

D 1866

it  
ecided  
farm-  
L. The  
FY  
HAND  
N.ONT.  
young  
Principal.

S  
RIO.  
let  
BAY,  
MING,  
S,  
ORONTO

OFITS  
M.  
at a very  
als but the  
ts in Gen-  
ck-raising,  
g, etc., etc.  
n agricul-  
ger profita-  
entioning  
e, Limited  
PRINCIPAL.  
ton and car  
Toronto.  
MENT.  
roperty -  
PAINTS.  
uaran-  
D.,  
nto, Ont  
LIFE  
NY.  
ONTO.  
OLLARS  
6,600,000  
death rate,  
per cent, on  
re in and a  
anted. Lib-  
N. Pres.

Y.  
RIO.

# The Farmer's Advocate

## and Home Magazine.

"PERSEVERE AND SUCCEED."

ESTABLISHED 1866.

VOL. XXXIX.

LONDON, ONT., AND WINNIPEG, MAN., MAY 26, 1904.

No. 609

EDITORIAL.

**Township vs. District Agricultural Society Grants.**

We understand that some of the Township Agricultural Societies in the Province of Ontario are complaining bitterly of the arrangement under which, in the distribution of Provincial funds, district societies secure a larger grant than the township societies receive, although many of the latter claim to be conducting decidedly the best fairs, and doing the most good.

According to the Agriculture and Arts Act, district, township and horticultural societies organized or recognized thereunder are entitled to grants by complying with certain conditions as to membership, reports and returns to the Minister of Agriculture, holding annual meetings as prescribed, and expending funds in harmony with the objects of the society. The division of the legislative grant for each district shall be made as follows:

(a) An amount not exceeding \$420 shall be subject to division among the Township and Horticultural Societies of each district, to be divided in proportion to the number of paid-up members of the previous year, as shown by the treasurer's audited statement and the certified list of members sent to the Department; provided that on or before the first day of September of the year in which the grant is paid the treasurer shall make affidavit as to the number of members for the current year, as provided for in section 19 of the Act; but any one society shall not receive more than \$140, nor shall any one society receive more than three times the amount reported as paid up by its members, and not more than one hundred and forty members shall be counted for any one society in making the division of the grant. 59 V., c. 14, s. 6.

(b) In case a Township or Horticultural Society is situated within two districts, it shall receive from each of the grants made to these districts, but in the proportion of only one-half of the number of its members in each case.

(c) The remainder of the legislative grant for each district, after thus paying to the Township and Horticultural Societies (if there are any) the moneys to which they are entitled, shall be payable to the District Society.

(d) The district of the City of Toronto shall not receive more than \$550 in any year; and the districts of the City of Kingston, the City of Hamilton, the City of London, the City of Ottawa, the Town and Township of Cornwall, and the Town and Township of Niagara, shall not receive more than \$350, respectively, in any year.

(e) The districts of North Muskoka and South Muskoka shall not receive in any year more than \$600, of which not more than \$220 shall be subject to division among the Township and Horticultural Societies, and of which no single Township Society shall receive more than \$100. 58 V., c. 11, s. 21 (b-e). [Note.—This clause is repealed.]

For example, we note by the current year's Ontario public accounts, that the London District Agricultural Society received \$210, and the East Middlesex Agricultural Society \$380, making a total of \$590, which goes to the support of the Western Fair, held in London. The London Horticultural Society receives \$140, which is expended in the furtherance of its objects, by holding flower shows, etc. N. Dorchester, London and W. Nissouri Townships, in the constituency of E. Middlesex, get \$140 each. In some other ridings,

township societies receive as low as \$45, \$60, \$70 and \$80 grants.

The suggestion has been made that the Government grant be distributed to agricultural societies in proportion to the amount they actually expend for agricultural purposes, which would do away with the distinction between district and township societies. To determine this might require more than a cursory totalling up and comparing of the agricultural schedules of the prize-lists as printed. The Provincial Department of Agriculture has now a superintendent of agricultural societies (Mr. H. B. Cowan), and it occurs to us that some useful commission work might be done by that officer this year, by making a visitation of agricultural society shows, and a careful enquiry into the way in which funds are expended, prizes paid, etc. It is no easy matter to devise a plan that will give equally good results under different conditions, because, as in other enterprises, all depends on "the men behind the show." If they have the correct idea of the purpose and plan of conducting an exhibition of educational value to the community, the show will be correspondingly successful and beneficial, and vice versa. In the meantime, we will be pleased to have this important subject discussed through the "Farmer's Advocate" by those whose experience and knowledge will be helpful in illuminating the question, and reaching conclusions upon which future enactment may be based, that will make for improvement in one of the most useful means that was ever devised for agricultural advancement, viz., the agricultural fair.

