

them through the press, imparting fresh ideas to workers, getting out reports for distribution, which, by means of advertising, can be made to pay for themselves, and at the end of the main series of meetings conducting a general "round up," where all the principal addresses are again delivered and discussed, and the needs of the work carefully considered while everything is fresh in mind.

I notice that the members of the Central Institute promptly squelched the motion to reduce their numbers, but it is quite evident that, as at present constituted and conducted, it is becoming a very expensive concern, the utility of which in relation to the local institute system is anything but satisfactory.

W. THOMPSON, Derwent, Ont.

[In Globe, Toronto, under date of March 26th.]

A Reply to Mr. Rutledge.

To the Editor of the FARMER'S ADVOCATE:

In the FARMER'S ADVOCATE of Feb. 15th, I read an article from the pen of Mr. C. Rutledge re the farmers' institutes. Now, sir, I consider the reflections thrown on those worthy institutions are very unfair and unmerited. So far as the monied assistance goes, given by the Government, what class of people has a better claim to such assistance than the agriculturists, who have more money at stake in real estate than any other class in existence, and contribute more largely toward the government funds? As for the members of farmers' institutes becoming uninterested in the work of the institution, the official reports of those gentlemen who supervise the work go to prove that, on the contrary, the institute meetings are becoming more interesting every year. Mr. Rutledge also refers to the bulletins and other literature, without stint, which the Department of Agriculture has so lavishly bestowed upon the members of institutes "free of charge." Now, sir, I would like some explanation as to how this literature is procured. Are not those bulletins the results of experiments carried on at the experimental farms and stations, and supervised by officials paid by the government, said bulletins and reports prepared by the Department of Agriculture at government expense? If so, how are they supplied to us free of cost? On the other hand, I claim that the farmers are paying value for all the privileges they enjoy, and that not only should the members of institutes receive the reports of the various experiments and discoveries in agricultural science, but they should be sent to every agriculturist in the province, thereby diffusing that information for which they have paid, especially so when it is without "cost or hindrance."

Again, he contends that these good things are appreciated only to a limited extent, forming his opinion from the attendance at and interest taken in the meetings held at Drumbo, Freelon and Milton. I think a good deal of those features are dependent on the intelligence of the community where those meetings are held, and of the officers who have the management of them. The same deputation to which he refers addressed the open meetings of West Wellington, at Drayton and Arthur, at which meetings they had the pleasure of addressing large and deeply-interested audiences, the members of which entered heartily into the discussion of the various subjects. At the night meetings the large town hall was packed to its fullest capacity, when a lengthy and interesting programme was rendered by the local talent, sandwiched with pithy addresses from the deputation. The success of these meetings is largely due to the zeal and enterprise of the officers who are elected to the management. When an institute has for its secretary a man of such acknowledged ability as to be placed in the highest and most honorable position attainable in connection with the institutes of the province, viz., President of the P. C. F. L., it is bound to succeed, and West Wellington should feel proud of being thus represented. If Mr. Rutledge would encourage the farmer in institute work, don't write in such disparaging tones, but try to elevate our calling and enlighten others by showing up the brighter side of agricultural advancement. As to the line of procedure followed by the people of Wisconsin for pushing the institute work, that doesn't go to prove that they are making greater advances in agriculture than the people of Ontario. On the contrary, with all their extra efforts in that direction, it was fully demonstrated at the Columbian Exposition that, compared with Ontario, the United States, in respect to their exhibits (which are a fair index to their education, facilities, resources and enterprise), sank into utter insignificance. Therefore, I fail to see how their money is better spent than ours—results fail to show it so. A good agricultural paper is a leading factor in the make-up of a farmer's helps. The FARMER'S ADVOCATE is unexcelled, and has many claims to the general patronage of the farmers, in whose interests it has always manifested great concern. Hoping this short letter may find room in its columns, I wish it continued success, always hailing it as a welcome visitor at our hearth.

Drayton, Ont.

