
CARLING STREET, LONDON, ONT.

WESTERN OFFICE:
IMPERIAL BANK BLOCK, CORNER BANNATYNE AVE. AND MAIN ST.,
WINNIPEG, MANITOBA.

BRANCH OFFICE: CALGARY, ALBERTA, N.-W. T.
LONDON (ENGLAND) OFFICE:
W. W. CHAPMAN, Agent, Mowbray House, Norfolk Street,
London, W. C., England.

JOHN WELD, MANAGER.

8. THE FARMER'S ADVOCATE is published every Thursday (52 issues per year). It is impartial and independent of all cliques or parties, handsomely illustrated with original engravings, and furnishes the most profitable, practical, reliable information for farmers, dairymen, gardeners, and stockmen, of any publication in Canada.
9. TERMS OF SUBSCRIPTION.—In Canada, United States, England, Ireland and Scotland, \$1.50 per year, in advance; \$2.00 when not paid in advance. All other countries, 12s.
10. ADVERTISING RATES.—Single insertion, 20 cents per line agate. Contract rates furnished on application.
11. THE ADVOCATE is sent to subscribers until an explicit order is received for its discontinuance. All payments of arrearages must be made as required by law.
12. THE LAW IS, that all subscribers to newspapers are held responsible until all arrearages are paid and their paper ordered to be discontinued.
13. REMITTANCES should be made direct to this office, either by Money Order or Registered Letter, which will be at our risk. When made otherwise we will not be responsible.
14. THE DATE ON YOUR LABEL shows to what time your subscription is paid.
15. ANONYMOUS communications will receive no attention.
16. LETTERS intended for publication should be written on one side of the paper only.
17. CHANGE OF ADDRESS.—Subscribers when ordering a change of address should give the old as well as the new P. O. address.
18. 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 Advocate, 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.
19. 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, OF
THE WILLIAM WELD COMPANY (LIMITED),
LONDON, CANADA.

well to strive for the ideal, but we cannot ignore the practical; and it seems folly, because, with some public utilities control was recklessly given away, to pretend to remedy things by purchasing such utilities. In other words, Government or municipal ownership and operation resolves itself into the homely simile of moving a burden from one shoulder to the other.

Let us have more telephones; let the legislation granting telephone franchises be such as to control and ensure reasonable rates, but leave the working or operation of such utilities to men whose business it is to give the best possible service at the lowest possible cost and who do not depend on political pull for promotion and increase of salary.

Farmers and the Tariff.

To the Editor "Farmer's Advocate":

A letter by Mr. Gunn in your issue of Aug. 31st brings before us an important question—the position of the farming community on the tariff question. The letter is very timely, since, as is pointed out, now, while the Tariff Commission is conducting its investigation, is the time to urge our claims. There is no doubt that other classes who benefit by a protective tariff at the expense of the farming community will be there in full force and will make their wants known in no uncertain tones. That being the case, it is certainly high time that we were taking some steps to effectively present our claims.

But while I quite agree with Mr. Gunn as to the desirability of taking action in this matter, and, while I agree with him in some other matters, I cannot agree with him in his main contention, viz., that we should demand a protective tariff on wool and sheep as an offset to the duties charged on our wool and sheep entering the United States. This has been strongly urged in some quarters, particularly by Mr. Lloyd-Jones, both in this paper and in other agricultural journals, but in spite of its respectable backing I cannot help thinking that it would be a great mistake and a real injury to the farming community to urge the adoption of such a duty. At any rate, it is well to consider the pros and cons of the whole matter before taking action.

There is not the slightest doubt that all of us raisers of a few sheep, like myself, and raisers of a large number, like Mr. Lloyd-Jones, would like to get more for our wool and lambs, but whether the measure proposed would effect the desired result, without working an equal or greater injury, is another question. It is held that because we import some wool and some lambs, all that is necessary is to impose an import tax against these things entering our country from the United States, and at once our prices will take a corresponding rise. But those who urge this show some short-sightedness and not a little inconsistency. For instance, take some statements made by Mr. Gunn in his letter. He states, first, that we import wool from the U. S. Later, he states that in the U. S. farmers got 28c. for their wool, while we only received 15c. Put these two statements together and we see that some fool Yankee must have bought wool at 28c. per pound and shipped it here where he could only get 15c. for it, making, as we can see at once, a very handsome profit. The thing is absurd, were it not that there is a reasonable explanation. The wool grown here is not of the finest quality, being the product of Downs and Long-wools—sheep whose first purpose is the production of mutton. It cannot compare with the Merino of the Western U. S. ranches, where sheep are raised whose main purpose is the production of wool. It is this wool that is imported, not because there is any shortage of wool here—such as it is—but because the finer quality is needed to mix with our own in the manufacture of many fabrics. An import tax on this wool could not raise the price of our wool here, and could only operate to hamper the work of our own manufacturers. The farmers of this country have very little to hope from an import tax on wool.

They have, however, something to fear. There is scarcely a doubt that the imposition of a duty on wool would be followed by a demand for higher protection from our woollen manufacturers, and this demand, under the circumstances, would be very hard to resist. Higher protection for woollen goods would mean higher prices for clothing, and it seems almost probable that from this cause the farming community would suffer to a greater extent than it would benefit by the increase (if any) in the price of wool resulting from the protective duty.

One other point brought out in Mr. Gunn's letter is deserving of notice. He is very anxious to build up the sheep industry, yet he complains because we only exact 20 per cent. duty on lambs that are imported, not to be slaughtered, but to improve our own flocks. It seems to be rather a funny way to help the sheep industry, to heavily all sheep brought into the country to improve our own flocks.

