organized and inspectors appointed for each particular breed and purpose of breeding, whose duty it is to see that all rules and laws of the association are enforced and to keep a record of performances prepotency, and results obtained from different mating, in short, to specify a complete working pedigree from which logical conclusions can be deduced, and from which laws can be formulated, barring out to a large extent personality or individuality, which is the great obstacle to coöperation. If such a system can be carried out it would be putting it mildly to say that it would be of inestimable value in the future. The investment would undoubtedly be great at first, but the interest would be ten-fold in the future.

"FADS" IN BREEDING.

By Hon. JOHN DRYDEN, *Toronto, Canada.*

A "fad" in connection with operations in breeding very often represents some quality considered essential among breeders because it has become fashionable. Why this is the case would be as difficult to answer as to explain satisfactorily why the ladies of our day insist on wearing a special kind of head-gear, which is not only unpleasant to behold, but is decidedly uncomfortable and difficult to control. In either case, it is sufficient to know that it is in fashion; no inquiry is made as to its utility.

Take for instance the present day shape and turn of the horns of the popular Scotch Ayrshire cow. These horns stand almost straight up from the head, and are certainly not ornamental, but they are *fashionable*. In an ugly bull they may be useful for his own defense, but not the slightest aid to the owner's escape. I am told that when the horn is not naturally of correct form it is trained by the use of pulleys and weights. I am sure no one would be found to declare that this has the slightest utility. Nor can it be said that this form has any special beauty that one could desire it, yet it must be present because it is fashionable—I call that a "fad."

Take, if you will, the extreme covering of the whole face of the Shropshire ewe with wool. It is of no real service, it is difficult to shear, and of little value, and besides is often accompanied with a raw, bad back, yet to-day it is practically invaluable. I call that a "fad."

Then, an imported animal is assumed to possess some charm not found in an animal equally as good but born west of the Atlantic Ocean. It may be no better in form, in breeding, in color, or in constitution, yet the imported animal will be sought after solely because of its birthplace, while the other is entirely neglected. I call that a "fad."

There was at one time a great craze for a red color among Short-horns. It did much damage because it forced out of use desirable

animals on account of their color not being red. No one can give a good reason for discarding the one and clinging to the other, yet most people insist even now on having red and not a roan or white. This also becomes a "fad."

I would not have it understood as my opinion that everything which may be said to be fashionable is necessarily inferior. For instance, the existing demand for anything closely akin to the late Mr. Cruickshank's Shorthorns may not yet properly be spoken of as a fad, because it has been proved by actual experience that these cattle have real merit. They are everywhere held in high esteem, and are in consequence *fashionable*. But let us peer a little into the future, and I venture to prophecy that the time will come when cattle of this sort will be chosen, not because of any merits as individuals, but because they show by their breeding that they belong to one or the other of these popular families. Then at that stage it will be right for me to say that what was once an appropriate fashion has degenerated into merely a "fad."

From these illustrations of the use of the word given me for my subject, it will readily be perceived how undesirable it is to allow ourselves to drift beyond a well-defined limit in following the lead of others, however excellent the course may have been in the beginning. That limit has been reached when the reality ceases to be, and instead you have nothing worthy of your esteem, except a mere form of words which means nothing existing now, but refers only to past renown long since extinct.

The ultimate end of all true breeding is *commercial value*. The real merit of a modern Shorthorn or Hereford is settled by a reference not to the prize ring, but to the butcher's block. What results will the animal show when the cross breeds appear in the Chicago Stock Yards as prime heifers or bullocks, or what ability do they show as producers of milk in the ordinary farmer's stable? The name of the family will not be considered in either case. The length of pedigree will not fill the pail, nor the name of a Duthie or a Marr give quality to the meat. At that stage we have come to real things, and mere names have no power to charm. The rough-rider going through the pens and bargaining money for meat never enquires the name of the family, it will be of no value then. We have reached the *reality* here, and the two words *quality* and *quantity* determine the value.

From many years of observation and experience I am led to conclude that few men in looking at an animal are able to give a proper weight to the several points. They are likely to give undue weight to a few points, lack of which has been indelibly impressed on the mind through some personal experience or some early impression. It may be the prominence of the brisket, the width of the muzzle, or the color of the horn, or other similar points, none of which is of paramount importance, yet standing altogether too prominent in the eye of the onlooker, and likely to be given too high a value. This is sometimes carried so far as to become a "fad" in the mind of the breeder.

