

properly for their future life-work on the farm, as to educate those of them properly who turn their face in the direction of professions. Let them send earnest young men to the college, and they will be sent back laden with the treasures of agricultural knowledge, a heritage in the benefits of which an entire neighborhood will participate ultimately. We make no claim to the gift of prophesy, but we hazard the prediction in the entire confidence of its fulfilment, that the day is not far distant when graduates from an agricultural college will be honored by the farmers as those in other lines are now, when they will be chosen as leaders at public gatherings, and will some day be numerous in the halls of the Legislature. Surely more than one farmer in five thousand can find the means next winter to send his son to this Institution. A far larger proportion of them send them to the commercial colleges, medical schools and universities, in the latter instances at more than twice the outlay incurred in sending them to the agricultural college. We are not faulting them for doing the one, but for leaving the other undone.

In all earnestness we ask of our farmers who have the means, are they doing fairly by their sons whom they expect to till their farms after them, if they deprive them of the advantages of the most direct agency we have of giving them an insight into the scientific side of their calling? Are they giving them fair play? Would it not be a thousand times better to start them with a full and vigorous education, and with less of fee simple than with more of the latter and but little of the former? Give the boys of the farm a chance.

How Farmers can Best Protect Themselves Against Combines.

This is a burning question to the farmers of Canada, and is becoming more so every day. It also vitally affects other classes along with the farmer, but in a less degree, for, while the combines only affect the cost of living usually to the laboring man, and, we may add, the cost of burial, they very much enhance the cost of the machinery which the farmer must use in order successfully to carry on his work.

In a recent article in the columns of a contemporary Mr. Jas. Laidlaw, Guelph, discusses the subject with a good deal of ability. He treats of the nature of combines in a historical sense in a masterly way, but when he grapples with the principal idea, that of the means to be adopted in seeking this protection, he is not so successful. Like the wise men who figure in that beautiful prize poem of holy writ, the book of Job, and who wrestle in vain with the mysterious problem of Divine Providence, Mr. Laidlaw seems to wrestle in vain with the means to be adopted in slaying this vile serpent of modern growth, with all her numerous progeny. He stops short where he should go on. He is undoubtedly right when he represents that the beast must be chained by the strong arm of the law, and that men should be elected to parliament who favor such a law, but to wait patiently for this in the ordinary course of events and with unorganized agitation, would lay the present generation in their graves without the attainment of the desired end.

It is true, as Mr. Laidlaw says, that it is not possible for farmers to meet combination with counter combination as to the regulation of production and a fixity of price. This would be wrong if it were possible. Such combinations are the children of unrighteous mammon. They cannot exist where the spirit of the Tenth Command has not first been ignored, nor can they breathe in the presence of the sanctions of the golden rule. Meeting iniquity with

counter iniquity is a poor policy even where practicable, for never in the history of the world were men authorized to do evil that good may come.

But though farmers cannot and should not combine to fix prices, they can and should combine for self-protection, and it is only by this means that we hope to get relief. The Farmers' Institutes are the medium through which this relief must come if it is to be immediate. It is true that Parliament has taken the bull by the horns, but even so, left to itself, the outlook is not reassuring, for many of its present members owe their seats directly or indirectly to the friends of combines.

Let this be one of the burning questions at the meeting of the Central Farmers' Institute next winter, when resolutions can be voted, urging upon Parliament the passing of a law rendering combines illegal, and those engaging in them amenable to punishment in some form. There are now no less than sixty of these institutes in as many of the ridings of Canada, and before the end of the year there will be others. There are also agencies in the other provinces which can be set to work—farmers' organizations which, if not so systematically organized as those in Ontario, may, nevertheless, render substantial aid. These can be communicated with, and their co-operation secured. The pressure which these organizations united could bring upon Parliament, would surely suffice to secure the desired end at its first sitting. If it did not, then, through the same agency, bring pressure to bear upon candidates, that would secure from them assurances of good conduct when the next election season arrives. Whatever help existing granges and farmers' clubs can afford should be diligently sought and thankfully received.

Cattle Running at Large on the Highway.

