

but to the family that only keep one cow, they are hard to beat. And, as I remarked in one of my former letters, when once you own one you always want one afterwards. No other cow's milk seems to fill the bill.

FARMER JOHN.

New Glasgow, Nova Scotia,  
August 7, 1885.

### Mr. Auld vs. Galloways.

EDITOR CANADIAN LIVE-STOCK JOURNAL.

Mr. Auld, in your August number, has given us two letters—one an old communication copied from the *London Live-Stock Journal*, signed "Verax," contains the following: "He (Mr. Auld) had put forward claims on behalf of the Aberdeen-Angus breed, which could not be sustained by recorded evidence." This is plain enough, and shows what Mr. Auld's own friends have to say about him as a writer on their favorite breed. Stronger language is needed to describe his assertions about the Galloways. He opens his own letter with an apology, blames the printer and his own unnecessary anger over a paragraph written by Mr. Kough, and which Mr. Auld says is of the "newest manufacture—brand new." Here it is as quoted by Mr. Auld: "When the breed (Aberdeen-Angus) was first established, which was some eighty or a hundred years ago, it was done by crossing

#### THE OLD GALLOWAY BREED

with a Shorthorn or a horned bull, and then judiciously selecting, so as to produce an ideal type in shape and color." This to my mind does not give a fair account of the origin of the Aberdeen-Angus. My opinion is, that for a much longer period there have been polled cattle in Angus. There may have been, and probably was, some judicious Shorthorn crossing, more especially among some families of the Polled Aberdeen; but whether this statement of Mr. Kough's be correct or not, it certainly is not new. Mr. Auld himself admits having previously heard it made in his hearing at a public sale. And Youatt (edition 1842, page 106), says, "Besides these (the Aberdeen shire native cattle—horned) there is a breed of polled cattle, said by some to be different from the Galloways, and to have existed from time immemorial; others, however, with greater reason, consider them as the Galloways introduced about thirty years ago," and somewhat changed by change of climate and soil. Professor Davidson, in "Domestic Animals of Great Britain," page 312, says of the Polled Angus breed: "This breed has a certain resemblance to the Galloways, and a mixture of blood seems to have taken place between them; but the cattle are less compact in form, and longer in their limbs than

#### THE TRUE GALLOWAYS,

and have not the depth of rib so characteristic of the latter breed. They have a freer though not a softer skin, and a less rough coat of hair than the Galloways. They are better treated when calves, and during the whole period of their growth, and though less uniform and confirmed in their character than the Galloways, owe more to art and careful culture." The same writer, page 316, says: "During the present century a variety has been established and widely extended, now generally termed the Polled Aberdeen-shire breed, in which the absence of horns may be ascribed in part to the introduction of the hornless cattle of other districts, but mainly to the breeding from animals of the native stock. This modern variety, however, scarcely even yet presents that uniformity of character which constitutes a true breed, although it is continually approaching to this condition. Into this district the Shorthorn breed has been introduced. It is cultivated by several breeders in the pure state, but more generally it is made to cross the native stock, by which means a present profit is obtained." W. C. L. Martin, editing "Youatt," (edition 1860, page 73), says, "The Angus polled cattle, like many other breeds, are exceedingly valuable in their own climate and on their own soil, but they do not answer the expectations of their purchasers when driven south. They yielded a good remunerating price, but they are not equal to

#### THEIR ANCESTORS THE GALLOWAYS

in quickness of feeding or fitness of grain. They attain a larger size but do not pay the grazier or butcher so well." Mr. Kough, therefore, if not ex-

rect, has others with him, and Mr. Auld's statement, that it is of the newest manufacture, is therefore not strictly correct.

The assertion that the late Earl of Selkirk declared that previous to about 1750 the Galloway was a horned breed, is new and strange to me. Had this been brought to my notice before the death of the late Earl, I would have written, asking him to contradict it, as being a mistake. Even were it true, it does not help Mr. Auld out of his dilemma. It would require a mythical Baron to corroborate Mr. Auld's assertion that "In Galloway there has always only been a 'very ugly horned breed.'"

Mr. Auld does not try to prove his former assertion that "the Galloway as it at present exists is descended from probably the most mixed race imaginable." Instead he gives a picture and a threat—and seeks to retire under cover of these. The picture is evidently taken in the primitive days. He says it is an exact copy of a prize Galloway at Lord Somerville's show in 1805. Who is this Lord Somerville? Where held he this Galloway show? Why should he set up in opposition to the Highland Society and squander his wealth on such poor pictures? The threat Mr. Auld makes is childish. If I provoke him he will do terrible things. Bosh! If Mr. Auld knows anything, let us have it, and the proofs. I believe the Galloways are a pure breed; that Mr. Auld's assertion to the contrary "can not be sustained by any recorded evidence." We want to get at the truths in this matter—the whole truth—established by facts—not wild assertion, such as any "crank" can make.

The statement Mr. Auld makes about "scurs" is an important one, and is quite new to me. If Mr. Auld is correct, the matter should be at once investigated—probed to the bottom. I will at once call the attention of the executive of the Galloway Association to the matter. He is very reckless, however, in saying, "All the authors I have consulted refer in large terms to the loose dangling horns of Galloways." In other portions of Mr. Auld's communications he refers to the following authors whom he has consulted, viz: Youatt, Allen, Parkinson, Coleman, McCombie, Marshall, Young, Culley, Lawrence, Henderson, etc. All these do not refer to Galloways having loose dangling horns. Mr. Auld's statement cannot be sustained.

