

Another very important point, and a very forcible educator, will be the different value we put on our stock individually. Take those two colts. The first by a pure-bred Clyde is "easy sale" at \$75, the second by that cheap Clyde-trotter-French-combination stallion would be a very slow sale at \$40. How much have you lost on that colt as compared with the first this year, and how much will you lose on him by the time they are both four years old? Will you, after that demonstration, still go on using the mongrel stallion?

Take your cows now. You know that "Bess," the old reliable twelve-year-old, still gives you 6 lbs. of butter per week, but you know also equally well that her daughter "Buttercup," though only four years old, gives you 10 lbs. per week, eats less and looks better. You value "Bess" at \$30. What value do you put on "Buttercup"? Can you afford to keep "Bess" any longer? What about those others that don't give as much as she does? Do you intend to go on keeping "Buttercup," so that she will help pay for the board of the other unprofitable brutes? Wouldn't you be better off to give away some of those cows at the beginning of the winter, or, at any rate, sell them for what they will fetch, or make beef of them? Carry out this comparison with all your other stock, and I don't think you will want much urging next year to buy a pure-bred bull, boar or roosters.

Again, you had some fifty acres of wheat this past season; 30 of it gave you 25 bushels per acre, the remaining 20 only 15 bushels. Why was this? Did that 20 acres pay expenses? If not, wouldn't you have been better off without them? You had a piece of Hungarian grass of four acres that returned you sixteen large loads of good hay, with only four days' work in all for plowing, cutting and hauling, because it was so near your buildings and on your own farm. You also cut forty loads of wild hay ten miles from home, which took you two weeks to cut and stack out in the swamp, and is going to take you three weeks more to haul home during the cold of winter. Now, in the first case, you got four loads a day of first-class hay; in the second only a little over one load a day of second quality stuff. Think it over seriously, and without prejudice for the good old times, and determine that this season you will endeavor to have all your hay at home, grow it on your own land, and thus not only get more of a better quality, but without any hardship of winter teaming. Let those far-away swamps severely alone. Believe me you can make more money giving your stock your full attention during the winter than you can save by hauling home swamp hay in the cold of January and February and neglecting your cattle at home. Let us think more and work more with our heads and not so much by "main strength and ignorance."

GENERAL.

Keep all those refuse pieces of meat from your animals, such as lungs, etc., and chop them up for your hens; burn your bones in the stove, and the fowls will be glad of them.

Look round you for fresh roosters. Make note of those hens that lay right along in the cold winter months, and keep all the pullets from them; they will most likely follow their mothers in their good deeds.

If you intend buying a bull or a boar, buy one that was born early in the year; they will be better grown than those coming later. Again, in showing them they will have a considerable advantage, as the ages are frequently reckoned from the beginning of the year.

"INVICTA."

How Best to Overcome the Present Agricultural Depression.

An Address delivered by James Elder, of Virden, before the Brandon Farmers' Institute.

(CONTINUED FROM PAGE 9.)

Next, we must curtail our purchases. There are two words in the English language, each composed of four letters, which in a general way mean the same thing, but at the same time have a vastly different meaning. If a man adopts one as a basis of his purchasing he will go down, whilst if he adopts the other he will be apt to succeed. These two words are "Want" and "Need." If a man buys all that he wants, look out for the bailiff. If he buys nothing but what he really "needs," he will be surprised at the reduction he can make in his annual expenditure. And with this end in view, let us use as little as possible the credit system so prevalent in Canada—a system which, although in some cases a necessity, has at the same time much to do with the present pinched condition of our people.

Many an article which is bought during the summer, in view of a good crop, could and would be dispensed with if the hard cash had to be paid for it. With the same end in view, let us give the machine agents and the organ peddlers a wide berth. By that I do not mean to say that we should not have a supply of the best machinery in the market. But surely we are capable of judging for ourselves what we need and when to buy. And I think that a good rule for a farmer is never to buy from an agent when he calls at the farm. Many who to-day are receiving the attentions of the bailiff will tell you that they could have done without the article for a year or two, and had no intention of buying, but were per-

sued by the agent who offered "such liberal terms," and before he was out of sight they regretted that they had given the order.

