generally, should neutralize much of the good work in which he is engaged, by running off after such an absurd myth as the "general purpose cow." Of course the breeders of Short Horns may perhaps feel grateful to him for bolstering up their business in this way, but we are far from attributing any improper motives to Professor Brown in this matter, though we cannot help regarding the special pleading in which he indulges on page 45 of his report as in rather bad taste. It would be very far from our purpose to say one word against the Shorthorn cow as regards the purpose for which she has been bred for many generations, but while we are ready to admire her as a heavy beef producer, especially in cases where her product is to be stall fed as in Ontario, we are not prepared to quite overlook the claims of other breeds. Professor Brown says in the closing paragraph of his chapter entitled "which cattle for Ontario," "The special beef and the conjoint beef and dairy wants of Ontario can best be held up by the use of that stamp of Shorthorns—so easy to select and so often met with. Why, then, the need of more discussion?" This, were it a statement of fact established quite beyond the limit of legitimate discussion, is just the sort of thing a prudent man occupying Prof. Brown's position might well hesitate to utter, but among intelligent breeders and dairymen throughout Canada and the United States we think we should find more to dissent from, than assent to, the Professor's dictum. An efficient endorsation of any particular cattle interest should be given with extreme caution.

But there is another way in which this matter should have been looked at. Does Professor Brown suppose the Shorthorn, the Jersey, the Hereford, or the Polled Angus cattle have reached their present high degree of excellence by the sort of purposeless breeding to which his "general purpose" theory directly points. Such animals as Clarence Kirklington, were produced by a rigid breeding out of the milking properties of the Shorthorns, while Mary Anne of St. Lambert and animals of her type have been the result of a thorough breeding out of the beef producing inclination. Is it desirable that these high types of excellence should be thrown aside for the purpose of furnishing the farmer with an animal that is neither the one nor the other? If this be so, let us go back to the mongrel at once, and declare by our action that the efforts of the most painstaking and successful breeders of beef producers and butter makers have been worse than thrown away, so far as the average Ontario farmer is concerned.

In a subsequent issue, after further perusal, we shall endeavor to deal with the report as a whole. As will be seen we have discussed this week only one page of the report.

THE CLYDESDALE CROSS.

We have had our say on this subject, and we are quite willing to abide the results of the experiments that are likely to be made by those believing in it. That some good animals may result from a union of the Clydesdale mare with the thoroughbred horse we are quite ready to expect, but should the business of producing half breds of this kind prove as profitable as that of coupling a thoroughbred horse with any of our large mares that have neither cleft, rump nor hairy gummy legs, we shall be surprised. Mr. Douglas asks a question, however, with the air of one who thought he had us very badly cornered. He wants to know where, when, and by whom his proposed cross had been tried. We cannot give the names of the breeders, as if we ever knew them we have long since forgotten them), but this much we can say, that about eleven or twelve years ago some of the farmers in Huntingdon, P. Q., and adjoining counties, tried the cross in question till they were pretty thoroughly sick of it, though the thoroughbred stallion employed was unquestionably a good one, being no other than the imported black stallion True Blue, some of whose half-bred daughters from good sized common mares have turned out remarkably well, and are now breeding to Day Star, and, if we mistake not, imported Moccasin.

As to C. I. D's letter we used the initials appended to it and no more, and though we like to see communications signed with the full name, we supposed that our esteemed friend's good taste had for once got the better of that candor for which every one who knows him will readily give him credit. Mr. Douglas need suffer no uneasiness as to our allusion to "practical horsemen" who had shipped trotters at a profit, we openly disavow having ever had any intention of including his name in the list.

LEAN STOCK IMPORTS.

BY SIR J. B. LAWES, BART., LL.D., F.R.S.

English Live Stock Journal.

Through the kindness of Mr. Moreton Frewen I have recently received a copy of his book on American competition published by Messrs. Chapman and Hall. Both in his book, and also in a letter published in the *Live Stock Journal* of the 10th July, Mr. Moreton Frewen advocates the introduction of store cattle into this country, to be fattened by our farmers, instead of the introduction of stock already fattened in the States; and in the same letter he invites me to give my judgment on "the question of lean stock imports to replace the present trade in dead meat."

"I will (he says), for this purpose, bring across a small consignment of these prairie cattle that have been fattening at Superior, in the State of Wisconsin. From Superior they will take ship a thousand miles down the great lakes to Buffalo; from Buffalo by rail to New York; from New York to Deptford for port slaughter. We can then, by reference to the live-weight scales in Chicago of the same day, establish the exact value of such cattle when lean on these prairies, and their cost of carriage to England; and then Sir John, with the help of his weighbridge, can tell the price obtaining for similar cattle in England. Such a test as this is worth all the theories ever written."

I am not quite sure that I understand Mr. Frewen's proposal, or—assuming it was carried out in accordance with his views—that it would quite meet our difficulties. Mr. Frewen's argument is that lean stock, and the food necessary to fatten them, can be sent over to Great Britain at a cheaper rate than the fat live animal, or the fattened carcass, and he goes into a number of calculations in regard to the amount of food required to produce a pound of beef.

There is one thing quite certain, and that is, if we are to fatten American cattle by the million, we must receive both the cattle and the food from the States. It is well known that in this country, as a general rule, where store animals are purchased in the market and fattened, they do not pay for their food, and that if the roots, hay, and cake that have been consumed for the purpose are valued at their market price, the result is generally a loss to be charged against the manure. Before the British farmers will consent to open their ports to lean stock with the risk of disease, they would require to be satisfied that the margin of profit was sufficient to cover such risk. As regards Mr. Frewen's proposal, if the matter could be arranged, I have no objection to carry out an experiment next winter by fattening 40 or 50 head of the prairie cattle, the food being sent over with them. In the States cattle are generally fattened on hay and corn, without succulent food, so there would be no difficulty as regards the transport.

Mr. Frewen, at page 34 of his pamphlet, discusses the comparative economy of bringing over beef, or the store animal and its food. He says that 2,600 pounds of mixed meal and hay —1,600 lbs. of the former, and 1,000 lbs. of the latter—will produce 250 lbs. of beef—by beef I conclude I may understand increase of live weight—and a little further on he estimates the cost of sending 1 lb. of beef to this country as equivalent to sending 7 lbs. of food, but in this case the beef would be carcass, and it would take twice 7 lbs. of food to produce 1 lb. of beef, assuming two-thirds of the increase of a fattening animal to be carcass. I should expect that the store animals would be very poor before they reached the farm-yards in the middle of England. An ox weighing 1,000 lbs. would contain not much more than 500 lbs. of carcass, and to make the animal fat enough for the English market would probably require an addition of 500 lbs. when the carcass would weigh about 820 to 850 lbs. Mr. Frewen estimates that 5,200 lbs. of food would produce this amount of increase, but I am inclined to think that more than this would be required. In one case you have to send over 1,000 tons of live animals, and 5,200 tons of food, and in the