

into the professions and more aesthetic callings in life, from which many of them will come forth much poorer than when they entered. True, to farm successfully, as well as to make any other calling a success, means hard work, but to say that farming means all work and nothing better is to say something that is as far from the truth as day is from night. In conversation with a gentleman the other day, who was once a successful business man, and is now managing a large farm in Western Ontario, he stated that farming furnished a wider field for thought and for active brain work than any other line of life, and we believe that this is true. Where will one find a wider and more pleasant field for research and investigation than on the farm in studying the qualities of the various soils, the kinds of grain to grow upon these different soils, how plants grow and feed upon the soil, why sunshine and rain are necessary for the growth of plants, the best methods of feeding stock, how to conduct the dairy, and a hundred and one other things we might mention?

One may well ask why these grand features connected with agriculture have not been instilled into the young men of the country before this. It is because they have not formed part of the early training of the child. Until we have on the curriculum of our public schools a course of study that will create in the young mind a love for the farm and the farmer's calling, and will set clearly before the pupil the advantages to be derived from engaging in agricultural pursuits, this tendency to crowd the professions will not be successfully overcome. We must begin at the beginning. Nothing much can be done after the early training of the young man has been in another direction. The farmers themselves can assist in this matter much more than they are aware of. If every farmer would give up looking upon his calling in a sort of apologetic way, and instead of saying, "I am only a farmer," would say, "I am proud to be a farmer," many young men would look upon the farm in a different light. Every young man worth a snap of your finger is ambitious, and if he feels, and those already engaged in farming lead him to feel, that, in becoming a farmer he is entering upon a lower scale in life, he is likely to seek some other calling. Farming, both intellectually and socially, should be and is equal to any other calling. Then why should the farmer belittle his own calling and put a "stumbling block" in the way of the best young men in the country from entering it?

Building a Silo.

It seems hardly necessary, in these days, to say much in vindication of silo-building, so conclusively has it been proven by the best authorities that the silo is the most economical and best method of preserving green fodders for winter's feeding. Yet we frequently hear of farmers who are opposed to the silo, and who claim that ensilage is not a suitable food for stock. They, as a rule, can give no valid reason for this contention, inasmuch as they have never tested the silo for themselves. Every farmer who has tried preserving corn in a silo, and given it a fair chance, is well satisfied with the results. No dairy farmer should be without one, and especially if he milks cows during the winter months, and we might go further and say that no farmer who can grow corn successfully can afford to be without a silo.

A silo can be built as cheaply, if not more cheaply than any other building of the same intrinsic value in connection with a farm equipment. The majority of silos are built of pine or hemlock lumber, though many farmers are now building silos of cement, especially when built square, as it is claimed that a square silo built of wood decays easily. A square wooden silo will last about seven or eight years, when it usually has to be relined. At the Ontario Agricultural College a square silo built eight or nine years ago is being replaced this summer by one built of cement. Mr. Rennie, the farm superintendent, says that the life of a square wooden silo is about seven years.

All things considered, it may be economy to build a cement silo, though the cost is considerably greater than when built of wood. A cement silo, properly built, should last for ages. A square silo built of wood will cost, on an average, from 75 cents to \$1 per cubic foot capacity. A cement silo will probably cost about two and one-half times these figures. The round stave silo is cheaper than either of these, and can, perhaps, be built with the least amount of trouble.

The size of the silo a farmer should have depends largely upon the number of stock he keeps. One having a capacity of from 150 to 200 tons would be about right for the average farm. A cubic foot of ensilage in a silo thirty feet deep will average about forty pounds in weight. Knowing this it will be easy to estimate upon the capacity of any silo desired. The following table and example from *Hoard's Dairyman* gives the average weight per cubic foot of well-matured corn ensilage, at different depths, after settling two days, and the average for the entire depth:

Average for	lbs.	Average for total depth, lbs.
First 5 feet.....	22.0	22.0
Second 5 feet.....	30.0	26.1
Third 5 feet.....	39.3	29.8
Fourth 5 feet.....	43.8	33.3
Fifth 5 feet.....	49.5	36.5
Sixth 5 feet.....	54.5	39.6

Find the number of square feet in the bottom of the silo, multiply this by depth of silage and the product will be the total cubic feet of silage. For instance, if a silo is 12x15 feet inside measurement, and 20 feet deep, it will have 3,600 cubic feet, and, when well filled with mature corn, the average weight, per cubic foot, will be 33.3 lbs., or 120,000 lbs. (60 tons) for the whole. The lower layer of five feet in depth will be nearly 20 tons, the one above is about 12 1/2 tons, and in this proportion for other depths.

