

Holstein-Friesian Association and National Records.

We are requested to give the following memorial publicity through the columns of the "Farmer's Advocate":

To the Hon. Sydney Fisher, Dominion Minister of Agriculture, Ottawa:

Sir,—At the last annual meeting of the Holstein-Friesian Association of Canada, held in Toronto, February 1st, of this year, the Live-stock Commissioner proposed and outlined a scheme whereby our association and record would be nationalized, with headquarters at Ottawa, and whereby certificates issued therefrom would be approved by and receive the seal of your department. After some discussion the following resolution was passed:

"Resolved, that this association be nationalized; that the officers and directors, together with Mr. W. G. Ellis, be, and are hereby appointed a committee, with power to act and to confer with Mr. Hodson, for the purpose of arranging details. Provided, that the proposed nationalization allows this society to retain all its officers and its individuality, and, further, that no such arrangement will bind the society unless at least six officers sanction same, and that a copy of this resolution be forwarded to the Minister of Agriculture."

As you are aware, Sir, the Holstein-Friesian Association of Canada was the first live-stock association to solicit and secure Dominion incorporation. In the twenty-two years of its existence it has never asked or received any assistance from any government, Dominion or Provincial. It has the hearty support and confidence of Holstein-Friesian breeders in every Province of the Dominion, and its standing as a progressive, well-managed organization is unquestioned.

Since the above-mentioned date our association has been absolutely ignored. The committee appointed for the purpose has never been asked to meet the Live-stock Commissioner, nor were representatives of this association invited to attend the organization meeting of the Canadian National Live-stock Association, called by the Commissioner, and held in his own office on April 19th and 20th. Newspaper reports show that Mr. Hodson has met the committees from the associations representing all the other breeds of live stock; that the committees have completed arrangements and signed agreements re nationalization, and that he invited delegates from each of these associations to attend the national meeting.

Although our association has for years advocated national records, approved of by your Department, there has developed among our members during the last few months a feeling of uneasiness at the methods employed to induce breeders to adopt the proposed scheme. If we did not accept the scheme we were to be deprived of the privilege of shipping our registered stock at half rates over Canadian railroads; our handbooks, though incorporated by Dominion Act, would not be recognized by the Dominion Department of Agriculture, and a new Holstein-Friesian Herdbook would be established.

We know that you, as Dominion Minister of Agriculture, are anxious to protect the interests of ALL Canadian breeders, and we feel sure that had you been able to give this matter your personal attention, our association would not thus have been ignored and discriminated against, nor would our representatives have been omitted from the delegates invited to the Canadian National Live-stock Association.

As members of the committee appointed with power to act in this matter of nationalization, we beg to lay before you ALL the facts. We feel sure that you entertain nothing but the kindest feeling toward our association, and that you will, after investigation, inform our board as to the cause of this discrimination.

We have the honor to be, Sir,

Yours very truly,
MATT. RICHARDSON, President.
G. W. CLEMONS, Secretary.

Signed on behalf of the Holstein-Friesian Association of Canada.

The Dairy Calf Crop.

That dairy-bred calves are fit only for vealing purposes is a recognized fact. Once feeders could be found with sufficient tenacity to develop them into beef, but that beef was so unpopular with butchers that the practice of maturing dairy-bred calves has all been abandoned. Calves have been marketed in such numbers at Chicago as to furnish an index of the rapid development of the dairy industry in Indiana, Illinois, Wisconsin and Iowa. It is a movement that suggests the breeding of beef calves as an avenue to wealth. Good beef calves will be worth money in the near future—enough, at least, to pay the cost of raising them and a decent profit added.—[Live-stock World.]

If You Want Anything

AND DON'T KNOW WHERE TO GET IT, AN ADVERTISEMENT IN THE "WANT AND FOR SALE" COLUMN OF THE "FARMER'S ADVOCATE AND HOME MAGAZINE" WILL GET IT FOR YOU. THE FARMER'S ADVOCATE AND HOME MAGAZINE, LONDON, ONT.

