

farmers have a right to demand that you conduct your deliberations with open doors."

Mr. Edward Jeffs proposed that our suggestions be heard, but he received no seconder, and we were told that the Board were perfectly capable of attending to their own business. The members of the Board are:—J. I. Hobson, (Chairman), John McMillan, Jas. Smith, Wm. Saunders, Edward Jeffs, Mr. Dowling, and A. Blue (Secretary and *ex-officio* member).

Gentlemen, we understand, have been chosen for their political prejudices; their special suitability for their work was a secondary consideration, it having been pre-arranged that four of the Board should be Reformers and three Conservatives. Mr. Saunders, being in England, could not attend the meeting. If he had been present, we would have expected a more pleasant reception; for in his public capacity as President of the Fruit Growers' Association and of the Entomological Society, we have always found him ready to impart any information that would be of advantage to the farmers, and we hope his great influence and intelligence will have weight on the Board.

This experience forcibly illustrates the necessity for representative boards to look after our agricultural interests in place of those appointed by the government. Is there one farmer in the whole Province who would vote for a man who advocated secrecy in the discussion of our agricultural affairs? How many farmers would vote for a representative who made our agricultural interests subservient to those of a political character? It will not do to say that collusion cannot exist so long as more than one party is represented on the Board, for a certain amount of brotherhood must exist before business can be transacted, and there may be no end to compromises made in order to prevent the exposure of the mismanagement of the Model Farm. But the exposure must come sooner or later, and if the fabric be not soon unveiled, it will collapse and fall to ruin by virtue of its own rottenness.

We have already pointed out the abuses which can be seen by the naked eye. Last year the government captured an agent for dairy implements, and appointed him "professor" of dairying. We exposed the pretensions of this man, and he has recently been dismissed. He is one of those of the secret order, having repeatedly refused to give information to those who sought it, and his management of the creamery business has been a disastrous failure. We have pointed out that most of the Model Farm experiments are worthless because they can not receive the sanction of professional investigators; and now, after spending thousands of dollars in fitting up a field for experimental purposes, there it stands a neglected waste—a monument to the incapacity and recklessness of its managers.

Before taking our departure we ascertained that the Board refused to appoint an assistant chemist, and that any analyses which we desired to have made in the forwarding of our creamery interests would receive the prompt attention of the chemist, without consulting with the Board or the Commissioner of Agriculture. Astounding revelations! By the action of the Board in refusing an assistant chemist, we infer that they are as ignorant of the wants of our dairy-men as they are of the first principles of dairying; and if such important matters are not

embraced in their duties, then where is the use of the Board? The present farm manager is a first-class practical farmer, knowing the special requirements of the Model Farm better than any board; he is, however, hampered by government contingencies which the Board may succeed in removing; but so far as the experimental work is concerned, without which the institution should not exist, we express the opinion that they are a pack of incapables, every old fogey of them, from the chairman all the way down to that overbearing little braggart, the *ex-officio* member, who basely, falsely, and maliciously accused us of assuming an antagonistic attitude for party purposes.

Farmers' Clubs

Middlesex Agricultural Council.

[This Council meets on the third Saturday of every month at 2 o'clock p.m., in the office of the FARMER'S ADVOCATE, 360 Richmond street. Correspondence on all questions discussed by the Council is respectfully solicited, and will be duly considered at the ensuing meeting. All communications should be addressed to W. A. Macdonald, Corresponding Secretary, London, Ont.]

The regular monthly meeting of this Council met on the 15th ult., President Leitch in the chair.

After routine, Mr. Frank Shore read the following paper on

OUR HERD BOOKS AND THEIR RELATION TO OUR STOCKMEN AND FARMERS:

As you have asked me to give my views on the Shorthorn Herd Book question, and as the ADVOCATE and the Middlesex Agricultural Council champion the interests of the farmers, I propose to look at the situation only from the farmers' standpoint.

It is a well known fact, from the cost of the different herd books and the scarcity of other necessary literature, it is impossible for every breeder and farmer interested in improved stock to become highly read up in all points that would constitute a good judge of pedigree. We therefore find this matter looked upon very much in the same light as the public look upon a bank note, which passes from hand to hand, those receiving and paying the note not seeking to know much about the standing of the bank by which it is issued, so far as the value of bank stock or volume of paying business done by the bank is concerned. All they care to know is that the paper is passable.

