

The Farmer's Advocate

"PERSEVERE AND SUCCEED" and Home Magazine. ESTABLISHED 1866.

REGISTERED IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE COPYRIGHT ACT OF 1875.

VOL. XXXVI.

LONDON, ONT., AND WINNIPEG, MAN., FEBRUARY 15, 1901.

No. 520

EDITORIAL.

The Live Stock Association Meetings.

In view of the annual meetings of the various live-stock organizations announced to be held during the present month, we would suggest that in order that the best work in the interest of these associations and the stockmen of the country generally be done, the meetings should be well attended, and that members come with well-thought-out ideas for reform, progress and usefulness, and not simply to adopt and give the tacit support of the associations to the plans of any one man or group. It is well in all such meetings, for the dispatch of business, to observe some order or system, and that the officers have a programme prepared of points which in their judgment should come before the meeting, but it surely does not necessarily follow, as is too often the case, that the meeting swallow whole the roll of "have-beens" on the list of officers and directors, without regard to fitness or efficiency, or the claims and desirability of "new blood" on the boards, nor the whole contingent of cut-and-dried resolutions presented, simply because they come before the meeting in a prepared state, and it may be with the veiled intimation that if they are not accepted the promoters will not "play in your yard," nor let "you play in theirs." It is, of course, all right to elect the men and adopt the motions that commend themselves to the good judgment of the meeting, but men should have the courage to dissent with no uncertain sound where they cannot approve, and not allow themselves to be led by the nose into bogs and byways, from which they find it difficult to emerge with credit to their judgment. It has not infrequently been noted and acknowledged that general annual meetings of these and kindred societies have proven but a formal means of reinstating in office a set of men who nominate each other, or have individuals prompted to do so, none having the courage to propose a change lest they give offence to the privileged few, with the result that often the majority go away disgusted with themselves and the whole affair, that they have wasted time and expenses in giving a new lease of official life to some men in whom they have little confidence, and implied approval of a policy that is distasteful to them. It is just this loose system of allowing things to drift that encourages machine methods and frequently leads to abuses that forfeit the confidence and sympathy of the people.

Now that the season for holding the annual meetings of the various live-stock associations and the election of officers and directors for the prosecution of the work of the same is upon us, we are reminded of the feeling more than once and by more than one exhibitor expressed in our hearing during the fair season last year, that the somewhat stereotyped boards of directors which have continued in office from year to year in some of these associations give little encouragement to the younger exhibitors who feel that since these boards have practically the appointment of the judges, since it is expected and generally realized that their nominations shall be accepted by the various fair associations, the new beginners get scant recognition in the honors and the prizes.

The tendency in most associations to suffer the re-election of undesirable directors rather than run the risk of giving offence by nominating new men is the weakness of many organizations, and should be guarded against, as it is just this system of drifting that frequently leads to abuses in the

management and to loss of confidence on the part of the patrons. Men who have proven useful workers, and who have not laid themselves open to the charge of using their position to advance their own interests at the expense of others, should be continued in office as their experience and judgment may be valuable.

There is little satisfaction in kicking oneself and cursing the clique on the street after their schemes have been allowed to succeed.

The annual meeting is the proper place and time for the ventilation of complaints and the correction of abuses if there be any, and lay members should make themselves heard at the proper time instead of allowing all the time to be monopolized by the professional talkers, who in some instances seem to imagine that they are "the whole show" and to forget that "there are others." There should be room for original thought and independent action in all these associations, and in some it would doubtless be an improvement if there should be effected "a shaking among the dry bones."

The need of a higher standard of quality in our live stock of all classes—horses, cattle, sheep, swine, and poultry—is a subject which may well claim the attention and effort of these associations, and broad and comprehensive views to this end should prevail. Pressure should be brought to bear upon leading fair associations to induce them to offer more liberal and diversified prize-lists in the live-stock department, which constitutes the principal feature of their shows, as it goes without saying that without this their exhibitions would be a flat failure. Those associations which are fortunate enough to have a surplus of funds can do no better service to their members than by using a portion of their accumulations in offering special and supplementary prizes at principal shows in all the Provinces, especially for home-bred animals, herds and flocks, for the progeny of a sire and the produce of a dam. Something in the form of an amateur class in each breed might be adopted, and special encouragement to farmers by way of a prize-list for grade females in both beef and dairy classes of cattle. To give a wider field for competition, a leaf might well be taken from some of the United States shows in the cattle classes, by making two sections, a senior and a junior, for yearlings and calves in each class, thus making more uniform classes than are found in our shows, where long and short aged animals compete in the same ring.