In newly settled districts where even the pastures are usually unfenced, this may be a very proper thing, but in older settlements where the lands are all enclosed, the practice appears to us to be wholly indefensible. The law at present leaves it with the municipalities to prohibit live-stock from running at large. Where this interdict has not been issued, anyone, from the nabob farmer of the neighborhood to the poorest peasant, has an equal claim in the eyes of the law to the much-coveted grass that grows upon the highway.

The battle of prohibitory municipal legislation is being fought in many of our townships with a rancor that is worthy of a better cause. It is provoking lifelong enmities, and in many instances ejecting council boards composed of men somewhat in advance of their age. So that for the good of all concerned it seems to us that the time is near at hand when the Legislature should step in and say that in coming time live-stock of any kind may not run upon the highway.

The principal arguments pro and con are these: The advocates of liberty say, (1) That the grass upon the roadsides uneaten is a nuisance to pedestrians in times of wet, when they must either wade through affectionate clay or get bedrabbled walking through the long grass. (2) That it is about the only way in which the poor man can get summer feed for his cow, as farmers usually are unwilling to let pasture. Their opponents argue (1) that now that fencing is scarce and dear, it is not easy to fence sufficiently against the highway stock that is usually of the vagrant character. (2) That it is very inconvenient for the farmers to have to keep the gates closed between the yards and the road, which they must do if stock is allowed to run. (3) That the poor man can

mow grass along the highway for his cow, and so have her better kept than when chancing it with droves of others for a livelihood in search of grass roots.

There is a strong objection to allowing stock to run upon the road, which will be more pronounced in the future than in the past. It is that it is fatal to the growth of young trees that may be planted there. Farmers are offered a bonus who will plant trees along the highway when they reach a certain age. This excellent law will be almost wholly inoperative unless stock is absolutely prohibited from pasturing on the road. It matters not though a herdsman is along, they will wantonly destroy the unprotected trees.

Those who favor live-stock pasturing upon the road, with or without a keeper, are the enemies of progress. They have never advanced a single argument in favor of the practice, a relic of a bygone age, that is tenable. Their chief reliance is the argument of the poor man's cow, but this argument from the lips of farmers who turn out their own stock to pasture with the poor man's cow, soon loses its virtue, and these are usually the loud champions of the poor man's cause. They are very willing that the poor man's cow may have one chance in twenty with their own stock on the road. Farmers who make a practice of turning out live-stock on the road are so far the greatest enemies of the poor man. Those who oppose the practice are his friends, could he but see it, for they would willingly let him have the whole of the grass upon the highway if he would cut it and take it away. The former show very plainly by their predilections what manner of farmers they are. However successfully they may grow grain, they have an inferior, unimproved class of stock, for never yet in a fully settled country was a good class of stock produced by pasturing on the highway. Good stock is regarded by the owners as too valuable to risk its hazards of accident, or to become emaciated from wandering in search of grass. That farmers are found advocating the continuance of the barbarism in old communities is an impeachment upon their inhumanity to the poor man, an evidence of an avarice that is narrow, and a stigma upon the character of their farming. They put their stock out on the highway either to save their own pastures or because these have failed. Until their own pastures grow their stock should be comfortably housed, and when these fail, a good supplement of oats, peas and vetches, or of fodder corn, will be much better for them than lowing on the highway because the food is not.

The poor man's family cow should be considered, carefully considered. Next to the wife of his bosom, the cow is one of the greatest blessings God ever gave him. To his family she is both meat and drink; but reflection should have taught him long ago that on the highway, fighting for an existence with the kine of half a dozen avaricious farmers, is not just the place for his cow. She wanders so far away in quest of food that if the boy put in half the time searching for her in growing mangolds, the milk supply would be doubled, and the poor beast might spend most of her time chewing her cud in the little yard by the stable. Most poor men who have a cow can rent a small piece of land adjoining the cow stable. Half an acre is enough. Sow this in part with soiling crop and in part with roots, and along with the grass cut on the highway there will be plenty of summer food and the cow always at hand. The poor man has the best right to the grass of the wayside, for if the gleanings of the fig-harvest were his in Palestine, the grass of the roadside should be his in Canada.

We have reached the dawn of an age which is going to revolutionize the appearance of our country,