

to be hoped, whilst stringent measures should be carried out to stamp out the disease, yet a reciprocal trade in cattle should be encouraged between the mother country and Canada.

Proper precautions should be taken by all railways and steamship lines to thoroughly disinfect persons and property coming from them where the Foot and Mouth Disease has appeared. The germs may remain for an indefinite time in cars and ships, only waiting for a subject to become developed into the disease. Herdsmen who have been in contact with diseased animals cannot be too careful, as the disease may be carried in clothing from one herd to the other, and from one place to the other.

#### Our Quarantine at Point Levis.

Confirming our remarks upon the quarantine at Point Levis, in July issue, we have received the following letter from the well known importer of Southdowns, Mr. John Jackson, of Abingdon, Ont.:

DEAR SIR,—I landed here on Saturday last with 68 Southdown sheep in fine, healthy condition, per SS. Hanoverian. The regulations are such that sheep have to be quarantined ten days. The first night they were taken from the ship and turned out without the least shelter, and being a cold wet night, I lost a very valuable one from exposure. There being seven or eight hundred American bound cattle quarantined here, Canadian stock is crowded out to perish, and the officials here say they cannot get the Government to supply the necessary accommodations. Now, Mr. Editor, knowing you are the advocate of the Canadian farmer, I think you will agree with me that it is not right to allow Americans to make use of our quarantine free, at the expense and to the great detriment of Canadian importers. Even the out-door room has more burdocks to the acre than I ever saw on the most mismanaged farm in Ontario.

Point Levis, Aug. 7, 1883.

Our leading importers all complain of this overcrowding, etc. The quarantine now contains the following, owned by Canadian importers: John Isaac, Bowmanston, Ont., 16 Durhams; J. L. Davidson, Balsam, Ont., 9 do.; J. Dryden, M. P. P., Brooklyn, Ont., 4 do.; Thos. Russell, Exeter, 2 do.; A. Johnston, Greenwood, Ont., 3 do.; Geary & Bros., London, 84 Polled Angus; V. E. Fuller, Hamilton, 5 Jerseys; H. Walker, Walkerville, Ont., 22 Jerseys; 11 Shropshire sheep and 5 Berkshire pigs; C. C. Bridges, Shanty Bay, Ont., 9 Herefords; Senator Cochrane, Hillhurst, Compton, P. Q., 107 Galloways; John Jackson, Abingdon, Ont., 68 Southdowns; James Glennie, Guelph, 57 Southdowns and 5 Berkshires; and P. Arkell, Teeswater, Ont., 50 Southdowns and 7 Berkshires. And by American importers as follows: Craig & McCulloch, Chicago, 56 Polled Angus; Jas. Lefel, New York, 5 Herefords; B. B. Lord, Sinclairville, N. Y., 105 Holsteins; Phelps & Sealy, Pontiac, Mich., 61 do.; Cudgel & Simpson, Independence, Miss., 33 Polled Angus; J. J. Hill, St. Paul, Minn., 27 Polled Angus; George Findlay, Lake Forest, Ill., 20 do.; A. Geddes, Chicago, 8 Durhams; J. Stewart, Blackberry, Ill., 19 Ayrshires; and G. W. Cook, Odebloot, Iowa, 306 Herefords; or a total, taking both American and Canadian importations together, of over eleven hundred head, quarantining at one time, of which over 700 head are for American stock farms. It is expected that next year the importations will be doubled.

#### Systematic Farming.

The farm that was awarded the first prize at York, England, by the Royal Agricultural Society, is an illustration of what systematic, intelligent brain farming can do. From the garret to the cellar, from the cow byres to the field, it was *system*. There was cleanliness and order in the cow byres where the milking cows were kept, and the calves' houses were comfortable and airy. Then the arrangements for feeding the stock were complete. Every thing is done by steam—a 7-horse power engine. There is a granary, pulp house, &c., all

being most compactly arranged. A grain grinder fit to make meal stands close by, while on the upper barn floor is a large straw-cutter. The straw is forked up, passed through the cutting box, and then delivered below to mix up with the pulped roots. What a digestible tit-bit the stock have, and what money must be made in this feeding process over giving stock whole turnips and tough hay and straw, as in this country! No wonder Englishmen have nice tender beef, fed like this. The grain is dressed ready for market and can at pleasure be hoisted into an upper story, either to be housed for feeding or stored in the granary ready for market. There is no back-aching work; machinery and system does it all. A good idea is suggested, and one which should be taken hold of by our Ontario farmers, and that is a large covered shed, 36x60, which is used in the fall for storing grain, thus saving the labor of stacking; in the spring it is used for ewes in lamb, and in summer it answers for an implement shed—"Thus made a treble debt to pay." Passing the thoroughbred stock, which are of a high order, the labor question comes up prominently in connection with the Royal Prize Farm, and this is important. The turnips were hoed and thinned by the piece, and only 5 shillings—\$1.25—an acre paid. You could not get that labor performed here for twice that sum per acre, nor three times that sum. Why? Because land like on the prize farm is in such a thorough state of cultivation, and free from weeds, that a laborer can go over three acres of land quicker with a hoe, than over one acre of poorly cultivated, weedy land. This is economy again; cheap labor follows in the wake of systematic farming, and systematic farming means money-making farming.