The question of the best system of selecting judges is a never-ending one, and one which we do not propose to discuss at this time further than to state our conviction that if our leading live-stock shows are not to drift into mere contests between a few professional showmen whose nominations of judges are accepted by the directorate of the exhibitions, some consideration will need to be given to the feeling rightly or wrongly voiced by young breeders and new beginners, that there is little encouragement for them under existing arrangements, as in their opinion they must bring out stock beyond a doubt superior to that of the old guard if they are to stand any chance of figuring in the prize list. We offer no opinion upon the grounds for such feeling, but knowing it exists, we commend it to the consideration of breed societies and fair boards, whether the system of directors appointing as judges fellow directors who are exhibitors in one class to judge another class which they have never bred—a system by which "You judge my class and I judge yours"—is the best calculated to encourage an increased competition or to induce amateur breeders to enter the field?

Weighed and Found Wanting.

We need not repeat nor enlarge upon the facts cited in the last issue of the *FARMER'S ADVOCATE* showing the unreliability of the tuberculin test, and its injurious effects, particularly on breeding animals. The actual damage wrought to breeding interests has already been sufficient not only to destroy confidence in but to arouse widespread distrust of tuberculin injections. No amount of bolstering testimonials from manufacturers that the tuberculous matter with its living germs from which the fluid is prepared has been "boiled," "sterilized" and "strained" till quite innocuous, or assurances that the test is a "good thing for the country" from parties who have their own reasons for desiring to see it perpetuated, can establish it in public favor. But there are other aspects of the case which deserve serious consideration, and to these we purpose devoting some attention for the benefit of the agricultural public. But before doing so, we must mention, in passing, one absurdity involved in the present system as it affects international relations. The limited number of pure-bred cattle going to the States must be tested, some of them a second time, after having already undergone the ordeal in Britain; and yet during the year 1900, Canada sent into the States 83,989 head of cattle, mostly grades and scrubs, without any test whatever, to be fattened, grazed or bred on farms—just as the purchasers felt disposed! Could anything more farcical be conceived?

We have been at some pains to study the records of the nature and history of the so-called test, and the results of its unfortunate application, which has been quite as futile in eliminating bovine tuberculosis as was the original attempt of a few enthusiasts to cure human consumption with the Koch lymph. Both were no doubt primarily well-meant but misdirected efforts. One cannot but ask who in the first place designed or sought the imposition of this test? Was it the farmer, the dairyman, or the breeder?—all of whom have greater personal interest in having healthy stock than can anyone else. Seldom do we see an unhealthy animal or hear of one dying, and probably least of all from any disease resembling tuberculosis. What says the Chief Live Stock Inspector in the annual report of the Dominion Minister of Agriculture, just issued? "I have much pleasure in calling your attention to the excellent health and condition of all classes of live stock throughout the entire Dominion." During the year ending October 31st, 1900, there were officially tested in Canada 17,785 cattle—mostly suspected herds—and of these only 358 showed a rise in temperature, supposed to indicate tubercles somewhere in the system; but that they are hurtful or transmissible is not asserted. The human consumption which ravages Canada, therefore, does not arise from the cattle! Undoubtedly the same is true of Great Britain and the United States. The public did not ask for this test, and the facts just cited demonstrate that they displayed good common sense in not doing so, even without waiting for bacteriologists to record the differences noted between the bacilli of bovine tuberculosis and consumption, or in the absence of proof that the disease is conveyed from animals to man.

But we propose to go further than this, and to put into the box on this subject an expert who, probably of all men living, joins in the highest degree the practitioner and the pathologist, William Osler, Professor of Medicine in the great Johns Hopkins University, and Physician to the Johns Hopkins Hospital of Baltimore, a graduate of Toronto University. We quote from his masterly article on "Nineteenth Century Progress in