

THE FARMER'S ADVOCATE

AND HOME MAGAZINE.

THE LEADING AGRICULTURAL JOURNAL IN THE DOMINION.

PUBLISHED WEEKLY BY
THE WILLIAM WELD COMPANY (LIMITED).

TWO DISTINCT PUBLICATIONS—EASTERN AND WESTERN

EASTERN OFFICE:
CARLING STREET, LONDON, ONT.

WESTERN OFFICE:
IMPERIAL BANK BLOCK, CORNER BANNATYNE AVE. AND MAIN ST.,
WINNIPEG, MANITOBA.

BRANCH OFFICE: CALGARY, ALBERTA, N.-W. T.

LONDON (ENGLAND) OFFICE:
W. W. CHAPMAN, Agent, Mowbray House, Norfolk Street,
London, W. C., England.

JOHN WELD, MANAGER.

1. THE FARMER'S ADVOCATE is published every Thursday (52 issues per year). It is impartial and independent of all cliques or parties, handsomely illustrated with original engravings, and furnishes the most profitable, practical, reliable information for farmers, dairymen, gardeners, and stockmen, of any publication in Canada.
2. TERMS OF SUBSCRIPTION.—In Canada, United States, England, Ireland and Scotland, \$1.50 per year, in advance; \$2.00 when not paid in advance. All other countries, 12s.
3. ADVERTISING RATES.—Single insertion, 20 cents per line agate. Contract rates furnished on application.
4. THE ADVOCATE is sent to subscribers until an explicit order is received for its discontinuance. All payments of arrears must be made as required by law.
5. THE LAW IS, that all subscribers to newspapers are held responsible until all arrears are paid and their paper ordered to be discontinued.
6. REMITTANCES should be made direct to this office, either by Money Order or Registered Letter, which will be at our risk. When made otherwise we will not be responsible.
7. THE DATE ON YOUR LABEL shows to what time your subscription is paid.
8. ANONYMOUS communications will receive no attention.
9. LETTERS intended for publication should be written on one side of the paper only.
10. CHANGE OF ADDRESS.—Subscribers when ordering a change of address should give the old as well as the new P. O. address.
11. WE INVITE FARMERS to write us on any agricultural topic. We are always pleased to receive practical articles. For such as we consider valuable we will pay ten cents per inch printed matter. Criticisms of Articles, Suggestions How to Improve the ADVOCATE, Descriptions of New Grains, Roots or Vegetables not generally known, Particulars of Experiments Tried, or Improved Methods of Cultivation, are each and all welcome. Contributions sent us must not be furnished other papers until after they have appeared in our columns. Rejected matter will be returned on receipt of postage.
12. ALL COMMUNICATIONS in reference to any matter connected with this paper should be addressed as below, and not to any individual connected with the paper.

Address—THE FARMER'S ADVOCATE, or
THE WILLIAM WELD COMPANY (LIMITED),
LONDON, CANADA.

P. R. Telegraphs and the British Postal Telegraphs; the latter costs about half the figure of the former for a telegram of ten words, but the Government telegraph system makes five mistakes to the Company's one; and in business one mistake may lose more than the cost of one's telegrams for a lifetime. Then, again, in the civil service the inertia is appalling, taking the service as a whole, either in Britain or Canada. A good man's efforts are either so hampered that his efficiency is destroyed, or he quits the fight against departmental lethargy in disgust. There is also another thing to consider, and it is that the political appointee quite frequently gets to think that he is not paid enough when he takes his present and past services to the Government into consideration, and if he does not get the figure he values his services at he balks, and the public pays the piper. To our mind, Governmental control of public utilities is not likely to be satisfactory until appointments to the civil service are made by impartial examinations, in place of the system pretty commonly used, namely, political preferment, which sometimes lands a good man into the country's service, but more often an indifferent public servant.

Points Right.

The compass you sent I received all right. I am well pleased with it; also the "Farmer's Advocate" is a leader in its class. Hoping you may be long spared to publish so valuable a paper.
E. THORNTON,
Lambton Co.

How to be Up-to-date.

I am still taking your paper, and am fully convinced it is the best agricultural paper in Canada, and do not believe it is surpassed, perhaps, as a farmer's periodical, in the world. I am fully convinced that no up-to-date farmer can afford to get along without its presence in the home. I can readily congratulate you on its weekly issue.
Ontario Co. C. J. STEVENSON.