No animal seems absolutely perfect; there is always present the inevitable "if," and it becomes a nice art to balance properly the weak and the strong points. The buyer who is seeking to become last owner for the purpose of slaughtering the animal has the best chance, because he knows best the proper commercial value of the respective parts, and in his case all sentiment, all fancy and all fashionable notions give way to entirely the consideration of the purely practical. This man is not likely to be carried away by a fad of any kind. He is at the last stage, and is looking for value received as expressed in dollars and cents, so that the color of the muzzle or the shape of the horn does not count in his calculations.

I ask can we who are the breeders learn a lesson from his practical manner of dealing with the animal, and to some extent imitate his example in seeking to produce the real and the valuable rather than to follow a mere sentiment, to our own continual and ever-increasing loss? Yet we must not be debarred from cultivating some points which do not count with the butcher, provided they are not put so far forward in our esteem as to shut out that which is of much more value. For instance, it adds much to the beauty of a horned animal when the horns are evenly turned and symmetrical in form, and it does not injure the animal in any other part, but in this we must not be willing to sacrifice the greater for the less. The butcher does not care whether the legs are straight and properly set, provided the carcass suits him, but to the breeder who is carrying forward his animals from one generation to another, it makes a very great difference whether the limbs be strong and capable of such free locomotion as may be necessary to preserve the continued health and robustness of each succeeding generation. Nor would the butcher study very much the "character" of the animal, because he is not interested in its power to transmit to future generations its own useful characteristics; he studies only the animal before him, and never thinks at all of a successor. The breeder has an entirely different view. He values the animal not merely for his individual price, but for his power to transmit his useful qualities to future generations, and, therefore, an animal with every evidence in his appearance, as well as in his breeding, of strong prepotency, will be considered of far greater value than another with an equal number of pounds of meat of fine quality, but no breed character. How much shall we fix as the value of such an animal? It is plain that he is worth much more to one owner than to another. To a man with females of a proper quality a sire of great excellence, and power to transmit it, becomes of priceless value. With all our knowledge of "Champion of England," among Shorthorns, and his astonishing prepotency, what would be his value if he could be presented to a modern Shorthorn breeder. Certainly away beyond the value of many a grand farm of considerable dimensions, provided the man was so circumstanced as to be able to reproduce him by many hundreds. The ordinary farmer looking on would say: "Surely this is a fad." But it is not; we have not in such a case passed beyond the reality

The value is not reached by calculating the probable number of pounds of beef.

I once heard a Professor argue before a crowd of farmers that one of the sure signs of a first-class milking cow was a dip in the back. This, he claimed, was infallible, and that breeders should aim to perpetuate this frame structure. This man is now dead and I presume his theory died with him. A good cow may have a hollow back, but we know it is not essential, and it certainly is not desirable; therefore, to advocate its perpetuation in any breed is but to follow the phantom of a "fad."

But I have said enough to make clear my view. Doubtless there are innumerable fads which might be mentioned and which should be avoided; it is not necessary to enumerate them here. When the thing advocated is a mere name, or notion, or sentiment, and has no real value, either from the breeder's standpoint or that of the consumer, it may safely be discarded as a fad, and considered of no material consequence.

My closing words to the young man just beginning operations are: Keep always before you the real and not the imaginary—the useful rather than the ornamental—the future as well as the present, and beware of following a mere fad, which tends always toward deterioration, and, in the final issue, lands you in utter disappointment and ruin.

INBREEDING BERKSHIRES.

By N. W. GENTRY, *Sedalia, Mo.*

The subject assigned me is an old one, discussed threadbare many times before without any common conclusion having been reached. I presume I have been asked to discuss this subject for the reason that it is generally known that I have practiced inbreeding in my herd of Berkshires for a good many years, and, furthermore, for the reason, if I may be pardoned for mentioning it, that I have met with a reasonable success. To start with, there have been all sorts of results from inbreeding as well as crossbreeding because there are all sorts of animals in the hands of all sorts of breeders having many different ideas and different theories. In my opinion little success can be achieved by any breeder unless he has the judgment to select superior foundation stock to start with. Life is too short for even the breeder of great ability to take something that is 20 or more years behind the time and to come in competition with the output of those who have superior stock. Unless a breeder is a real judge he certainly cannot advance much, because he has the wrong ideals and will be found continually drifting in the wrong course. I cannot lay too much stress upon the importance of starting with foundation stock of the right kind. Do not be fooled into buying inferior animals because they are cheap or even because