In the same way, we seldom find parties purchasing particular enough as to the quality of the immediate ancestry, but from want of knowledge are naturally very suspicious as to whether certain stock is unquestionably eligible for registration in the highest register; and therefore, for the last few years, in nine out of ten of the inquiries received in correspondence comes the question, Is this animal's pedigree recorded in the British American Herd Book? This shows how necessary it is to have the standard so that there can be no shadow of doubt as to the breeding of animals entered therein.

As you are well aware, Ontario has long been considered one of the best breeding grounds, not only from our freedom from all kinds of infectious diseases, but our climate serves to build up good constitutions, and there have always been buyers in abundance for all the horses and cattle we can breed, providing they are a suitable class, and our neighbors across the line have been amongst our best purchasers. But they have heretofore totally ignored our Shorthorn herd books, and every Shorthorn bred in Canada has to be re-entered in the American Herd Book before it is classed there as registered stock.

The reason of this is plain to be seen; for, while they have for years adopted the rule that no animal can be entered in their Herd Book that does not trace in all lines to imported

stock, and have, as a matter of course, taken the English Herd Book as the first record for Shorthorn cattle, they have dubbed our Canadian Herd Book as a record for grades. This has affected animals bred in Canada in the following manner: Canadian breeders use the English Herd Book reference numbers to their imported bulls, while American breeders invariably use their own, and Canadian bred animals with all English Herd Book crosses are valued higher than precisely the same blood, where sires are all bred in Canada, and are therefore not admissible in the English Herd Book. Were our Herd Book placed on a higher standard than the English Herd Book, breeders in Canada would all refer to their own book.

This fact alone, in the past, has shown Canadian breeders the absolute necessity of adopting the highest standard that we may recover our lost position, which has worked more particularly against the smaller breeders who cannot possibly place such high priced imported sires at the head of their breeds. Especially just now does this recommend itself to us, as there is a fast increasing demand for the best quality, and growing taste for all kinds of improved farm stock. From every corner of the country come inquiries and buyers, as men are fast finding out that life is too short to begin and build up any class suitable to their wants, and they have therefore concluded to avail themselves of the advantages which the improvement made by successful breeders in the past have done, and try to continue the good work which these talented men have spent a lifetime in perfecting, and nothing will help us to retain all that has been handed down to us like a thoroughly reliable record.

The present rule, disqualifying as it does many cattle, and amongst them some good individuals, seems to be hard on those that are owners of such, but where do we find a good work that does not militate against the interests of some party or community?

DISCUSSION.

THE PRESIDENT—Pedigree is often misleading so far as milking qualities are concerned. Many of my worst milkers have come from pedigreed bulls. Milking properties are a question of feeding as well as breeding. From calfhood up, the animal should be fed with bulky food, so as to distend the stomach and make the cow roomy. She should be kept in a good growing condition, and all tendencies to put on fat should be overcome. There is no certainty of getting good milkers from pedigreed sires, even if the dams are noted for their milking qualities. I always look to the teat for my pedigree.

JAS. LITTLE—I have had good and bad milkers from pedigreed Shorthorn bulls upon good Shorthorn grade cows. There is no certainty in the business; I have tried it till I am tired. I believe in having beef and milk in the same breed, so that when you fail to get a good milker you succeed in getting a good beef. In this country we follow general purpose farming, and we should keep general purpose stock.

FRANK SHORE—I can also get a good supply of milk and a good beef carcass from the same cow. My herd is Shorthorns.

JAS. LITTLE—I have a common native cow weighing about 1,000 lbs., and she gives the same quantity of milk as a Shorthorn grade cow weighing 1,300 lbs., both eating the same quantity of food. The Shorthorn is certainly the best breed for general purpose farmers.

HENRY ANDERSON—Some years ago, I had excellent milk cows, and put them to a Galloway bull. I failed to get one good milker, and came near ruining the milking qualities of my herd. I also find that most of the Shorthorns are inferior milkers.