

peachment by saying that they were invited by the Association to read papers, to which we reply:—No Government organization has a right to invite parties who are personally interested in any special breed of stock, and if they have been invited to read papers on creamery matters, they should confine themselves strictly to this subject. So long as it remains an unsettled question which is the most profitable dairy breed, the discussion of such questions should be confined to associations organized by the free impulses of the people. So much time has been wasted in extraneous issues that no time has been found for the free discussion of questions pertaining directly to the business for which the Association was organized.

One of the most important questions which is at present agitating the minds of the creamerymen is the obtaining of a simple, cheap and accurate system for testing the cream. A discussion on this question was commenced, but was peremptorily burked, probably on account of the oil-test having been introduced and boomed up by the Model Farm, which method of testing has recently been proved to be unreliable. The butter-maker at the Model Farm maintains that the system is satisfactory, and just because the machine gets through a lot of work in a short time, and the butter obtained, as measured by the oil-test, closely conforms with the results obtained by the churn. This may be all true, and yet great injustice may arise. Justice to the patrons depends upon the accuracy of the individual tests, which may vary materially from the aggregate results. What is our Model Farm for if not to investigate such problems? Probably the duty will fall upon us, as the milk tests have done. We will describe our methods of testing cream in another issue.

We shall not now further enlarge on the objectionable tendencies which are creeping into this Association in the hope that the authorities will take warning by these mild criticisms. We feel it our duty to add, however, that the offices are falling out of the hands of our butter-makers and farmers, and are being rapidly filled by butter and cheese speculators, newspaper writers, etc.

Independent Agricultural Editors in Demand.

We clip the following from the Paisley Advocate of January 12. The remarks are taken from the report of the Centre Bruce Farmers' Institute, and were uttered by Mr. J. Rowand, M. P., whose speech the editor of the Paisley Advocate winds up thus:—

At the close of his address, however, he went a little out of his way to boom a certain agricultural journal. Now we have several of these journals in Ontario, and the proprietors of them should be prepared to buy their own grease without being boomed by anybody before an audience such as that assembled in the hall on that particular evening.

Please count us out of your list of cringing journalists, Mr. Editor. Our experience of Government organizations is that the booming you mention forms the exordium of the orations and not the peroration. It is a disgrace to the journalistic profession—and we feel ashamed of it—that there should be so many agricultural editors who base their prosperity on such servile methods of gaining popularity and influence. They are kindly invited to contribute papers, their expenses being paid out of the public chest; they usually hold some office in the organization,

and although they must be convinced of the wire-pooling that is going on, they are not in a position to criticize the meetings fearlessly and independently for the benefit of their readers.

It is true that we also attend a large number of Government meetings, but as the boomers you refer to are afraid of the truth, we are seldom called upon to deliver an address. Our object in attending is to take notes and watch the proceedings in the interest of our readers.

Again we ask you, Brother Editor, to be so kind as to count us out; we always buy our own "grease," and pay for it out of our own pocket.

Our Agricultural College.

Many of our critics still labor under the delusion that we entertain feelings of hostility against the Institution specifically known under the name, style, and title of "The Ontario Agricultural College and Experimental Farm." The College and Farm are practically two separate institutions, although it is sometimes difficult to draw a sharp line of demarcation between them, and when we criticize the Farm department, which we call the "Model Farm," we make no reference to the College.

Now, if we entertained hostile political feelings, which some of our enemies contend to be the case, it is plain that we would attack the College as well as the Farm, both being maintained by the same government, and controlled by the same source.

Professor Mills is a high authority on educational matters, is an indefatigable worker in the cause of agricultural education, is kind and courteous to all whom he meets, and nobody is keener than he in grasping the wants of our farmers, with whose cause he has the warmest and strongest sympathy. Having elevated the College to its present high state of efficiency, he has devoted his spare moments to the study of agricultural problems—indeed, for years he has been a zealous student of agricultural science, and his early experience as a practical farmer admirably fits him for success in his studies, and for grappling with our agricultural necessities. He craves criticism, but all failings have been due to influences over which he has no control. He is resolved that light shall shine, and that truth and justice shall prevail.

