

The Farmer's Advocate and Home Magazine.

"PERSEVERE AND SUCCEED"

ESTABLISHED 1866

REGISTERED IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE COPYRIGHT ACT OF 1876.

VOL. XL.

LONDON, ONT., AND WINNIPEG, MAN., OCTOBER 26, 1905.

No 683

EDITORIAL.

Let Us Dignify Our Calling.

We still occasionally meet farmers who apologize for their occupation, and, sorry to say, agricultural college men are sometimes among the number. Asked what they are at, they answer, "Oh, I'm just farming," implying plainly their belief that they might be at something better, such as institute lecturing, Departmental work, scientific investigation, or something of the sort. We always pity such men, for not only do they fail to make the most out of farm life, but they lack the most essential qualification for the agricultural profession, viz., intelligent, whole-souled appreciation of and sympathy with farm life and work. Without this the professional is incapable of inspiring among farmers the necessary confidence in his work. The time is coming when all such positions will be filled with men who really love the farm and would willingly remain thereon, being tempted to leave it only by generous emolument and by that instinctive public spirit which actuates broad-minded men, coupled with the compensating advantage that they will still have to do more or less with the business in which they are interested. The agricultural experts of the future will be farmers first and scientists afterwards. We have some men of this kind now, and their work tells powerfully in the promotion of better farming; but we also have others whose brows are never deeply seamed with care for farmers or farm problems.

It is a bad sign to see a boy yearn towards the professional field, and it pains one, also, to see any farmer bow the knee to merchants, manufacturers and scholars. The tendency must be an atavistic influence of feudalism. It seems bred in the bone, for it dies hard. As a class, one of the lessons we have not fully learned is to dignify our occupation. We will never do this until we really believe that ours is a business offering as wide a scope for intellect, as rich a reward for effort, as any in the world.

There is a persistent tendency in estimating the advantages of farming to dwell too exclusively upon the financial side, overlooking the wholesomeness, comfort and daily enjoyment which are some of its cardinal attractions, to say nothing of its advantages from the standpoint of good-living, citizenship, domestic environment, and moral and intellectual development. Whenever we hear the expression, "only farming," the instinctive response is, "What could you be at that's better?" It is no wonder such men are browbeaten; they deserve to be. When a true understanding of these things actuates our thought and conduct we are not looked down upon. In proportion as we respect ourselves and our occupation we command the respect of others. To him who does this the term "farmer" is never applied as an opprobrious epithet. The only ones thus stigmatized are those who merit the insinuation. Time after time have we seen young men and boys in barber shops, stores and other public places, by their apologetic conduct and language invite contempt upon themselves and their business. Presently would enter one of those princes of every locality—a successful farmer, who was proud of his calling. Instantly the atmosphere changes; the scoffers take a back seat, and, if the conversation turns that way, the better element speak up with respectful meekness to meet a worthy farmer whom they can respect.

Future of the English Royal.

The Royal Agricultural Society of England ranks easily foremost among the organizations of that class in the world, and particularly so because of the inestimable service it has rendered the breeding of pure-bred live stock. The annual exhibition of the society known as "The Royal" stands unique among live-stock shows. To be a "Royal" winner or a "Royal" champion carries with it a badge of distinction recognized by stockmen the world over, hence the widespread interest, not only in the show and its awards, but in the existence and progress of the society as an organization. Until recently the annual show has been migratory, in order that its benefits might be felt locally as well as generally, but for various reasons it has found itself in deep water financially, and with the hope of making ends meet, it was decided to try the experiment of making it a fixture at Park Royal, London, but the hopes of the promoters of that change have not been realized.

Last August a special committee of the society was appointed to thoroughly investigate the entire position of the society and to make a report to the Council as to what reforms and economies they consider desirable to put the society on a sound footing. Their report was submitted to the Council, and, with the exception of the paragraph relating to the disposal of Park Royal (which was remitted to the committee for further consideration), it was adopted.