There is something suggestive all through about this Royal Prize Farm, and the lessons should be of easy application to Ontario farmers, and to the Ontario Government.

Mr. Hutchinson, who occupies the first prize farm, is merely a yearly tenant; the holding belongs to Sir John Lawson, and only consists of 240 acres of land, yet Mr. Hutchinson is *draining* with Government money at 6½ per cent., and on his own responsibility. How many farms in Ontario, and those held by tenants, have been drained by Government money? And how much of that fund is available? And how have municipalities used it? The depth of the drains on this farm and their construction, is another point which may with good grace be brought up for instruction. The *Advocate* has continually urged more thorough drainage of all lands—high or low. The drains in the Royal Prize Farm are 21 feet apart, and 4 feet deep. The land is a hard clay, and is similar to the majority of soils found in western Ontario, especially the northern part of the peninsula. Indeed, part of the farm which obtained the red ticket for the best in England, was, at one time, in a worse condition than many farms in Ontario at the present time; for it is said part of the farm was in wood and grass, and Mr. Hutchinson set to work, cleared out the trees, trenched the ground, and fenced it in. And there is plenty of land in Canada that can be operated on in this way, and which will make equal returns.

Besides drainage, the secret of Mr. Hutchinson's success in farming comes out when it is stated he spends \$3,000 a year on manures besides that which is made by his stock. Just think of a farmer in this country laying out for manure \$3,000 on a 240-acre farm in a year, besides what is made on the farm. But this is the way to make money; feed the land or it won't feed you. Then keep plenty of stock if you want to make manure, and have good stock. All the stock kept on the farm are first-class, and they

have been prize winners, and hence more than an ordinary return has been made from this source.

The management of the Royal Prize Farm in England only illustrates what system and intelligence can do in agriculture. The great secret of Mr. Hutchinson's success in his model farm is nothing more than systematic knowledge in every department of agriculture. A man to be a successful farmer in Ontario, does not want to be a specialist; he wants to take in the whole scope of a mixed husbandry. Then farming pays, and is sure.

The whole success of the efforts of the winner of the Royal Prize Farm may be summed up in a few words:—*System*; a great knowledge of the principles of stock raising and feeding; farming in general; rigid economy, and the proper application of labor-saving machinery. System and intelligence will always win. There is another point of which cognizance should be taken in regard to systematic farming, and that is the social view. The Agricultural and Arts Association of Ontario have offered a prize for "Why young farmers leave the occupation of their fathers to go to cities?" and this body asks for the remedy. This is given in the person who won the first prize at York; for, besides being characterized as an educated farmer, it is said he "is a jolly good neighbor, who enjoys the pleasures of life, rides straight to hounds, knows a hunter as well as any man in England, and as an all-around judge of stock cannot be beaten."

Intelligence, system, and the prospects of enjoying the pleasures of life, as in the case of Mr. Hutchinson, will keep both young men and old men on the farm. If this gentleman is only a tenant on 240 acres of land, and farms and enjoys life like this, what couldn't a man do in this country who owns his farm? Ponder this over.

#### Pasturing the Public Roads.

The Massachusetts Ploughman says:—

"In some of the country towns the practice of pasturing the public roads is altogether too prevalent. There are many reasons why this custom is a bad one, both for the owners of the cattle and for the owners of the land that abuts on the road that is pastured. He who turns his cattle into the street is never quite sure where he shall find them when he wants them; if he was, it would be very difficult to get rid of the feeling that he is trespassing upon the rights of others, in fact that he is doing that which is very irritating to his neighbors, by causing them much trouble to keep their gates shut. If by chance a gate is left open the cattle are sure to discover it, and pass into the garden or orchard, doing more injury in an hour than it would cost to hire a pasture for them two months. If the owner of the land thus trespassed upon chance to be a very good natured man, he will send the cattle home with a gentle reminder that he does not like to have them in his garden; but if he be a man that looks closely after his own interest, even if it breaks friendship, he will yard the cattle, and notify the owner that he can have them after paying all damages; this the law requires him to do, although one who pastures the road is rarely willing to do so. The result is, as a rule, the friendship between the two neighbors is broken, that one of them might get for his cattle a few cents worth of feed which belonged to others."

"The law does not compel any one to keep his gates shut, or in fact to have any fence next to the street; but it does require every one to confine his cattle upon his own land; failing in this, he is liable for all injury they may do to others. In some towns farmers are compelled to keep their cattle out of the public roads. A few towns have passed stringent laws to prevent cattle from feeding on the streets, and also to prevent the sides of the roads from being ornamented with old carts, broken wheels, ploughs and other worn out farm implements. As towns have full power to do this, it would be well if all towns would pass laws restraining all persons from obstructing the road, to the injury of the travelling public and those who reside in the town."

We can fully endorse the above. Not only are stock a nuisance on public highways, but often