

EDITORIAL.

Our Position Endorsed.

Editor FARMER'S ADVOCATE:

SIR.—Your article on "Live Stock Husbandry and the Dominion Experimental Farm Staff" is very much to the point, and expresses the thoughts of the most intelligent farmers of my acquaintance. It covers the ground so thoroughly that I should not have trespassed upon your space except to thank you for the very able manner in which you have embodied the views of the farming community. But the time seems appropriate for an expression of opinion when a new Minister of Agriculture is taking hold of the reins. A word might direct his thoughts into a channel whereby live stock would receive the consideration it deserves.

Dairying has been so energetically and fluently advocated that the supply of cheese and butter has increased to such an extent that a halt must be called in that direction for a time. Prof. Robertson, who has had charge of that department, has conducted it with eminent ability; but his services are now required mainly in another capacity.

In looking over the reports of the Minister of Agriculture, I find the following staff: Director, Agriculturist, Horticulturist, Chemist, Entomologist and Botanist, and Poultry Manager. Whilst dairying and fruit raising, analyzing, insect studying, and poultry growing all receive attention, live stock has been overlooked, and one branch, that of sheep husbandry, entirely neglected.

We know that farming, the world over, depends upon live stock as its sheet-anchor. No matter what the soil or how rich naturally, crops cannot be grown any length of time without stock. There is not a farm in Ontario that can be carried on successfully without them. And I make another equally broad assertion; that there is not a farm in this whole Dominion on which the stock might not be improved. If I am right in these assertions, what a field is open along the very lines which you have indicated! No matter if one grows the best barley, or oats, or peas, the work is only a partial success unless one has the stock to consume them profitably.

Again, where are the steers to come from to enable the dead meat trade, which the Government intend establishing, to be a success? At present they are not in the country, and for the sake of our good name, don't allow a hoof to be shipped that is not strictly first-class.

Our mutton is much superior to our beef, as a rule, and this trade may be made quite profitable in a short time, as it only takes a few months to produce a lamb, whereas it will take three years from now to have the steer ready for shipment.

But enough has been said to endorse the ground you have taken. I hope you will not let the subject drop; it is a most important matter.

"FARMER."

A Subject for Congratulation.

It affords us no little satisfaction to announce, as was foreshadowed in our issue of Dec. 16 last, that the property owners of London, Ont., at the recent municipal elections carried the by-law authorizing the expenditure of \$25,000 for the erection of new live stock and other buildings for the Western Fair, together with a general rearrangement of the grounds. All the old ramshackle stock buildings had long since outlived their usefulness, and the horse sheds, cut off to the east by the race track, were practically inaccessible to the public. The crowding of the agricultural machinery into the southwest corner of the grounds has been a chronic grievance with the manufacturers. In fact, as we intimated on several occasions last year, the Western Fair had reached a "critical stage"—in fact, a point where it either had to take a decided step in advance or "drop out of sight" in the circuit of great Canadian fairs. The Directors realized this thoroughly, and by their timely and vigorous action brought the needs of the Fair before the local municipal authorities and the people, being ably backed up by the city press. Strong resolutions in support of the movement were adopted by various organizations of breeders—the net result being, as stated above, the passage of the by-law. The next step will be the adoption of suitable plans for the removal of the old buildings and the erection of new ones during the coming season. With these improvements properly carried out, and a liberal revision of the live stock prize list, the Western Fair will greet exhibitors and visitors in most attractive style next fall, and which unquestionably will add greatly to its enduring popularity.

The number of months in a year a cow gives milk is largely a matter of habit. It is therefore important that a heifer's first milking period should be extended over fourteen or fifteen months. She should, therefore, be bred for the first time with that object in view.

The New Clerk of Forestry for Ontario.

Thomas Southworth, who was recently appointed by the Ontario Government to succeed the late Hon. C. F. Fraser as Clerk of Forestry, is a thorough Canadian—a native of the soil. He was born in 1855, in the County of Leeds, Ontario, and has been a continuous resident of that county until his removal to Toronto to assume the duties of his new position. Mr. Southworth's mother, Diantha Stoddard, was born in the same county; her parents, who migrated from Connecticut, having been among the pioneer settlers of Leeds. His father, Stephen J. Southworth, of Brockville, was a native of Vermont, but came to Canada over sixty years ago; he, like his wife, being of Puritan ancestry. The new Clerk of Forestry lived on his father's farm till it was sold in 1875, and the family removed to Brockville.

