That there is a live stock situation on in Illinois, and to a lesser extent throughout the corn belt, is evident to all who have taken sufficient interest in the matter to give it serious thought. The writer has given the subject much consideration and the object of this paper is to set down some facts and observations which may assist in clearing the vision and pointing the way to a rational increased interest in animal affairs.

A comprehensive inquiry among farmers throughout the state of Illinois conducted under the direction of the writer shows conclusively that on the whole there is a wide-spread tendency to abandon live stock production. Briefly stated the causes which have most largely contributed in bringing about this condition are:

*An address delivered at the annual meeting of the Illinois Live Stock Breeders' Association January 27, 1910, and published by request of that Association.
1. For brief periods grain farming has been more profitable than live stock production because, temporarily, the price of feeds used largely in the production of live stock have been relatively higher in price than animal products. These relatively higher prices for grain have caused a very material extension of grain growing especially of the acreage devoted to corn. To secure additional areas for corn farmers have been plowing up old blue grass pastures. Elimination of pastures from a system of farming is quickly followed by a very pronounced reduction in the number of live stock.

2. The most profitable production of meat animals has hitherto been associated with cheap lands. The opportunities for stock raising offered by these cheap lands in various sections of the west, southwest and northwest have lured many successful stockmen from the state. The opportunities of these newer sections as compared with Illinois for the exclusive grain grower have not been equally attractive hence there has been a tendency for a large exodus of live stock producers while the grain growers have more largely remained.

3. The great difficulty of securing tenants who have had a successful experience in live stock management tends still further to decrease the number of live stock kept. This is an important consideration for the impression prevails that there is a strong tendency toward landlordism and tenantry.

4. The extensive exploitation of a simple system of exclusive grain farming that when properly followed looks toward a permanent agriculture.

5. There has been and still is a very general lack of appreciation of the value of farm manure produced by live stock on the farm. These are weighty considerations and operating together or singly it is no wonder that they should have a profound influence in bringing about radical changes in systems of farming.

The agriculture of the United States is relatively new. It can not be said that any system or systems of farming have become permanently established. Agricultural policy and practice is largely tentative. Rapidly changing economic conditions will force correspondingly great changes in agricultural practice. Farmers ought not and doubtless will not long allow their progress to be retarded in any large way by stereotyped methods and a circumscribed outlook.

Every effort should be made at this opportune time, therefore, to get as broad a vision and as keen an appreciation as possible of the current trend on the one hand and on the other, the higher possibilities of agricultural development under rational systems of farming. In a country whose agriculture is new there are few
agricultural questions which are either difficult or complicated. As an agriculture becomes older the number of problems arising increase rapidly and their solution becomes correspondingly difficult. The agriculture of the United States will be very shortly called upon to settle some of the most far-reaching questions which have ever been presented.

There is a newness about most agricultural problems that is fascinating, and while the agricultural successes and failures of other and older nations furnish valuable data and are highly suggestive there is a sense in which the farmers' problems of this country are peculiar to the United States. With our numerous agricultural colleges and experiment stations, national wealth, intelligent and well-to-do farmers, and with our vast but rapidly wasting agricultural resources, the United States has the opportunity to establish an agriculture that will clearly outrank that of any other nation. To do this will require the prompt, well directed cooperative effort of all who can in any way contribute to this end.

Agricultural betterment is a larger question than that involved in any single branch of agriculture. It frequently happens, however, that circumstances which affect an important branch of agriculture may also directly or indirectly affect other phases of the business.

No important branch of agriculture has experienced and survived more vicissitudes than live stock production. Farmers have frequently become panicly over it. A suggestion of such a condition now threatens the industry.

As has been noted there has been a growing tendency to abandon live stock production for exclusive grain growing. Reasons for this movement have been stated. Conditions have favored the change. The fact should not be lost sight of, however, that some of these causes will not continue to operate with the same force. On the other hand it is safe to assume that new difficulties will arise.

If there ever was a time when the farmers of a commonwealth were warranted in largely discontinuing live stock production, that time has passed and for the following reasons:

1. Intelligent live stock husbandry is more profitable than grain growing. The multiplicity of kinds and methods of live stock production and the variations in market value, both of feeds used and animals involved, preclude the possibility of publishing here a comprehensive and detailed account of the profit making possibilities of the business. In this connection some experimental data of the Missouri Experiment Station where various forage and grain crops were consumed by hogs is given as an example. The hogs used in the investigation weighed at the beginning about one hundred pounds each. The corn, where used as a supplement to
forage crops, was charged against the hogs at sixty cents a bushel; the gains on hogs were credited at $6.00 per hundred weight. Nothing was charged for labor and no credit given for fertilizer. An acre of blue grass in the season of 1908, when pastured with hogs at the rate of 14 hogs per acre for a period of 140 days, was worth, after deducting the value of the corn used to supplement the pasture, $18.80. An acre of clover pastured by 12 hogs 90 days under similar conditions yielded $37.59; rape, oats and clover in 1909, 10 hogs for 78 days, $22.02; cow peas, 12 hogs for 32 days, $17.71; corn and cow peas, 10 hogs for 32 days, $35.40. These figures speak for themselves. Similar work will be conducted at the Illinois Agricultural Experiment Station.