For my own part, I never give an order to a calling agent, but when I have, after calm deliberation, without the aid of this self-constituted, philanthropic advisor, concluded that I need a certain article, I go to town and buy it, and have never found any difficulty in finding a dealer.

Agents may think this plain talk, but I have a brother an agent, and they say he is a good one—a rather doubtful compliment.

The next point to which I would refer is one for the remedying of which I have less hope, simply because our party prejudices prevent us from taking an impartial view of it. I refer to our trade relations. I know that I will be met by some with the cry, "No politics in the Institute." I think that is a foolish cry. If you say, "No partyism in the Institute," I say amen to that. But we are farmers, and farmers constitute by far the majority of our population, and no class of men in the Dominion have a better right to discuss the political questions of the day than we have. But we cannot do so because our party prejudices interfere, and those who, by means of rings and combines, are sucking the very blood from our veins, take advantage of that in order to have the political machinery run in their own interests. What would you think of a man who, on account of being troubled with a cough, would call a doctor, and allow him to sound him all over, except just over one lung, because he was a little ticklish just there; and yet that is just the position taken by those who cry, "No politics in the Institute."

It is all very well to say we should discuss plowing, sowing, pickling, stacking, etc.; but when the manufacturers meet, do they confine themselves to asking the best material for bushing, the best kind of knotter, or the most durable journal? No, sir. The all-absorbing question is, How shall we fix the tariff so that the farmers may be made hewers of wood and drawers of water while we become millionaires? And when the farmers can meet in the same way, and casting aside the party prejudices inherited from our fathers—prejudices which, in their day, were principles founded upon questions which no longer exist—consider without bias what will be for our mutual benefit, then, and not till then, will we have fair play in the race of life.

Now, sir, I hold that if the farmers of Brandon are sincere in asking this question, it is our duty, as honest men, to lay aside our party names, and calmly look at the political, as well as every other phase of the question, and if we find that the policy of our party conflicts with our interests, let us sever our connection and vote for our interests.

And since you invited me to come here and discuss this question, I claim the right to speak my mind without hesitation.

Personally, I believe that one of the most potent causes of the present depression is the existing protective tariff, which debars us the privilege of choosing our own market either for sale or purchase. Why do we find so many first-class, intelligent western farmers buying American binders, and paying forty dollars (\$40) each extra for them? It is either because the binders are superior, or because those farmers are absolute fools; and whichever way you put it, if I desire an American machine, why should I not be at liberty to buy it without paying a fine under the name of duty? Of course, the reason given for the adoption of the system was to build up the manufactures, and thereby increase our population and secure home consumption for our products. That system has been in operation for nearly fourteen years, and now we ask, Where are our manufactures? Where is our increased population? "Echo answers, where?"

We were to foster our "infant industries." But whilst we were rocking the cradles, and benefitted politicians were singing a sweet lullaby, some of our "infants have died," and those who have lived have changed into monsters called rings and combines, which now stand with their heels upon our necks, whilst they drain the blood out of us. Why, I ask, should we farmers stand divided, whilst we are made a prey of by miller and grain dealer rings on one side, manufacturer rings on the other, and railway rings on top of all?

Let us unite, and not only talk together, but vote together, and then, and not till then, will we be in a position to make "tyrants tremble." And now, perhaps, I have said enough upon this tender but important point. There is another point upon which I wish to touch, and I sometimes think that it is the most important, because most potent of all; I refer to the moral phase.

I said at the beginning, that many of us in coming to this province very much resembled Lot viewing all the plain of Jordan, and pitching his tent towards Sodom. In reading the histories of Abraham and Lot, the chief difference seems to have been that, whilst Lot was most concerned about pitching his tent, Abraham never forgot to build an altar to God. And is there not good reason to believe that this fact had something to do with the vastly different fortunes which befel them? Is it not true that many of us have more resembled Lot than Abraham; and may not our difficulties and disappointments be attributable to a merciful rather than unkind Providence?

Let us pause and think, and, where necessary, amend our practice, and if we do, I have no doubt that ours will yet be a prosperous country, and we a happy and contented people.

Fifty Years Ago.

BY T. B. WHITE, CLARKSBURG, ONT.