Instances of Successful Co-operation: IV.

(Continued.)

I have already mentioned the Canadian cheese industry as one proving the advantages of farmers co-operating, and an editorial note in the previous article well stated that, though many of our cheese factories had more recently been taken over by private enterprise, their success had been achieved as co-operative concerns. In view of what has been maintained in these articles as to the right principles and methods of co-operation, it may be well to point out that in the cheese industry there is not the same need for a specific guarantee of milk supply by members; as milk, unlike live animals or other farm products, cannot easily be sold except to the nearest factory in most cases. The capital required was obtained from members instead of by loans. Without the guarantee as to care of animals and milk, which is universal in the creamery associations of Denmark, our factories, as we all know, have had the greatest difficulty in securing milk of the best quality, and, in consequence, our national cheese product has not been as uniformly excellent as it should be. The same is very true of our creamery butter, and for the same reasons. The Dairymen's Associations, however, are overcoming these difficulties in another way, and it is noteworthy that their tendency is distinctly towards co-operation in principle, and away from the spirit of Government compulsion.

Readers of the "Farmer's Advocate" are sufficiently familiar with the history, methods and principles of the Patrons of Industry, so that I need only mention the binder twine factory and salt supply enterprises begun under their auspices, and continued with entire success, breaking and keeping down piratical combines in both those directions. As in the cheese industry, conditions peculiar to these enterprises made it easy for them to succeed in spite of private competition, and in spite of the fact that they were not owned, organized or managed according to co-operative principles and methods. They are simply limited liability concerns, and the fact that a large number of their shares is held by farmers does not make the distinction any less real.

That they have gained practically the same results as truly co-operative organization would have secured is due chiefly to the fact that the owners and managers were actuated at heart by the spirit and principles of co-operation. But they might, for their own benefit, have done otherwise, and the farmer consumers could not have done anything to control their policy or actions. That these owners and managers have thus operated according to the spirit of co-operation only proves that farmers can work together, "each for all, and all for each."

So much, then, for co-operative industries. But what the farmers produce, separately or jointly, must be sold; and what is sold must be carried (in our case most of it a long distance) to market. The amount of farm products sold by Canadian farmers is enormous, and it might with great profit be done co-operatively.

It has been done co-operatively abroad. Denmark has its associations for sale and transportation of butter, bacon, eggs, horses, etc. Germany has nearly 2,500 associations for the same purposes. France and Belgium are similarly provided. By thus carrying their products to market, insuring them in transit themselves, the Danish associations actually save one-quarter of the price received on the British market! The western farmers of the United States are rapidly increasing their already numerous associations for co-operative sale of products and purchase of supplies. Iowa alone has over 200 of these local associations, owning their own elevators, dealing in lumber, coal, etc., besides handling their grain and live stock in combination. The Rockwood association alone handles over \$700,000 worth of goods annually.

At home, as my readers will have seen in the "Farmer's Advocate," of March 16th and 23rd, Ilderton has its apple association, with a successful record in packing and selling apples, and Forest has its fruit-growers' and forwarding association, with pronounced success in the same work. Read these accounts again. They are significant. These associations are new, but THEY HAVE GOT RESULTS.

In all these instances of co-operative packing, shipping and sale, the essentials to be noticed are the adoption of grading and uniform trade-marks. In the case of the Danish and other European organizations the control of the freight rate situation is also obtained as one of the first results. We will have this result also when our organizations are powerful enough.

The "Farmer's Advocate" has forestalled me again in the matter of co-operative or "mutual" insurance. Every farmer knows of such native organizations, and of their value in the community. It may hardly be in place just here, but it may be said that co-operative insurance is the only kind the farmers should adopt—but it should be truly a co-operative concern in every instance. And the scope of such insurance could be widened. In Europe the farmers have mutual insurances against sickness, loss of labor supply, etc., the latter case being a suggestive one for the Canadian farmer.

Careful reading so far will show very well the principles and methods of the most successful foreign organizations in the world, and will, I think, surprise many with the facts of the extent to which organization of that sort has been carried out, as well as of the wonderful results thus secured to the organizing farmers. I shall not attempt to outline cases, at home or abroad, where co-operation and agricultural progress

are together absent, but I shall give an instance or two of importance, to show that the intent to co-operate, unless put into shape according to the principles and methods emphasized herein, may result in total failure.

