

EDITORIAL.

Royal First-Prize Winners.

We give the place of honor in this issue to portraits of what are accounted, in Great Britain, to be about as near present-day typical specimens of the breeds represented as the foremost stock-breeding countries in the world can furnish.

At the upper right-hand corner stands the yearling Shorthorn bull, Count Victor, winner of the first prize at the Royal, Darlington, in a strong class of twenty-five competitors. He was bred and shown by J. Dean Willis, of Bapton Manor, Codford, Wilts., England. He was calved 20th January, 1894. He is a massive roan, a son of the famous Count Lavender, and out of a Sittyton Gondolier cow. An authority speaks of him as being "one of the most remarkable yearlings seen for many years, his substance, scale, and wealth of cover being unique." He is remarkably good in his fore end, shows a great fore-arm, well-filled girth, and beautifully-arched rib, while he is especially good over his quarter, and has a rare coat. We understand he has been purchased to go to South America.

At the lower left-hand corner is seen a good representation of the three-year-old Shorthorn heifer, Miranda, calved 24th August, 1892. She was the Champion Shorthorn cow at the Royal, Darlington. She is also bred and is owned by J. Deane Willis. She is by Count Lavender, the present stock bull at Windsor. She is out of Missie CXXV., an Upper-mill cow. Her depth, width, substance and scale commanded much admiration. Extra fitting is showing itself, however, as she is becoming a shade uneven in flesh.

The two-year-old Ayrshire bull, First Choice of Southwick (3005), occupies the top left-hand corner. He was calved 1st March, 1893. He was bred by Sir Mark J. Stewart, Bart., of Southwick, who won first with him at the Royal, Darlington, and third at the Highland, Dumfries. He is a fine, level bull, bearing many good dairy points. His position of third place at the Highland was due to lack of size, and not from inferior quality.

The representation in the right-hand bottom corner is that of the Polled Angus cow, Legend (16518), calved 20th January, 1890. She was bred and exhibited by George Smith Grant, Anchorachan, Glenlivet. She was the champion Aberdeen-Angus female at the Royal, Darlington. She won the Ballindaloch cup last year, when she looked better than when shown this year, as she was due to calve in a few days after the latter occasion. The engraving itself is a reproduction from a special engraving issued by the Scottish Farmer.

The British Embargo on Canadian Cattle.

Mention was made in the August 15th *ADVOCATE* of the alleged discovery of pleuro-pneumonia, on July 10th, in one or two Canadian cattle landed at Deptford, Eng. It appears to have been an opportune "discovery," because, in the British House of Commons, since the new Minister of Agriculture, Hon. Mr. Long, stated that in consequence the Government must maintain the embargo. There is reported to have been no opportunity afforded Canadian representatives to examine the lung or lungs in question; but the report serves the purpose of those who desire to sustain the protective restriction just as fresh efforts for its removal were about to be made. As in the other isolated cases reported during the past few years, and upon which the Home Government based its action, certain lung conditions may have been found, bearing, as some of their own experts put it, a "closer resemblance," or "identical in morbid anatomy," with contagious pleuro-pneumonia, but nothing more. The employes of the British Board of Agriculture are very ready to see anything resembling what they are looking for. Meanwhile, Canada suffers, the victim of the reports of these experts who detect appearances which, on the admission of other experts, might be accounted for by exposure to cold in transit, or, possibly, like the "marbled appearances" on which so much stress used to be laid, resulting in one instance from the embedding of a small portion of rose bush, with prickles attached, in the lung, having been inhaled, and working its way down the bronchial tubes.

It is said a suggestion, for it amounted to no more, came from the Home authorities that the Canadian Government should follow up and "kill out" the herds and contact animals from which these alleged cases came: but was there any assurance that even that course would have satisfied the English authorities? None whatever that we ever heard of. The herds were traced out carefully, but absolutely no excuse presented itself to our authorities that

warranted them in embarking in a campaign of slaughter. Besides this, the British Minister had no end of "suggestions" to fall back upon, such as the adoption of a different system of marking export cattle, etc.

