

London (Eng.) Letter.

The Board of Trade figures for the complete year, ended 31st December, which were issued a week ago, are as usual a source of useful information. From them we learn that out of a grand total of \$47,215,095 worth of live stock imported, Canada contributed \$16,670,933, or 36.51%, practically double the amount of the 1902 returns. In fact, with the exception of butter and oats, there have been substantial increases in the volume of Canadian imports, which, I hope, and have reason to believe, will be still greater this year.

In the valuation of the cattle for these returns it is interesting to note that while those from the United States are valued at \$2.50 per head more than Canadian, in the market quotations the difference works out on an average 90 stone bullock (720 lbs.), at from \$3.75 to \$7.50.

When the Canadian shipper makes up his mind to send forward only the best finished beasts in carefully graded bunches, he will find that all the markets on this side are good. The only preference that is known here is a very decided one, and that for the best wherever it comes from. Unfortunately, our markets are flooded daily with "secondary" meat from all parts of the globe, which in many cases barely realizes enough to pay expenses. The American exporters long ago grasped the salient points of the market tendencies, and are, as a rule, sending us the best they can buy, knowing that the competition for their choicest lots will be on the buyer's side, while plain lots go begging.

As regards the difference in the shipments from the two countries, and they are many, Canadian shipments as a rule are made up of all sorts and conditions, while the American lots are carefully classed in bunches of equality, breed, age, condition and weight, all being taken into account. This being so, it is not difficult to account for the big difference in values.

The same rule holds good in the dressed meat department, the best always commands the market. In the meantime, there is NO ROOM FOR ANY MORE FRESH MEAT COMPETITORS in our markets. The great Chicago firms—Swifts, Morris, Cudahy, and S. & S.—rule the roost. Armour's are represented here, it is true, but they are making no headway, and if they are being squeezed out of it, Canadian enterprise would want a lot of patience and perseverance not to mention the almighty dollar side of the question to gain a foothold.

Among the many reforms to be brought about, I am pleased to see that an effort is being made to have the country of origin declared for our import statistics. At present there is great confusion, owing to the fact that goods are credited to the country according to the port from which they are shipped; thus Canadian cattle reaching us via Portland and Boston are included in the United States returns.

The Colonial Products Exhibition at Liverpool was, as regards Canada, rather disappointing, the colonies principally represented being the West Indies and South Africa. This might have been expected, as Sir Alfred L. Jones, the organizer of the affair, is more intimately associated with them. Nevertheless, the exhibition was so successful that it is proposed to make it an annual one. St. George's Hall at Liverpool, while being a building of considerable size, is not large enough for holding a large combined Colonial Exhibition, and while advocating the holding of such exhibitions, I would suggest that Canada take the initiative of having "one of her own."

Last week's Canadian contribution to the great London improvements was the opening of the splendid new offices of the C.P.R. Railway in Trafalgar Square by Lord Strathcona. As usual with every thing this company undertakes on this side, they are fitted up in a most attractive and luxurious style.

The omission of a meat trades' representative on the Chamberlain Tariff Commission, mentioned in my last letter, has been rectified by the invitation and acceptance of a place thereon by Mr. William Cooper, a prominent salesman in the Central Meat Markets.

Canadian bacon is still in great demand, and prices have gone up appreciably during the week, but only for the leanest light weights. In this department fat selections have gone out of favor, and it is difficult to find purchasers, whilst the lean descriptions are always wanted. The latest official quotations are 11½c. for bacon averaging 40 lbs. to 50 lbs., best and leanest selections.

This week the business done in Canadian cheese has been somewhat limited, but this was only to be expected from the extensive trade which took place the previous week. Prices are well maintained, and show no sign of weakening. Some of the best white and colored varieties were sold at 11½c., but the majority of transactions were on 11c. basis.

The butter market, as far as the imported article is concerned, has shown a decided falling off lately, both as regards prices and supplies. "Colonial" butter, the name by which Aus-

tralian produce is known here, has taken a decided lead in the London market, and owing to its abundance and handy price, is now becoming an article of everyday consumption, where but a short time ago it was looked upon with suspicion, which usually greets anything "new" in this country.