G. L. PAGE.

The Agricultural Awakening.

There is no more significant movement to-day than the arousal and consolidation of agricultural interests and the weakening grip of old-time political partyism. Nor is this confined to Canada and the United States, where the Patrons of Industry, the Farmers' Alliance, the Grangers, and kindred organizations, have made such remarkable strides. Though not always permanent as organizations, once specific objects are attained their indirect influence is powerful and lasting. The propaganda of the National Agricultural Union of England appears to be gathering strength and a host of friends. It is an effort to unite as one force agricultural landlords, tenants and laborers. One of its most active promoters is the Earl of Winchelsea, whose aggressive little paper, The Cable, gives the Union programme, which members of parliament and candidates are asked to support, as follows:

First—To relieve agricultural land from the unfair share which it now bears of the local burdens of the country by placing upon the whole national income charges which, like the poor rate, the highway rate, and the education rate, correspond to national duties and requirements.

Secondly—To restrain Railway Companies from imposing excessive rates for the carriage of agricultural produce, and especially from granting rates which give a preference to foreign produce over our own.

Thirdly—To provide State-aided Old Age Pensions for agricultural laborers.

Fourthly—To introduce such improvements into the Agricultural Holdings Act (1883) as may be necessary to give the tenant security for his improvements, taking good husbandry into account.

Fifthly—To extend the Merchandise Marks Act to food, and to strengthen the existing law which deals with adulteration.

Sixthly—Power to the Government, in the case of landlords who desire to create small holdings in suitable localities, to advance the money required in making the necessary buildings, roads, fences, etc., on the security of the holding.

STOCK.

The Part That the Shorthorn Is to Play in the Future.

[Read by J. C. Stoll, Edmonton, at the late meeting of the Dominion Shorthorn Breeders' Association.]

There is a strong probability, amounting almost to an absolute certainty, that while grass grows and water runs the human race will require as an important factor in its sustenance an ever-increasing supply of beef. With the constantly increasing population of the world, and the growth of new towns and cities, especially in this western world, we may reasonably expect an increasing demand for this product of the farm, and the increasing number of persons in comfortable circumstances will no doubt exact a better quality of beef as they do a better quality of butter, and will be willing to pay a higher price for what suits their taste. The wise farmer and stock raiser and feeder will see that it is to his advantage to cater to the taste of his customers, and to meet the demands of his market.

The British market has, in the past few years, been a grand opening for disposing of the well-fed beef of this country, and has been the means of bringing large sums of money into our country. That market is still open and free to our beef, if not to our live cattle, and probably will continue to be open and free; and while we have not now, and may not again, have the advantage over other countries in that market in being permitted to take our cattle inland alive for the markets of inland cities and towns, we will still have the British markets on equal terms with other countries, and if proper care and attention is given by our breeders and feeders to producing the very best quality of beef, and having it placed upon the market in the best possible condition, there is no doubt we shall obtain the highest prices going. The whole difference between profit and loss in a critical market generally lies in the difference in quality and condition. The best will always bring a fair price and find ready buyers, even in a depressed market, while animals of inferior quality and condition are passed by and neglected even in a buoyant market, and have to go begging for buyers in a depressed market.

There is a fair prospect that large slaughtering and packing establishments will in the near future be opened in leading cities in Canada, which will dispose of large numbers of cattle, and these will arrange for shipping our beef dressed, and placing it on the English market in that shape, at much less expense for freights than can possibly be done with live animals, and with much less risk of loss, and in more uniform condition. The offal can, in these establishments, be utilized to advantage in many ways, giving employment to large numbers of men who will in turn become consumers of the

products of the farm and customers of the farmer. The outlook, therefore, is by no means discouraging, but rather hopeful, and with an enterprising and industrious people such as we have, with the skill of our breeders and feeders which has been proven in many ways, we may feel confident of being able to hold our own in competition with the world in its markets.