FAILURE OF ATTEMPTED CO-OPERATION.

With the exception of one co-operative bacon factory, established in a Danish district where there were not hogs enough to keep it going, there is no discoverable instance in Europe where co-operation has failed. For failures we must, unfortunately, seek at home. The (so-called) Co-operative Bacon Factory at Palmerston will at once occur to everyone. This factory was organized, as was the binder twine factory at Brantford, as a limited liability company, with shares held among the farmers to a considerable extent. The Brantford Company succeeded, while the Palmerston Company failed. The reason is easily seen.

When the farmers' company started business, the private packers—who, be sure, understood long ago the dangers to them of co-operation—went to the farmers with increased prices for hogs. They went to the many farmers who didn't own shares in the factory, and also to the few who did. They offered such prices that the new factory lost one dollar on every hog they handled, and the new factory soon quit. It was very simple. The farmer who had \$10 in bacon-factory shares got his cash—\$10—in increased profits on one batch of hogs sold in Toronto, and could afford just then to see the shares worthless. But the fact is, he didn't expect the factory to fail because HE sold his hogs to the factory's competitors. He thought the other shareholders and the farmers generally would hold the factory up. And thus the factory failed. Had that factory been the property of a co-operative association, every member of which had given a guarantee to sell it every hog raised, and a guarantee to pay his share of the liabilities if it failed, you may be sure it would be the biggest and most successful bacon-curing factory in Canada to-day. More, the complaint of one farmer, that he doesn't get fair prices for selects, and the content of another on getting too good a price for fat, corn-fed hogs, would be settled for good. The ten per cent. commission every buyer of hogs takes out of the farmer would go to the farmer's bank account, along with enhanced profits in other respects. As it is, we are deploring "the failure of co-operative bacon-curing," and saying it cannot be done. All that is nonsense. It can be done if the farmers do it themselves.

Another instance of so-called co-operative farmers' industry is the "Farmers' Co-operative Harvesting Machine Co.," at Whitby. It is, perhaps, too soon yet to decide whether it is a success or a failure. That is in dispute at present among the directors, one of whom is a prominent Toronto financier. But it certainly is not co-operative, and so far as can be learned most of the shares are not held by farmers. What concerns us—the farmers—is that the farmers should either buy or manufacture co-operatively not only their binders, but all their implements. Truly organized according to the methods and principles outlined in these articles, they need only make their own terms with the firms who are already in the business. The following articles will show how the Canadian farmer can and should accomplish this and other objects by co-operative organization.
AUSTIN L. MCCREDIE.

What Price for a Herd-header?

The above question, often asked himself by the beginner in pure-breeds, was suggested to us a short time ago by a pure-bred cattle man, who drew attention to another breeder's idea of a bull to head his herd, and the price such should cost. The bull in question, an animal of one of the beef breeds, cost somewhere between \$75 and \$125, and was at the head of a herd numbering some twenty or more breeding females. The said bull was neither a good representative of the breed (judged either for type or masculinity), nor of the beef type, and had been altered, would have made, if properly fed, only a fair steer. The breeding females in the herd could safely be valued on the average at \$100. What, then, should the breeder expect to pay for a fit bull to head his herd, two things being steadily in mind, viz., that the bull is half the herd, and that the greatest and quickest improvement in the quality of a herd can be made by the use of a first-class male? Given a herd of twenty mature breeding females, at an average of \$100 apiece, no person can reasonably expect to get a bull with the necessary character, either of sex or breed, to render him the service such a bull should, for a sum much below \$300, and should be prepared to go double that price for a superior animal rather than take one of mediocre breeding and medium individuality at half the price. Any bull sexually sound will get calves if mated to healthy mature females, but there is in the breeder's art more than mere bringing together of animals to multiply the species. Even if the breeder looks at the matter solely from the standpoint of the money to be made from breeding pure-breeds, and does not concern himself over the improvement of the breed, even that man will find it pay him to use the very best bull he can afford; and he simply cannot afford to use an inferior bull because it costs only a hundred or two. Far too many men breeding registered cattle to-day are