Does anybody suppose that so deadly and contagious a disease could be hid in a corner all these years, nobody knowing anything about it! To the ordinary lay mind the idea is preposterous, and the British cattle breeders, whose herds have been more than once ravaged and destroyed by it, know this very well. We have had no such outbreaks, because the disease was not here, hence the "additional information" repeatedly asked for about "the disease" by the Home authorities could not be given.

Fortunately for Canada, the shipment from the Old Country of diseased or suspected cattle for Clark & Norris, Col. Blair, Andrew Allen, Thomas McCrae, and others, landed at Levis, P.Q., in 1888, were exterminated to the last vestige within the quarantine walls by slaughtering and burning.

Better evidence than that asked for by the British Board of Agriculture was afforded by the examination of no less than 3,085 sets of lungs last November at different abattoirs throughout Canada, when no case or trace of the disease was found.

The loss to Canada through the embargo has been variously put at from \$10 to \$15 per head, through the cattle being necessarily slaughtered within ten days after landing, and being confined to a very limited — not always remunerative — market.

We most strenuously object to the embargo because it is a standing notice to other countries, such as France, Germany, and Belgium, that it is dangerous to import our cattle and give them the freedom of the country. It is no justification for a standing slander of this sort to say that the character of our beefs going forward has been improving and that it is better for our farmers to finish the cattle here and perhaps develop a profitable dressed beef trade.

Now, what of the future? Reasonable efforts have been made to convince the British authorities, and anyone willing to be convinced, that this contagious plague does not exist in Canada, though still further efforts in that direction might be made.

1st. The test of last November, referred to above, is to be repeated this fall upon even a more extensive and systematic scale, we are informed.

2nd. We understand that in October a shipment of probably a thousand head of cattle will go to Belgium, and all being found satisfactory upon examination by their experts there, our cattle will have unhindered access to their markets during October, November and December, under the ordinary inspection as a preliminary to the entire removal of the restrictions from the opening of 1896. In the event of such a shipment, would it not be well, as a precautionary measure, that we should be officially represented by a properly-qualified person accompanying it from start to finish? Our interests would, in a measure, be guarded and an official report would be available.

3rd. The Canadian Government has more than once extended an invitation to the British authorities to send veterinary experts of their own choosing, at our expense, to Canada, to examine our herds in every part of the country, and examine the working of the quarantine regulations. In the British House of Commons on Aug. 22, however, Hon. Mr. Long intimated that that would be of no use (to him), so that it is idle to press the invitation — beyond it being a challenge to them that we do not fear scrutiny and publicity.

4th. Now, since the British Minister rests his action solely on the report of his experts, as he told the House on the same occasion, our authorities should insist upon the right of representation and equal access to all these alleged cases, along with the British experts, with power to make pathological examinations, etc. Of the necessity for this we are more than ever convinced since Mr. Long's last speech in the House. He refused to have any special experiments made regarding the last case, and also refused the request of the member for Forfarshire (Mr. White) to lay the brief official report on the two cases before the House.

With a brand new Minister of Agriculture and a Colonial Secretary proposing a new and progressive policy in relation to the outlying portions of the Empire, something at least on a par with the course of Belgium — a foreign power — might be expected, otherwise it will inevitably revive the question of whether, in the maintenance of our elaborate quarantine system in its present iron-clad form, the game is worth the candle; though to discuss the merits or demerits of that does not fall within the scope of this article. Some of our great transportation companies (and others as well) would no doubt welcome a letting-down of bars that would very largely increase their business, though it might not have a stimulating effect on trade with Great Britain.

It may be idle to remind English officialdom that some such perversity once upon a time resulted in a certain "Boston Tea Party" and the loss of half a continent: but right on the surface of Mr. Long's declarations lies one lesson, viz., that while the Britisher is for Colonial Empire and Imperialism, he looks to his own interests first, and we do well to govern ourselves accordingly.