It is not argument to misrepresent,—which Mr. Auld does when he tries to tell his readers that I have said the Galloways are the cattle to starve. On the contrary the statement was that the Aberdeen-Angus would starve where the Galloways can live, thrive and make good, wholesome beef. For proof I refer Mr. Auld to the late Mr. McCombie's "Cattle and Cattle Breeders," 1869, page 18. I must resent the attack made on Rev. Mr. Gillespie. He misquotes that gentleman, and tells us "I" (Mr. Auld) know much more of the "ancient" history of the "polled" Galloway than Mr. Gillespie does, have consulted more writers on the subject than he knows of. Modest Mr. Auld! There must have been plenty of "auld" horns about Tillyfour in your young days.

D. MCCRAE.

### The Herd Book Question.

EDITOR CANADIAN LIVE-STOCK JOURNAL.

SIR.—Since the query of "D. H." appeared in the April JOURNAL of 1884, regarding his heifer's pedigree, certainly much that was unknown to young breeders has been brought to light. And, sir, I fully believe that, with the extermination of scrubs, you have also a mission in bringing this apparently troublesome question to a satisfactory conclusion. From what has been written by Messrs. Dryden, "Breeder," and others, it is evident that neither of the herd books is up to its respective standard; but whether from mistake or design is not quite clear. This is a matter of very great importance to many of us throughout the Dominion who are investing some of our hard-earned dollars in Shorthorns. Though owning a few pure-bred cattle, I have not got the length of having either herd book to refer to, so that I would like Mr. Dryden to explain the following case, which I expect must have come under his observation. In the catalogue of cattle, entered for the first sale held in Toronto under the auspices of the B. A. Association, I noticed on page 4 the pedigree of Louise, tracing to the imported dam Lady Eden, got by Hudsworth, a bull without a number, next dam Fisher Roan (also imported), got by Maynard's Duke of Wellington, also unnumbered. On page 28 of same catalogue we

find another pedigree tracing to same dams. Those, I presume, are registered in the B. A. H. B. Now what I want to know is this, Were the imported dams anything but grades, or did crossing the Atlantic make them pure-bred? Here are two instances of descendants of old country grades (as it appears) being received by the B. A. H. B., and of course the C. H. B. would also register them. Does this not show the rule regarding the tracing to imported stock to be an absurdity? Is it not disloyal to Canadian breeding to reject a pedigree that might have a dozen straight crosses from, say, the best of pure bulls, because the dam away back was not imported, when such pedigrees as I refer to above would be received? In May JOURNAL, page 124, you, Mr. Editor, in reply to my former letter, express the opinion that "importers, through self-interest, if nothing more, seek a long pedigree," but you see such is not always the case.

There is another point regarding pedigrees of imported cattle, which I ask to be explained in your journal. We often see that a dam is got by the son of a bull which is numbered. May not the son's dam be a common scrub for all that is known to the contrary? And yet either of the herd books will register a pedigree with such a cross if of an imported animal, but let a breeder try to get a like pedigree of a Canadian bred one with a cross of a Canadian bred bull—son of such and such a numbered one—even though all the other sites and the dam of a few generations back were imported; and I expect the officers of either associations would look at it in scorn. Many Canadians seem at the present time to be prejudiced against Canadian-bred animals, and in the show ring particularly have I noticed this. Some judges will give the preference to an imported animal, even when the Canadian opponent (bred perhaps from an imported sire and dam) may undoubtedly be the better one. It seems to me the B. A. Association's object is to place a premium on imported cattle, let the breeding be more or less defective.

I cannot see why the seven cross standard is not really higher and therefore better than that which only requires to have all sires and dams imported or trace to imported stock. Let the herd books be amalgamated with the seven cross standard, whether Canadian or imported, and let it be adhered to without fear or favor, and as far as possible without mistake, is in my opinion the best way out of the difficulty.

POSA.

### Crops—Bank Barns—Scrubs.

EDITOR CANADIAN LIVE-STOCK JOURNAL.

DEAR SIR,—The stock in this section is doing remarkably well this season. The frequent showers that have fallen have kept the pastures fresh and green. There is now more feed in the fields than can be consumed by the stock of each farm, and should the weather continue thus for six weeks more, live stock will go into winter quarters in grand flesh. The soiling feed of western corn and oats, and peas that we had provided has not been used. Roots are very thrifty. The frequent rains have spoiled the crop of spring wheat, which when sown late has rusted badly, and is now being cut for feed while yet green, in this whole region, so there will be an extra sheaf for the cows this coming winter.

I am pleased to state that this section is being well provided with bank-barns. Within a radius of three miles no less than thirteen have been erected the present season, which means not only better accommodation for stock, but a saving as well of one-fourth of the food usually required. In a two mile range here there are thirteen barns, and nine of them have stone basements.

The greatest drawback this section has to contend with is the "scrub nuisance" of every kind. Stallions, bulls, rams and boars roam at large, and do an immense amount of damage to the country. Yet we believe still more is being done by those that are being kept for public use. I wish I had the same privilege as friend Yorke and kept a pound. Like the editor, I had our best heifer tested in this way by a neighbor who keeps a scrub "muley," kept of course for his own use, but he managed to break through the fences somehow. We don't like to quarrel with our neighbors, but somehow "old Adam" rises up within us, and we feel like resorting to fire-arms the next time our premises are visited by that "muley."

One man keeps a runt of a boar which digs under the fence and lets us in for December pigs. Another