There is no use deceiving ourselves. Protection cannot benefit the farmers of Canada, except in a few very unimportant lines. The price of the great bulk of our farm produce—the things we raise and produce for our living—is fixed abroad, because we are all large exporters of these things, and no amount of protection can raise their price here. On the other hand, we suffer largely by protection, because the duties on all the manufactured articles we use raise the price of all these things brought into the country and enable our own manufacturers to charge a proportionately high price for their products, because they are relieved, to that extent, of foreign competition. That is so because we are large importers of all these things, and would not be possible otherwise. The farmers of Canada, then, stand to lose all and gain nothing by the policy of protection, and our demand, presented before the Tariff Commission, should be for a general reduction of duties. By demanding protection on the few little side lines, where it might possibly be of some benefit to us, we only pledge ourselves to the support of an evil system and render ineffectual any resistance we might offer to it.

On one other point I can most cordially agree with Mr. Gunn, and that is the stand he takes on the question of the importation of shoddy and its use in the manufacture of woollen goods. Immense quantities of this rubbish, these "cast cloths and rotten rags," are used in the manufacture of cheaper grades of cloth, to the great injury of the wool-raising business. This should be entirely prohibited. Shoddy is not used because by its use the manufacturers can produce cheaper and better cloth, but because by using it they can produce a cloth that looks better than it really is—in fact, a bogus cloth. The manufacture of shoddy cloth is of the same nature as the manufacture of artificial butter, oleomargarine, and should be equally forbidden by law. The farmers of this country would do well to press for the total prohibition of the manufacture of shoddy, which not only is a swindle on the general public, but greatly injures the producers of wool.

It is as strongly as anyone, that the sheep industry of this country should be built up, and I believe, an industry that can be carried out with a good deal of profit on the part of Ontario in a moderate way and under proper management, there is no reason why it

thing we can do should be done to help that industry, but if we take pains to thoroughly understand the situation, it is my belief that we must come to the conclusion that the best way to help this industry is in the way we have already helped the beef and dairy and bacon industries, viz., by spreading knowledge in regard to it, and not by agitating for tariff changes which will do as much harm as good, and will pledge us to the support of an evil system.

Simcoe Co., Ont.

E. C. DRURY.

HORSES.

Classification of Horses for Show Purposes.

Any person who attends the horse ring at fall exhibitions, or horse shows, either in the capacity of director, attendant, judge or spectator, notices that mistakes in the classification of the exhibits are not rare. Exhibitors, either through carelessness or ignorance, not infrequently enter and exhibit an animal in the wrong class. Many high-class animals are shown in a class to which they do not belong, and while an animal so exhibited may be more valuable than those with which he is in company, he is out of his class and cannot win. Occurrences of this kind are unfortunate, and not infrequently subject the judge to severe and unjust criticisms. Some claim that the prize should be given to the most valuable animal in all cases, but this is a very unsafe view to take. In the first place, the animal must be shown in his proper class, and his value must be considered wholly as regards his development of the special characteristics demanded in the class. For instance, in the roadster class, where considerable speed is demanded, the more the better, so long as the animal has the other characteristics of his class, viz., size, style, manners, and ability to go fast without boots, well developed. We will suppose two animals are competing, one a good-sized, stylish, well-mannered fellow, who carries his head well and looks well at all gaits, and can trot, say in 2:30; the other, also of good size and good manners, but has a common appearance and a slouchy way of going when going slowly, but can trot, say in 2:05. Now, sir, which should win? If we place the prize according to market value the latter will win easily, but as a roadster such extreme speed is not required, and it is very seldom a piece of road sufficiently smooth (unless the pavement, on which no sane man will speed a horse) is found to justify a driver in speeding him. The well-prepared race-track is the only safe place for such speed, and then the animal requires to be fit for racing, else it will be unsafe to allow him to go. The speed of the first mentioned is all, and I may say more than is demanded in a roadster, and as he has sufficient speed for his class and out-classes the other in style and general appearance—an essential in a roadster—I think he should win, notwithstanding the fact that his competitor is worth many times his value, but as a race-horse, not as a roadster, the class under discussion. In this case the animals were each in his proper class; but in others they are not. A man may exhibit a roadster in the carriage class or vice versa, and, while his entry may represent the highest market value, he should not win. In such cases, the owner of the animal, either through want of accurate knowledge of the characteristics demanded in horses of certain classes, or carelessness in making his entry, has entered him in the wrong class, and it is often impossible to convince him that he has made a mistake. He either cannot or will not see it; he considers his horse has not had justice, and in many cases will enlarge, often in language more expressive than polite, upon the ignorance of the judge. If exhibitors would read the prize list carefully, and carefully consider the characteristics of their horses, and then be careful to enter them in their proper classes, conditions of this kind would not occur. Unfortunately, there are many good and often quite valuable animals that do not possess the characteristics of any class in a marked degree. In other words, while useful and valuable animals, they cannot be satisfactorily classed; hence are not show horses and should not be exhibited. Owners of such often grumble that there is no place for them to show. Exhibition societies cannot make classes for all types of horses, and it would not be wise to do so, as, while an unclassed horse may be valuable, it will generally be found that he is of mixed breeding, and as he cannot be produced with any degree of certainty, it would be a mistake to encourage his production. The aim of all exhibitions should be to encourage the production of the recognized and marketable classes. The classes which include most of the horses owned and exhibited by farmers are the heavy draft, agricultural, general-purpose, carriage, roadster and saddle. The other classes, as high-steppers, tandems, four-in-hand, hunters, etc., require animals that, in the first case, have the general characteristics of their class well marked, and then are subjected to a course of training in order to develop these characteristics. Hence, these classes, we may