**Agricultural Progress Illustrated.**

If we except those farmers of Manitoba and the Northwest Territories, with whom the production of hard wheat is the specialty par excellence, and for which the natural conditions have been peculiarly favorable, the agriculturists of Canada have placed their main reliance upon live-stock husbandry, or "mixed farming," as it is sometimes called. In our judgment the results, as we have observed them from the Maritime Provinces westward, have vindicated the wisdom of the system. Fundamentally, it is sound, and, therefore, safe. Upon this theory of successful farming the "Farmer's Advocate" has been conducted for nearly forty years, and we see good and sufficient reasons why the policy should still be continued. Fortunately, data is available whereby these results can be tangibly measured. The Province of Ontario furnishes a fine example of the results of an intelligent system of live-stock husbandry, and in the official records of the Provincial Government Bureau of Industries, we have a carefully compiled and reliable record of results. A fair period for consideration would be the years from 1897 to 1902, the returns for which we have before us. The increases in the capital of the Ontario farms, and of products sold, have been truly remarkable. There have been corresponding reductions in the amount of chattel mortgages against farmers, and of the number and amount of mortgages to loan companies, largely incurred for the purchase and improvement of farm property, which is very strong evidence of the financial progress of the farming community, especially when we consider the splendid improvements made at the same time in farm dwellings and barns, and in the general conditions of living on the farm. By means of animals and their products exported from the Province, money has been pouring back into the coffers of the agriculturist. Contrasting

the years 1900-1-2 with the former three-year period of 1897-8-9, we find an increase in the value of animal and agricultural products of domestic products exported of no less than \$55,497,000.

We give herewith a number of these statistics, which are anything but dry reading:

**CAPITAL OF ONTARIO FARMERS.**

Total value of land, buildings, implements and live stock on Ontario farms:

1897	\$ 905,000,000
1898	928,000,000
1899	948,000,000
1900	975,000,000
1901	1,001,000,000
1902	1,045,000,000

Total values at market prices of all field crops:

1897	\$107,000,000
1898	110,000,000
1899	106,000,000
1900	115,000,000
1901	128,000,000
1902	146,000,000

Value of live stock sold during the year:

1897	\$30,000,000
1898	34,000,000
1899	38,000,000
1900	42,000,000
1901	47,000,000
1902	53,000,000

Cheese produced in Ontario:

1897	\$11,719,000
1902	14,792,000

Swine sold or slaughtered in Ontario:

1897	\$10,080,000
1902	20,154,000

Included in total live stock in previous table.

Cattle sold:

1897	\$18,850,000
1902	28,840,000

Chattel mortgages against farmers:

	Number.	Amount.
1897	12,108	\$3,986,600
1902	7,285	2,637,925

Values of the live stock on farms:

1897	\$ 98,650,000
1902	140,545,000

Farmers' poultry:

	On Hand.	Sold.
1897	2,318,088	1,088,914
1902	2,957,286	1,898,289

Deposits in Government Savings Bank:

1897	\$48,984,976
1902	58,488,188

No figures published distinguishing farmers from others.

Mortgages to Loan Societies:

	Value of Real Estate Mortgages.	Amount of Loans Secured.	Overdue Mortgages.
1897	\$229,270,328	\$101,548,225	\$2,941,208
1901	189,613,577	118,291,151	1,585,817

No figures available distinguishing one class from another.

Values of animal and agricultural products exported. Domestic production:

1897	\$55,538,592
1898	75,834,858
1899	68,140,758
1900	81,856,450
1901	78,680,966
1902	94,517,019

1900-1-2 exceeded 1897-8-9 by the following amount: \$55,497,000.

Facts like the foregoing deserve very careful study, not simply because they are calculated to give us good heart, as to the condition and progress of agriculture, but for the still more valuable lesson they teach for the future, as to the direction in which the operations of the farm can, with the greatest degree of certainty, be made profitable.