Dehorning Profitable and Humane.

To the Editor "Farmer's Advocate":

I noticed an article in the columns of your paper re dehorning cattle, for and against, and it certainly leaves an opening for discussion. I have had some experience with horned and dehorned, and speak very strongly in favor of the latter. We must admit, of course, that the operation is seldom performed without a certain amount of pain, but I have known both man and beast to suffer more from the effects of an ugly rip or tear, caused by an unnecessary attack from a horned bovine, than the dehorning process could possibly bring about. On one occasion a cow was hooked in the udder, resulting in the loss of one-half the udder, to say nothing about the pain she suffered for days until the inflammation caused by the wound could be checked. All this might have been prevented if the offender's horns had been removed sooner. This is only one case; many other instances might be related, some resulting in death. There is still another important item, namely, the convenience with which dehorned cattle can be fed and watered in a group, dehorning having a tendency to "civilize" them, if you will allow the expression. Possibly a dehorned cow may make it rather unpleasant for another when in close quarters, but is no more to be compared with a horned one than is the back of a knife to the keen edge when firmly pressed against the flesh.

I have seen the saw and patent clippers used for dehorning, and prefer the saw. Have also used the chemically-prepared hornstop, and have noticed that it is not entirely painless either, as the calf appears to be very uneasy for an hour or so after the application, owing, I suppose, to the blistering qualities of the preparation, but on the whole I think it the best way. If, however, this has been neglected, the operation can be performed without much trouble by the use of a fine, sharp saw, when the animal is from eight to twelve months old, the loss of blood apparently having no bad effect, and if properly done the horns will not grow. Some people argue that the horns being the cow's only means of defence, it is violating the laws of nature to have them removed, but, in my opinion, until we can produce a breed of cattle that are humane enough to use their horns only at the proper time and place, the sooner and the closer they are off the better.

Frontenac Co., Ont.

J. BRIDEN LEONARD.

More About Dehorning.

To the Editor "Farmer's Advocate":

I read with interest the articles on dehorning in your valuable paper, and really I think Alex. Young writes some absurd statements. The article in March 23rd issue only suggested that the Government might take up the matter and pass a law compelling stock-raisers to dehorn. I don't think the Government will ever pass any such a law, because a man is perfectly justified in either cutting the horns off his cattle or leaving them on, but no one in our neighborhood, or for miles around, thinks it wrong to dehorn his cattle—cows and all—and every steer-feeder and dairyman that I have had a talk with thinks it a great benefit to have the horns cut off. Mr. Young thinks it cruel to cut the horns off with an instrument. Well, it may and certainly does give them pain for a few seconds, but it is just like a man having an aching tooth drawn—it hurts during the operation and is sore for a few days after, but the very small amount of pain the animals suffer then is nothing compared to what cattle suffer from being gored while drinking from troughs, feeding around the straw-stack, or licking salt in the pasture field, to say nothing of the accidents that happen to the human race from the horns. How very pleasing it is to see a bunch of cows or young cattle crowding up to the water trough, all drinking peaceably, and retiring without a single rip or gore. And any small boy may safely tie in the dehorned cows. It is a great labor-saver to have the horns cut off, because it permits us to safely put a bunch of cattle in a shed or box stall and let them run loose, in which condition, it is claimed by experimenters, they do just as well as if tied up.