Mr. Southworth's schooling was obtained at the country school, in Kitley, and the High School, at Athens. After removing to Brockville, he was employed on the Brockville Recorder staff—finally as editorial writer. In 1879 he was married to Miss Mary Taylor (of Gananoque), sister to Geo. Taylor, M. P. for South Leeds, and in the following year embarked in the printing business. In 1881 his business was amalgamated with the Recorder, a partnership being formed between him and the late Col. David Wylie; since which time, till this year, the business, and most of the time the editorial management of the paper, was in his hands. From his early rural surroundings, as well as his newspaper career, he brings a fund of information which should prove of value to him in connection with the Forestry problem and the work of his office, which is naturally congenial to him as a studious observer of the conditions of national prosperity.

We take pleasure in giving elsewhere a contribution from Mr. Southworth's pen, dealing with the aim and scope of the Ontario Bureau of Forestry. While it has to do largely with the public domain, attention should not be allowed to flag regarding the subject of ordinary farm tree culture, such as the planting and care of trees for the sake of beautifying the farm, and as windbreaks, which become more and more necessary as the forests are yearly thinned out. As Mr. Southworth indicates, rapid progress is hardly to be expected in the growth of farm plantations for direct commercial results; but this subject will not be lost sight of by far-seeing men.

The Canadian Fat Cattle Trade—Some Practical Considerations.

SIR.—In looking over the live cattle trade back to the days when ocean freights were £5 to £7 per head for cattle, \$1.50 for fittings, and no insurance, we see that it took \$50 per head to cover expenses to Liverpool or London. Now you can ship at a cost not exceeding \$24, insured. In August, 1884, I shipped to London at \$19 per head, insured, and in November, 1885, I paid 35 shillings for ocean freight, and insured for 1 per cent; average per head, less than \$19. In November I shipped 100 head at 50 shillings, insured (to Liverpool); this lot cost a little over \$24 per head. The above covers all expenses from home. The August shipment (1884) sold at £18 per head; they averaged 1,350 pounds live weight at home, and netted \$4.75 per 100 pounds at home. The November lot netted \$3.75 live weight at home. The August shipment (1885) netted \$4.50. The above lots were sold on foot for so many pounds per head. Assuming them to dress 55 pounds to the 100 pounds live weight, the August (1884) lot brought about 11½ cents per pound, shrinking offal. (The November lot numbered in all 100 head.) I had 19 that had been weighed at home. The whole lot were sold to be dressed and weighed. Here are the prices: 4½ d. for 12 head, 4½ d. for 7 head, 4½ d. for 52 head, 4½ d. for 26 head, 4½ d. for 3 head. I give the returns for the 19 head: Beef, 701 pounds average; total for beef, £251 16s. Hides, at 21s. each, £19 19s. Fat, 38 pounds each, at 2d., £6 2s. 2d. Offal, 16s. 6d. per head, £15 13s. 6d. Total sale, \$1,391; less expenses, \$24 each, \$456; netting at home 4 cents per pound live weight; dressing 53 pounds to the 100 pounds home weight; netting 11 cents for the beef shrinking offal. The offal of 100 head averaged \$10.60 per head. The live weight of the 100 head averaged from 1,250 to 1,275 pounds each. The ocean rates and number of days feeding before being sold and slaughtered, after cattle are landed, fixes the rate per head of expenses on each shipment. In London the butchers have full charge after purchase; in Liverpool they are not theirs until slaughtered and weighed—the shipper is very liable to be charged a six or eight days' feed bill, at one shilling per night for hay alone.

The question arises, Is there a better and cheaper method of handling our cattle? We know that it has been tried by Canadians, and was a failure. We know that Eastman & Co., New York, were engaged in the dressed meat trade a number of years ago, and we hear of great losses reported. We also know that Armour, Swift, and Morris are engaged in the dressed meat trade continuously, and when we consider for a moment their capacity for handling dressed meats, their vast capital, long experience, and the thorough system that they have in America and all over Europe, where their own men look after their interests daily, one would wonder why they send hundreds weekly of the finest live cattle that grace the English and Scottish markets! They must see some paying object in shipping live cattle. It also looks as though those