The above table does not apply to round silos. In *FARMING* for September, 1896, page 42, an excellent description of a round silo is given by Mr. Joseph E. Gould, Uxbridge, Ont. According to his description a 60 ton, round, stave silo can be built for \$40 to \$60, depending upon the price of the lumber in the locality. Mr. Gould's large silo, holding 140 tons, cost about \$75. The important point to be considered in building a stave silo is to secure as much depth as possible. The planks should be two inches thick and any width up to ten inches. The following table shows the capacity in tons of round silos of various sizes:

Diameter of silo in feet.	Depth of silo.			
	20 feet.	22 feet.	25 feet.	30 feet.
10	31 tons.	34 tons.	40 tons.	47 tons.
12	45 "	49 "	56 "	65 "
14	63 "	68 "	77 "	90 "
16	80 "	90 "	105 "	130 "
18	100 "	110 "	125 "	150 "
20	125 "	135 "	155 "	185 "
22	145 "	160 "	180 "	215 "

A Tribute to Mr. Dryden.

A representative deputation, consisting of Messrs. John I. Hobson, President Dominion Cattle Breeders' Association, G. W. Clemons, Secretary of the Holstein-Friesian Association; George Gunn, President Dominion Swine Breeders' Association; D. G. Hammer, President Dominion Sheep Breeders' Association; J. E. Brethour, Burford; James Tolton Walkerton; Major Sheppard, Grimshy; R. C. Steele, Steele Briggs Co.; J. M. Shuttleworth, manager Bow Park Farm; Wm. Davies, of the Davies' Packing Co.; Alderman Hallam, Toronto; John Kelly, Shakespeare; Wm. Laidlaw, and James Anderson, Guelph, and one or two others, waited upon the Premier of Ontario on June 7th, and asked that in the interests of agriculture in this province the services of the Hon. John Dryden be retained as Minister in charge of that department. The deputation presented a petition signed by fully two thousand of the leading horse, cattle, sheep, and swine breeders of the province, the leading poultrymen and fruit-growers, and other prominent agriculturists, setting forth the splendid services Mr.

Dryden has rendered to agriculture in Ontario, and requesting that the Government make a special effort to induce him to remain in office.

The members of the deputation and the petitioners belonged to both political parties, and, therefore, nothing of a partizan nature could be ascribed to their action. It was merely a focusing of the general approval of Mr. Dryden's services to agriculture which exists in the country, and giving expression to the strong desire of those who know the value of his work, that his services should not be lost to the province at this juncture. A few weeks ago we gave expression to our views regarding the retention of Mr. Dryden as Minister of Agriculture, and there is no need of further endorsement on our part other than that we hope the mission of the deputation will be fulfilled, and that his services will be secured to this province for many years to come.

Excessive Freight Rates and the Export Cattle Trade.

In a recent issue of *The Weekly Sun*, Mr. G. S. MacDonald, a railway freight expert of Montreal, gives the following valuable table of comparisons regarding the freight charges on cattle shipped from Argentina, the United States, and Canada:

Distance (Miles).	Time (Days).	Transport Charges.	Sale Price in Britain.	Producers' Profit or Loss.	Shippers' Profit or Loss.
Canada.....	3825	\$22.00	\$22.35	-\$35.75	-\$1.40
United States.....	456	\$8.50	77.94	40.00	56
The Platte.....	7200	14.00	68.90	30.00	2.00

Estimated Difference for 1897 between Canada, United States, and the Platte (Uruguay and Argentina), in prices of production, transport and sale of cattle, per head of 1300 lbs. exported to Great Britain.

* Harbor fees, feed, insurance, and selling commission included.

** The figures under this head refer to net weight, which is 53 per cent. of the gross weight of Canadian and Platte cattle and 54 1/2 of United States cattle. The average prices taken are \$10.50, \$11, and \$10 per 1300 lbs. n. for Canadian, United States and Platte animals respectively.

The fact that the freight rates from Canada to Great Britain are \$6.00 more per head than from the United States will be a surprise to many cattle breeders and feeders. There is no reason whatsoever why this difference should be made. If the distance travelled is taken into account the shipper in the United States should pay a higher rate than the Canadian shipper. But the Canadian shipper is not so highly favored by the railways and steamships and, instead of paying a lower rate, he pays a much higher rate, and does not get as much for his cattle. As compared with Argentina the Canadian shipper pays only \$6.00 less per head than the shipper of the La Platte, while the time of transit is twice as great from the latter country. If we take the figures given in the table we find that the cost per mile for the Canadian shipper is nearly three-quarter cents; for the American shipper less than one-half cent, and for the Argentine shipper a little over two-fifth cents per mile. This unfair condition of things should not exist, and our export cattle trade will never be placed upon a proper footing till some radical remedy is applied.

Another discouraging feature shown by the table is the amount of losses sustained by the Canadian shipper as compared with the shipper from South America. While the latter makes a profit of \$2.90 per head, the former loses \$1.40 per head. Last year may, however, be only the exception; but