The trade in the central meat markets has been very slow, hundreds of tons of inferior and stale meat being shown daily, for which there is no demand.

At Deptford business has not been very brisk, but prices have not dropped, as the even quality of the stock coming to hand is well maintained. The latest prices quoted for cattle there being 11½c. to 12c.

Jan. 16th, 1904.

Scottish Feeders Want Canadian Cattle.

Lawton, Coupar-Angus, Scotland,
December 24th, 1903.

To the Editor "Farmer's Advocate":

Sir,—I have just been favored with a report of a farmers' meeting, in Guelph, during the Winter Fair, at which some remarks were made on the British "embargo" against Canadian cattle by "Colonel Ferguson, of Pictstonhill, Scotland," whom we all know and greatly esteem here, as Mr. William S. Ferguson, tenant of the farm of Pictstonhill, whose presence at convivial meetings is indispensable, and had our friend reserved his wholly irresponsible bombastic utterances on the embargo for an audience acquainted with the circumstances, it would have called for no comment, but, to prevent misunderstanding in Canada, I should like, with your kind permission, to offer some explanations.

It is absolutely not the case to say that three-fourths of the people directly interested in live stock in Great Britain are opposed to the free import of Canadian cattle, and even if they were, their only reason for this opposition would be to exclude competition from Canada by subterfuge, and they would form a ridiculous minority of the whole electorate who decide the Fiscal Policy of this country to be "Free Trade." It is perfectly certain that the Embargo Act would never have been passed but for the evidence of the existence of disease among Canadian cattle—pleuropneumonia, to wit—brought before Parliament by the Board of Agriculture—evidence which time and events have now proved to be utterly erroneous. Under these circumstances, the continuance of the Embargo Act is in the same sense a crime, as would be the continued imprisonment of a person who had been found guilty by a jury, on evidence afterwards proved false.

Now, I notice, the "Colonel" said he would neither "give the reason, nor his own opinion," why the embargo should be maintained. "Raise your own corn, and feed your own cattle," he says. "That is what 'we' (Who are we?) are trying to impress on the British farmer," and doubtless he would expect Canadians to take this lying down. But I greatly mistake if Canadian, any more than British, farmers will accept an unreasoned order, even from a "Colonel" arrogantly using the "we" of authority.

Before me I have a report of a speech delivered by Mr. Ferguson at a meeting of the Scottish Chamber of Agriculture, in 1901, when, in seconding an amendment in opposition to a motion calling for the removal of the "embargo," he said: "Remember that you are not asking for the introduction of Canadian cattle only. If you ever get a measure to introduce cattle, it means foreign cattle. It is impossible to restrict the operation to Canadian cattle." Also, "What security have we that there is no disease in Canada? You speak at large, because you do not know. Some of 'us' have been across the great undefined frontiers of thousands of miles. We have seen the cattle roaming backwards and forwards between Canada and the States."

Well now, his first reason has vanished like last winter's snow. Canadian cattle can easily be given freedom of entry to Great Britain by a simple amending bill, exempting Canada from the operations of the 1896 Act, without consulting Germany or any foreign nation; while the second, and sole other reason, is—in view of all the facts—nothing better than a suggested slander, and the "Colonel" showed greater discretion than valor in refraining from repeating it to his Canadian audience.

Dr. J. G. Rutherford, Dominion Veterinarian, surprises me much in making, at this same meeting, the following statement: "When Scotchmen talk about the injustice done to Canada, it is not sympathy for us so much as their desire to make a few extra shillings for themselves, and it would be a sound, sensible policy for us to finish our product, and take the profit the Scotchmen want to get."

Well, sir, in the first statement, Dr. Rutherford—unwittingly, I am sure—does us "real" injustice, and I send herewith a proof copy report of the Scottish Chamber of Agriculture meeting this autumn, when the snatched decision of 1901—in favor of continuing the embargo—was reversed by an overwhelming majority in support of its removal, and you will see in this report that the mover of the amendment against the motion for raising the embargo said: "I think the arguments of both Mr. Gray and Mr. Henderson (the mover and seconder of the successful motion) are more in favor of the Colonial than in favor of the feeder of the cattle in Scotland, and my opinion is that we should not look

so much to Canada. Canada will look after herself, to all appearance, and let us look after ourselves." Now, it is hard to be blamed both ways, and I should just like to say to Dr. Rutherford, that the advantages accruing from the removal of the embargo would be mutual. So far as I see, Canada would not reap less than an equal share. And suppose the embargo were removed to-morrow, that would not prevent Canadians from adopting Dr. Rutherford's policy of "finishing their own product," nor would it give to Scotchmen any power to dictate in what shape their cattle should be exported, but it would give Canadian farmers freedom to sell their cattle whenever they could get the best price for them "in an open market" in Scotland and England.