large operators, having access regularly to a market of 60,000 to 80,000 head of live cattle per week, can and will practically hold the dressed meat trade of Europe against any country not able (up to date) to export over 150,000 in any one year. I repeat again, that establishments with a staff of trained business men scattered all over Europe, and they reporting to the head office daily, are in a position that no small concern or company can compete with. Are we in a position to send dressed beef continuously the year around? I doubt it; and where would the plant for the purpose be established? Is it not an undeniable fact—I care not what the industry engaged in—that the success depends upon a continuous supply of the article or commodity produced, and its quality? I do not see how the dressed meat industry can control or secure our best finished cattle, especially from May until November, and it is during this season that our best cattle go forward. Again: the persistent efforts of the people of Australia to establish a live cattle trade show that they cannot be wholly satisfied with their dressed meat business. Then take the reports of refrigerator beef at London and Liverpool for a number of years through the months named—7 cents to 9 cents per pound for best—and I venture the statement, from a personal knowledge, that large quantities are sold at 6 cents and less; and can not the Chicago firms sell for the prices named, when they buy thousands of cattle weekly at 2½ to 3½ cents per pound? It is from cattle of this grade of prices that they furnish their customers with dressed beef in Europe. Their good cattle are sent alive. Take the lot I had in London, August 15th, 1884, that brought £18; they would dress 55 to the 100 pounds, or 742 pounds each, at 9 cents—\$60.78. Then say the offal is worth at Montreal \$9. Total, \$75.78. Deduct freight and shrinkage to Montreal, \$5, then \$10 for slaughtering, freight, and other selling charges—in all \$15 per head. We would have netted at home for the 1,350-pound steers \$60.78 each; that is, if the beef brought 9 cents per pound, which I much doubt. They realized at home \$64 as sold, showing \$3.22 in favor of live shipment, if I am correct as to costs of handling dressed beef.

It is stated that cattle are cruelly treated in transit. Yes, there is cruelty at times to an extreme degree in the treatment they get when being loaded and tied on board of ship. The inspectors appointed by the Government should do their duty, and put a stop to the unmerciful pounding that cattle are subjected to from the hands of men that I call hardly human. Outside of this one hour's ordeal, a competent foreman can land cattle without shrinking, as the ships are nearly all supplied with an abundance of pure fresh water (the shipper furnishes his own feed). In fact, I have landed cattle when I stated to my commission men that they never would weigh more on arrival than at starting, and I have landed them when I thought they had shrunk, but never did I land a lot but they looked better than they did leaving Montreal. After the cattle are landed at London or Liverpool, if you can feed cattle in a Canadian barn to gain, you can there. The lairage buildings are simply grand for cattle, with pure water before them. I landed Tuesday at 8 o'clock, p. m., and had them all tied up by 10 o'clock. On Thursday morning at 10 o'clock the market opened, and the cattle were in fine condition. When slaughtered, there was not fifty cents loss on the lot from bruises. Although a hard market, they realized four dollars per head more than they could have been sold for at home. And if my ocean freight had been 20 or 25 shillings per head, instead of 50 shillings, my cattle would have realized at least five dollars per head more. I had (or all Canadian cattle had) to compete against well-finished American steers, with a freight of 20 and 25 shillings per head, from New York and Boston. What the Canadian producer needs is fair competition in ocean rates.

As a producer, I will hail with satisfaction any new method that will permanently assist and benefit the cattle industry of Canada; but with the facts as indicated above before us, it would appear to me wisdom to see that our live cattle shipping facilities are the best possible, irrespective of any proposed opening of a dressed meat trade.

C. M. SIMMONS

No San Jose Scale in B. C.

SIR.—At a recent meeting of the Board of Horticulture, the reported presence of the San Jose Scale in British Columbia was brought up, and a resolution was passed to the effect that, after diligent inquiry, no such pest was found to exist in the Province, and I was asked to give publicity to the fact. Will you therefore be good enough to publish this communication, and oblige,

Victoria, B. C.

J. R. ANDERSON,
Deputy Minister of Agriculture.

Farming World (Edinburgh, Scotland): "There are, we repeat, hopeful signs for the future of British agriculture. If our farmers are given a 'fair field and no favor,' if they are united among themselves, if they are placed on an equality with the foreigner in the matter of railway rates, and if they take full advantage of the educational institutions now within their reach, they will yet cause to flourish the grandest and most ancient industry which the world has ever known."