It has been proven that the loss of a small amount of blood by a steer before being put in to fatten in the fall, insures better health during the fattening period. As for cows, no wise dairyman will cut the horns off during the milking period; there is ample time for that in the fall or winter, when most cows are dry for a month or two. I have seen thousands of cattle dehorned, but very few with a long stump on one or both sides, and never saw one with a sixteenth part of an inch of the animal's head cut off. Our men have straight eyes in their heads, and strong steady nerves when operating on an animal's head. Perhaps Mr. Young is right about it giving the animal less pain by applying caustic

potash when the calf is a few days old, but one has to apply plenty and make sure work, or else that is the very time a stump or deformed horn will grow, and even if no stump grows the animal's head grows just as hard as when the horns are allowed to grow till two years of age. I think the best time to take the horns off is in the fall, when the animal is rising two years old. It then has a tendency to tame or subdue any unruly or masterful ones, and keeps them quieter, than if the horns had been removed with potash; however, either may be practical. I don't think it necessary to dehorn pure-bred bulls; they look better with horns; besides, we put rings in the nose of such animals to facilitate handling. I feel quite safe in saying that one hundred bulls become cross without being teased or badly managed for every one that does from such causes, and much safer in saying that there are a thousand men that would rather face an angry bull without horns for every one that would face the bull with horns. Any intelligent stock-raiser knows it is the nature of bulls of some breeds to become cross with age.

Fortunately, nature caused a few muleys to grow, to let man see the difference and profit of hornless cattle. The sum and substance of the whole matter is this: It's very profitable to dehorn cattle, and if the Government ever does anything about it, let them pass a law compelling the use of the most humane methods for the operation.

E. E. G.

Waterloo Co., Ont.

[NOTE.—Mr. Thos. Crawford, M. P. P. for West Toronto, has introduced a bill in the Ontario Legislature, for the purpose of making the dehorning of cattle compulsory. The bill provides that all steers, heifers and bulls shall be dehorned at one year or under, a penalty of \$10 being provided for failure to comply with the law. While the bill is general, no doubt exemptions will be made in favor of pure-bred breeding stock, and it is improbable that it will pass this session or in its present form. It is generally conceded that there are many advantages from dehorning in the case of beef cattle and dairy cows, and the question of cruelty depends largely on the age at which the operation is performed and the skillful use of the means employed.—Ed. F. A.]

Would Remove the Horns.

To the Editor "Farmer's Advocate":

In your issue of April 13th I noticed an article headed "Against Dehorning." Now, I should like to know what this man is driving at. In his article I can only find two points advanced by him. The first is, he says the master of the herd is master anyway, and he can do just as much harm without horns as he could before. Now, I should like him to watch cattle that have horns at a water-trough. Do they all come up at once and drink quietly, or does some big steer give an old cow a rip in the side and cause the blood to trickle down her side, much the same as he describes. His second point is the awkwardness and carelessness of the general farmer in dehorning his cattle. Allow me to kindly tell him that I think he is mistaken. The farmer who follows this business knows how to make a good job; and always does so on cows in our county. The beginner may not do so well, but after he dehorns a few he will soon see what is wanted.

Mr. Young says, "Raise a breed that has no horns." Now, if a man has a field that will make him more money in wheat than in oats, he will sow wheat if he is wise. The same is true about cattle. The breed that suits the man and makes him the most money, are the ones to raise. Would any breeder of pure-bred Durhams or Jerseys sell his herd for the sake of a few horns? Those black cattle without horns may be all right; if so, why are there not more of them in the country. I do not know of one herd in this section. I sincerely believe that the Shorthorns are here to stay, with or without horns, and the progressive farmer or breeder is likely to dispense with the horns before the animal.

J. T. HARVEY.

Wellington Co., Ont.

A Costly Cow.

The Colorado State Supreme Court has affirmed the decision of four lower courts in the famous Stevens-Smith cow case, which was begun fifteen years ago, and has cost \$2,500 in attorney's fees and court costs. The value of the cow was \$30, and she has been dead twelve years.

Stevens placed the cow in a pasture fifteen years ago. While he was in California the owner of the pasture sold it, with his herd, including Stevens' cow, to R. M. Smith. When Stevens returned he demanded the cow, offering to pay for her pasturage. Smith refused to give her up, and the long legal fight began. Stevens says he will carry the case to the Federal Supreme Court, if possible.