A Meeting of Agricultural Scientists.

BY PROF. J. HOYES PANTON.

Having had the pleasure of attending the late convention of the Association of Agricultural Colleges and Experiment Stations, at Denver, Colorado, I have thought it might be of interest to some of your readers to know what was done. Notwithstanding the somewhat distant place of meeting, over one hundred delegates were present. The Association consists of five sections:—

1. Agriculture and Chemistry.
2. Botany and Horticulture.
3. Entomology.
4. Mechanical Arts and Engineering.
5. Agricultural Colleges.

The forenoon and evening sessions were general, but the afternoon was occupied by meetings of the various sections, in which matters pertaining to each section were discussed, and from the papers discussed were selected those to be read before the general session. The discussions this year related largely to the course in agricultural colleges, and the connection that exists between colleges and experiment stations.

Director True, of the Agricultural Department, Washington, read a very able and exhaustive paper on the origin and development of experiment stations in the United States since their establishment, and closed by making the following suggestions:—

1. A well-defined line between experiment stations and agricultural colleges, as regards the work to be accomplished by each.
2. Permanency of the staff in stations.
3. Keeping accurate records of the work done.

This address was referred to a committee, that afterwards recommended its suggestions to be adopted.

Immediately, a most spirited debate followed, on the first recommendation, showing that the "shoe pinched somewhere"; in other words, there seemed to be an idea prevailing that some colleges were using the funds for other than strictly experimental work. In fact, it was well-known that in some, the president is the director of the experiment station, and that many teaching professors are the investigators. With some, it is a question to what extent a teacher of science is likely to make a good investigator in such work as the stations require, and vice versa. One man may do both, but some are inclined to think, an investigator should have his whole time and thought occupied in his work, and not a large proportion of it in teaching.

The result of the discussion was that suggestion 1 was laid on the table, and 2 and 3 passed without a dissenting voice. Much discussion took place upon agricultural college work. Among many of the colleges there is a strong desire to extend the course beyond four years, and to raise the standard necessary to attain a degree, and to abolish labor from the course, except as far as it can be strictly termed educational.

There is a decided feeling against compulsory labor, which seems to have only one redeeming feature, viz., educational. In the discussion they seemed to forget that there are other factors that should be considered in connection with labor, such as: (1) A means of physical exercise; (2) a source of financial aid to the student; (3) to keep the student in touch with the work of the farm, and to have a tendency to dignify labor; (4) it serves daily to illustrate many of the principles taught in the classroom.

The moment manual labor is withdrawn from the course at an agricultural college there will be a strong tendency to drift from the work of the farm. Michigan College is one of the few that still stand by the principle of compulsory labor. The abolition of compulsory labor indicates that the agricultural colleges of the United States are doomed, as colleges to train a young man for the farm, and will soon seek a new name, feeling that the present title is a misnomer. In fact, some now claim that they are educational institutions, by which a student gets an education by means of knowledge derived from the teachings of *nature*, rather than that from the teachings of *classics*, and *literature* in general. One is astonished at the few graduates turned out in some of the American agricultural colleges; in some cases only one, and in many very few, when you consider the amount expended on the work. There is a lesson here for Ontario, to never lose sight of the true object for which the College was established, viz., to give a young man an education which will fit him for his life work upon the farm, and to take a greater interest in work that will illustrate the teaching he received at college, thus emphasizing the *Why* for his work, as well as the *How*.

The result of the discussions relating to agricultural colleges was that a committee was appointed to collect data during the coming year, from home and foreign colleges, regarding the whole work of agricultural colleges, hoping from this to be able to formulate some scheme so as to reach a more uniform standard of entrance; to follow a more uniform course, and, finally, to adopt a higher standard for a degree.

It is quite evident that the colleges are drifting into a confused condition by attempting to fit young men and women not only for the farm, but also for the counting-house, schoolroom and machine shop.

Concerning dairying little was brought out in general discussion. However, one good point came up in reference to the adoption of a uniform factor