With these facts firmly fixed in our minds, we rejoice to learn that the Ontario government has acted so wisely as to increase his influence. He now exercises a controlling influence over the Farm department, and we are convinced that there will be no cringing in his methods of reformation and cleaning out of the Augean stable. Experimentation will continue to be a leading feature of the Institution, and Prof. Mills will undoubtedly have a good deal to say in the matter, because the Commissioner's Advisory Board, although honorable men and good practical farmers, are a costly ornament and a downright nuisance in experimental agriculture. We still apprehend many failures here, for it requires talent which our country has not yet produced to be a successful investigator. However, we hope for the best, and will rejoice when we shall truthfully pay such compliments to the Farm as we now do to the College.

A great deal is said about the condition of the farmer. What about the condition of the politicians who legislate for his asserted interests?

The Dominion Draft Horse.

The organization known as the Dominion Draft Horse Breeders' Society, incorporated April 12th, 1886, deserves every encouragement, and we are always ready to freely advertise and otherwise encourage, by all legitimate means, every independent organization which tends to the prosperity of our farmers. The management, whose names were advertised in our last issue, enjoys the confidence of our farmers, and we know of no obstacle to success.

The object of the Society is to furnish our farmers and breeders with a draft horse which, although not having a long pedigree, possesses the individual merit required for producing a sound, strong, healthy offspring. There is little or no risk in breeding from such animals, and the price of those registered in the stud-book have appreciably increased—those which in the absence of the Society would be classed as grades of a very ordinary character. We hope our cattle breeders will take a lesson from this Society and form an organization with similar objects in view. The standard of registration adopted by the Society is comprehended in the following sections:—

"Sec. 11. Every application for registry must show that the animal whose pedigree is submitted for registry is the offspring of an accepted sire, and of a dam the produce of an accepted sire."

"Sec. 12. Accepted sires are (1) imported stallions of the Clydesdales and Shire breeds that stood for service in the Dominion of Canada prior to 1886, but are now dead or removed from the country, having pedigrees satisfactory to the Council. These sires the Society agrees to register free of charge and accept, and their male produce in Canada with imported Clydesdale and Shire mares may be registered and will be accepted sires. (2.) Stallions registered in Shire Stud Book, or in the Clydesdale Stud Book of Great Britain, Canada, or the United States. All animals so registered of mixed breeding shall be named Dominion draft horses."

Where to Procure all the Manure Required.

It is the habit of many farmers to dilate upon the advantages of barnyard manure over other forms of fertilizers, maintaining that it produces surer and more profitable results, and if it is not made in sufficient quantities, why then, raise more stock, to be sure. Now that it is a plain, practical fact that the bigger the manure heap the greater is the exhaustion of soil fertility, provided the food consumed by the stock is produced on the farm, it is well to inquire how the fertility of our soil is to be maintained. Even granting that all the manure is saved from waste, which is certainly a most desirable aim, this economy will not solve the problem, as there will always be a loss of fertility so long as stock or dairy products are sold off the farm, and the more the stock the greater the loss. Some farmers exclaim: Why, buy food, of course! This is all very well so far as you are concerned, but what about the condition of your poor neighbor whose land is becoming impoverished owing to you purchasing his grain, his bran, or his hay? It would be more charitable for you to say to your neighbor: "Don't sell your food, friend, for you are robbing your soil." Every farmer can't thus rob his neighbor and still maintain the soil fertility. Try the experiment in your own family: Give Tom, Dick, and Harry each a penny; let each rob the other, and then count how much wealth has been produced.

Any farmer with half an eye can plainly see that we must, sooner or later, depend upon commercial fertilizers to maintain the fertility of our