The breeders of this country are directly responsible for the class of cattle the country produces, and they should exercise care and discretion in keeping up the standard of the product as far as their influence extends. It is a matter for regret that the average farmer is so slow to acknowledge the superiority of pure-bred stock for feeding purposes, or rather so slow to avail himself of its use in improving the stock he has; but we have to deal with things as we find them, and the only way to secure an improved state of affairs is by a gradual system of education, line upon line, precept upon precept, and experience and observation join to confirm the opinion that the greatest factor in bringing about the class of beef cattle rendering the greatest profit to the farmers of this country for that purpose has been, and will continue to be, the Shorthorn. Other breeds may come and go, but the Shorthorn seems destined to go on forever. They furnish the standard of excellence for others to aim to attain, but for this country no other seems to fill the bill so satisfactorily, either as a beefing animal or as a general purpose cow.

The cow which can give a fair supply of milk for the dairy, worth say \$40 a year for butter or cheese, and at the same time raise a calf on her skimmed milk, which, at 2½ years old, with proper care, is fit for an export steer or heifer worth from \$65 to \$75, and is herself worth nearly that amount for beef, when from any causes she ceases to breed, is a safe sort of animal for the general farmer to have and to keep, and the farmers of this country, so far as they have sought to make any improvement in their cattle, have shown their preference for the Shorthorn for the purpose of grading up their stock. An examination of the host of cattle placed upon the market will satisfy any man who knows anything about breeds that not more than one out of every 10,000 shows evidences of any other improving blood than that of the Shorthorn. It is this blood which has made our cattle fit for the export trade, which has brought millions of money into the country. Other breeds have not been untied. In some sections of the country first-class herds have existed for 25 to 40 years, but go into those same sections of the country, go into the markets of those neighborhoods, and how many animals do you find giving evidence of the blood of those breeds? Very few indeed. If they possessed the influence to improve the common cattle of the country which the Shorthorn does, surely the farmers in so long a course of years would have by some means discovered the fact and have availed themselves of their use. But go into a neighborhood where a Shorthorn bull has been kept for a few years, and you will see evidence of his influence in the fields and by the roadside, in the improved form and condition of the grade cattle of that section.

The question of the adaptation of a breed of cattle to any country is one which the majority of the people interested generally settle for themselves as the result of experience and observation, and this test seems to have definitely settled the question in the mind of the great majority of the people of this country that the Shorthorn is here to stay; and I, for one, am cheerfully willing to accord to this noble class of cattle the highest meed of praise, and to their breeders the honor of being placed high upon the honor list of benefactors of their country.

Let this Association as such, and individual breeders as well, be true to themselves and to the best interests of the breed, by seeking to perpetuate in their cattle the great cardinal virtues of robust constitution, feeding qualities and uniformity of a good type for early maturity, the production of the largest quantity of the best quality in the smallest superficies and at the least cost, and an animal that will give the best return for the food consumed and of a quality that meets the demand of the market, and success may be safely considered assured. To this end the pruning knife should be more fully used than it has ever been, and all inferior animals weeded out. The mistake has too often been made of spoiling a tolerable steer to make an inferior bull because there seemed to be more immediate profit. Such a course is sure to prove unprofitable in the long run, as it injures the reputation of the breeder to send out an inferior animal from his herd, and a bad one will be pretty sure to perpetuate his meanness in his offspring.

Uncle Abe Renick used to say he always felt his knife turn in his pocket when he saw a mean bull, and it were well if this spirit actuated all our breeders. And not only mean bulls, but mean heifers and cows should be culled out and sent to slaughter if we would attain the best results in breeding.

Many of the crazes which, in the past, have done so much to injure the breed, have had their day, and are dead and well buried—such as that for fancy pedigrees, without an animal to match, and the craze for a fixed color, no matter how deficient in the more substantial virtues; and let us hope we shall not again be led to run after other fads which may be started, but breed for usefulness first and let pedigrees be secondary, but not a matter of indifference. When a good beast and a good pedigree are combined, the best results may be reasonably looked for, and will be generally attained.