This document was signed by fifteen members of the committee, two having been unavoidably absent. It consists of eleven brief clauses, but if the report is brief, the recommendations are sweeping, and some portions of it have caused regret to the members and to the council generally. The first paragraph is introductory. The second expresses the recognition by the committee of the services of the staff in the past, but in view of the financial position of the society they are unable to recommend a continuance of so large an expenditure as is at present incurred under this head, and see no other course open but to request the council to ask for the resignation of the whole staff, as at present engaged at Hanover Square and Park Royal. The next paragraph states that the committee consider that a sum not exceeding £1,500 per annum is all that the society is at present justified in expending on the salaries of the secretary and administrative staff. They recommend that a secretary (to devote his whole time to the work of the society) should be appointed at a salary of £600 per annum, and an assistant at £300 per annum. They recommend that if a satisfactory price can be obtained for Harewood House it shall be sold at as early a date as possible, and, failing this, that such part of the house not absolutely required for the purposes of the society shall be let. They recommend that the cost of the "Journal," including distribution, shall not exceed £600 per annum. As regards the scientific departments of the society, it is recommended that the Board of Agriculture be approached with a view to obtain a grant in aid of these. Unless such assistance can be obtained their work must be curtailed.

As to the society's show, it is recommended, that no exhibition be held at Park Royal in 1906, but that it take place in the Provinces, if a suitable site can be obtained and financial arrangements be made; also, that a sum of not less than £2,000 from the governors' and members' subscriptions be credited to the expenses of the annual show. The opinion is expressed that it would be most advantageous that conferences be

held annually between the council and officers of the Royal Agricultural Society and the secretaries of County, Breed and leading Agricultural Societies, to consider questions of general and mutual interest. It is advised that immediate steps be taken for the disposal of the society's interest in the Park Royal estate. This clause has been referred to the committee for reconsideration. The last paragraph draws attention to and emphasizes the desirability of encouraging members to give financial support to the society beyond the minimum subscription.

The foregoing summary will clearly indicate the gist of the recommendations of the Committee, which, in effect propose that extensive economies be effected in the cost of the staff and offices; that, if possible, State aid be obtained for carrying out the scientific departments, otherwise that they shall be curtailed; that apparently the migratory system of holding the shows is to be resumed.

Without attempting, at this distance, to dogmatize, it is probable that the management of The Royal would be benefited by the infusion of "new blood." As a live-stock exhibition, it is admirably conducted, and its excellencies may well be preserved with the introduction of more modern and economical methods in other respects. It is now undergoing a severe house-cleaning process, and the sincere wish of the "Farmer's Advocate" is that it may emerge from the process improved and with an infusion of vitality that will ensure its usefulness to agriculture and the live-stock industry for generations to come.

A Sine Qua Non.

In this issue our regular Scottish correspondent discusses the municipal system of Glasgow, the city universally regarded as the most successful in the municipal administration of civic necessities, such as street cars, lighting and water-works. Living right in the Scottish metropolis, the writer (Mr. MacNeillage) is thoroughly conversant with the working of the system there, and being well known as an astute observer and level-headed thinker, his analysis of the pros and cons of municipal administration will carry considerable weight. The impression he seems to leave is that, while the pecuniary and other advantages enjoyed by Glasgow's taxpayers are commonly overrated by outsiders, there has been, on the whole, an economic advantage in efficiency and cost resulting from the municipalization of at least several important necessities. The proviso is, however, strongly enjoined that the success of the system depends on it being kept absolutely clear of politics. Politics is the stumbling block to public ownership in Canada and the United States, and has been, perhaps, the greatest obstacle, to quote an example, to the financial success of the Intercolonial Railway. The trouble has been aggravated in this case, because the "pull" for the reduction of rates, improvement of service, personal and local privileges (such as free passes, cheap fares, etc., to say nothing of demands for employment, and grafts of various kinds), has come, necessarily, from the people living along the road, who were individually far more interested in securing direct advantages than economy of administration, while, on the other hand, those Canadians who were concerned in having the running cost kept within the income lived mostly at a distance from the scene of operations, and, therefore, exerted little influence in having expenditures kept down by strict business methods. The consequence is that the I. C. R. patrons have been