"Fifty years since, the sun rose on a different America. Our own Ontario, then a forest, may, in its most cultivable portions, be considered as cleared. In consequence the winds from many points, which formerly blew over the forest, which gave off continual quantities of moisture to the atmosphere, now passes over a soil much drier, even heated, which, instead of giving moisture to the passing breeze, absorbs that which it contains. The result is that those breezes which formerly gave us continual summer showers do so no longer. The rainfall is, perhaps, still in equal volume in Ontario, but not equally well distributed, and our forests to the north obtain a moisture which at an early day fell closer to the lakes. The result is well known. Our harvests are demolished, and our prosperity diminished."

The above is from Introduction to Forest Report, 1886, and the following is from a Globe editorial on "Thanksgiving Day" for 1892: "Old men, looking back on their youth, sigh that things are not as they used to be. We can agree with them, but not in the same sense. They are better than they used to be. No age can compare with this in the wide diffusion of material comforts, or in the prevalence and accessibility of intellectual delights. Take whatever 'Golden' or 'Augustan' age you please, and this will not suffer by comparison."

Whatever faults and delusions the old and illiterate may have respecting the past, present or the future, it is seldom we meet with two opinions more contradictory and positive than the above, and my advice to such friends is that they would do better to be more sure about their own spectacles and not be so ready to attribute all the misconceptions they meet with to those whom we are told can see no farther than the next harvest time.

Those who have read the Report from which this first opinion is taken will know that it labors hard to show that this change for the worse has been brought about by the over-clearing of our forests and consequent change of climate. But is the statement true, either as regards diminished crops or change of climate? I think not, for however extreme a season may be, whether in floods, droughts, frosts or thunderstorms, similar extremes have been before. I have read that Prof. Cleveland Abbe, the founder of our weather bureau system, is of the opinion that there is no noticeable change in the climate since history began. Clearing and draining the land changes the effects of the climate some, and on the whole beneficially to health and agriculture. But, because land dries quicker and some runs of water dry up where they used to run all summer, it does not follow that we have not rain as often and as much as there was fifty years ago. It is to get the water away that we turnpike our roads, ridge up our fields and dig ditches and drains, and not have it standing on and percolating through the land all summer, keeping it cold and sour, and consequently in wet seasons starving out our crops.

But near one hundred fold
Grow each potato will;
If planted where it's not too cold,
And hoed up in a hill.

In 1888, rain fell on more days (133) than was ever recorded at the observatory, Toronto, before. And in the years 1889 and 1890, it seemed to be raining with us most of the time, and we had a greater deficiency these years in crops than we ever had for want of rain. In 1891 we had no rain from seeding to about the first of July, and crops were looking bad, but rain came, and, though sparingly, we had one of our best harvests. In 1892 we had rain from spring to winter, and though crops are not to complain of, it has been with difficulty we could get them or work on the land, so that if the forests to the north of us do obtain a moisture which fell fifty years ago closer to the lakes, we have something to be thankful for.

With respect to droughts: In 1861, grain in this township and Nottawasaga was sown, grown and got in without a shower, when our farms were only about half cleared. On Peace River, at a mission farm, 4 or 5 years ago, they had no rain, and consequently no crops, and that for them means almost starvation, but from a letter I have before me I see the harvest of 1891 was a good one, so that this philosophy about over-clearing the forests changing the climate seems at fault out there.

On the drought of 1813, Thomas Jefferson, in a private letter lately published, says: "From the fork of James river and the falls of other rivers upwards and westerly, we have had the most calamitous year ever seen since 1755, when it never rained from April to November. There was not bread enough to eat, and many died of famine. This year (1813) in these upper regions we have not had a single rain from April 14 to September 20, 5 months, except a slight shower in May. From 500 acres of wheat sowed I have not got 1500 bushels. Our corn has suffered equally. I am told the drought has been equally fatal as far as Kentucky."

The year 1755 was the year General Braddock left Virginia with an army to take a French fort on the upper Ohio, when he was killed and his men routed, and the year 1813 James river was blockaded, and Jefferson had to sell his wheat, raised the year before, for 17 cents per bushel. In those times the sun rose on a different America.

I will have to keep frosts and thunderstorms for next paper.