Since the embargo "was" put on, Canadian cattle have only had one landing port in Scotland—Glasgow—and a few ports in England, at which slaughter is compulsory within ten days, thus confining their purchase entirely to the butchers in the vicinity of these ports; whereas, before the embargo, there was absolute freedom of market, with unrestricted competition from all—butchers, farmers, etc.

Sir, I venture to agree with a view of the Globe, Toronto, recently expressed in an article referring to our meeting in October with Lord Onslow, the present Minister of Agriculture—a view quoted by the press here—namely, "That the removal of the embargo was, at least, as important to Canada as any preferential duty of grain which Britain was likely to concede."

Indeed, it is difficult to fully realize what an increase in the value of your cattle—in any shape, fat or store—would result from the raising of the embargo. Many a time, large cargoes from Canada, the States, or may be the Argentine, simultaneously arriving, with only ten days for slaughter, cause excessive and wasteful depressions, from which your trade suffers. By all accounts, this has been a very unprofitable season for your traders here, and a report, just to hand from Montreal, shows that \$200,000 has been lost on 30,000 ranch cattle, some cargoes of which barely paid the freight charges.

In conclusion, I would direct your attention to the Statistical Yearbook for 1902, issued by the Dominion Department of Agriculture. It is there shown that nearly 70,000 cattle a year have been exported to the United States, valued at from \$14 to \$24.75 a head, in face of a "duty" ranging from 27.4% on fat cattle, to \$3.75 and \$2 on stores; while, before the embargo, only a few hundred a year crossed the frontier. Now, I think those cattle would have brought \$10 to \$15 a head more "in an open market" here, over and above the cost of freight, etc.

These statistics further show that the value of your cattle coming here since the passing of the Embargo Act, in 1896, has been \$10 to \$15 a head less than before, and that, "notwithstanding they now come as fat, instead of mixed fat and store animals."

Why, sir, in 1890, when we had open ports, Canada sent us about 67,000 cattle, valued at about \$6,566,000; in 1897, when we had restricted ports, she sent us 120,000 cattle, the value of which is given as \$6,454,000, and these latter were all exported as fat.

Everything goes to show that \$10 to \$15 a head is a reasonable estimate of the increase in the value of your total cattle export that would take place as a result of the removal of the "British Embargo," while we, too, would be great gainers.

Apologising for so trespassing on your space,

Yours faithfully,

WM. HENDERSON,

(Member of the Executive Committee of Canadian Cattle Importation Association.)

Lawton, Coupar-Angus, Scotland, Dec. 24th, 1903.

Knowledge Needed.

A few bits of knowledge which the thoroughly successful farmer requires:

- (1) Botany enough to enable him to recognize weed enemies, and understand the nature of his crops.
- (2) Geology enough to know different kinds of soil.
- (3) Entomology enough to know which insects are pests and which are friends.
- (4) Ornithology enough to know which of the birds are injurious and which helpful.
- (5) Forestry enough to know how to preserve, extend and harvest his bush lands.
- (6) Horticulture enough to know how to manage his fruit and vegetable gardens.
- (7) Veterinary science enough to understand his horses and cattle and their ailments.
- (8) Mastery of the principles of stock-raising.
- (9) Practical ability and push enough to enable him to apply his knowledge of all these things in actual work.

In addition, he must be a carpenter at times; he must know how to mend harness, file saws, sharpen axes, and care for machinery. He must possess public spirit and manliness enough to make him a valuable member of his community; domesticity enough to make him the indispensable center of his home; common-sense and business methods enough to enable him to guide wisely all the ends of a complicated business. Yet some people, who don't know any better, think any ignoramus can be a farmer!