While it is true that at times and under unusual conditions, which have been particularly unfavorable for profitable live stock production, exclusive grain growing has seemed as profitable and in some cases more profitable. It is not true today, nor is it likely to be true until the demand for corn, clover hay, alfalfa and other foods largely used in the production of meat come into more general use in the human dietary. These crops, admittedly the most natural and profitable on Illinois farms, are suited primarily to live stock production and as long as they are grown they, together with the by-products of many other farm crops, will be used largely for live stock production either in this or other states or countries.

If according to the popular belief the increase of population eventually forces live stock production out, Illinois lands may be forced to produce crops which are primarily suited for human food but not those which now seem best adapted to our soils and climate. Illinois farmers, however, are not likely to be benefited by such a change in farm practice. Because live stock production has been on the wane in the state and because it has been assumed that live stock must eventually be crowded out by the increase of population some have felt that the time has come when live stock production should be abandoned. The causes for the waning interest in live stock production have been noted elsewhere.

Statistics do not prove that as population becomes more dense that there is a necessary decrease in live stock. On this point the following data, showing the number of various kinds of live stock per capita for dates and countries indicated, will be of interest:
The full significance of these statistics is not appreciated without the further statement that they represent numerical values only. There has been a very decided improvement in quality of the live stock in the various countries named. A small number of animals now with their increased efficiency equals a large number in former years. An increase in numbers as well as an increase in their efficiency is doubly significant. These statistics will also suggest along what lines changes have taken place in live stock production as population becomes more dense.

There is a sense in which it is true that the live stock per capita decreases. It is in the early history of a country when the population is small and extensive systems of live stock production largely constitute the agriculture of the country. In such instances population frequently increased more rapidly than live stock. When, however, the conditions demand the establishment of intensive forms of agriculture it appears as in Germany, France, Denmark, Holland, Italy and the British Isles that there is a tendency, with but few exceptions, for live stock per capita to increase rather than decrease.
A thoro test has been made in this country and it has been pretty well demonstrated that farmers will not indefinitely convert crops of the farm into meat unless adequately remunerated. If there is a shortage of meat animals, as there seems to be, it is due as much or more to the fact that live stock producers are not now satisfied with promises of profits. A distinct shortage stimulates prices. A distinct advance in prices stimulates production. There is no likelihood, however, that live stock production will be overdone as the area that can be devoted exclusively to live stock production is rapidly disappearing. Then, too, the meat eating population is increasing more rapidly than live stock production. Please note that I use the expression “meat eating population.” I do so advisedly.

To be sure it will take a little time for people generally to appreciate the fact that for many years in this country they were able to buy meat at a price which was but little above the cost of labor involved in its production. It is to be expected that until the cost of producing meats is more generally understood there will be occasional “boycott” demonstrations. There is no need of alarm that federal or state investigation of the present high cost of living will reflect to the discredit of the stock raiser, providing, of course, that such investigation shall be conducted along scientific and practical lines by thoroly informed and adequately trained men. Let no one be deceived that the present high prices for food stuffs is temporary. All that the consumer can justly demand is that food stuffs shall be available at prices which represent a fair profit above the costs of production and distribution.

It is good policy for a nation or a state to encourage intelligent agricultural production. The most effective way of encouraging agriculture is for prices to be maintained on a stable basis which represents a reasonable profit to the farmer above the cost of production. The government eventually will be forced to protect producers as well as consumers for the time is rapidly passing when any necessary factor in the business of the production and the marketing of foods will long thrive at the expense of any other.

Intelligent systems of live stock husbandry are the most profitable systems of farming under conditions likely to prevail for a long series of years and doubtless indefinitely. Then too, in considering a question of such significance only averages extending over a series of years equally favorable to grain growing on the one hand and live stock production on the other, should be considered conclusive. In these comparisons, live stock production is likely to lose much in light of the fact that our crops are produced by men who are primarily successful grain growers, involving relatively simple operations and who are more or less deficient in their knowledge of successful live stock management which presents nu-
umerous complicated and involved processes. Because systems of successful live stock production present not only more, but also more complicated problems than systems of grain growing, adequate provision should be made for the investigation of these problems and the wide dissemination of the results of these investigations.

A system of permanent agriculture exclusively devoted to grain growing has been worked out and because of its relative simplicity is being widely adopted and widely exploited. This, as far as I am able to judge, is admirable for the farms which are especially adapted to grain growing and where for various reasons live stock production seems impracticable.

There is a marked tendency, however, to adopt this system in localities and on farms naturally better adapted to live stock production than grain growing. Also where live stock production is entirely practicable, but conditions favorable for grain growing. The fact should not be lost sight of that where profitable systems of live stock farming are practicable, they are preferable to systems of exclusive grain growing. It will be time enough to abandon live stock production on Illinois farms when conditions have so radically changed that grain farming is more profitable. The state has put inadequate but relatively large amounts of money into the study of soil fertility and as a result the Agricultural Experiment Station has developed a system of grain farming which is certainly profitable and almost as certainly permanent. No one believes, however, that Illinois should rest her future, agriculturally speaking, on a single system of farming. There are several systems of live stock husbandry which are believed to be even more profitable than the system of grain farming referred to and which are equally permanent. These systems are yet to be worked out and exploited. What the state has done for exploiting a system of grain farming should now be done in a larger way in establishing and exploiting systems of live stock husbandry. While it is true that the fertility of a farm cannot be maintained simply by returning to the farm the manure made by live stock fed upon the crops grown on that farm it still remains true that most systems of live stock farming call for the purchase of less plant food than any system of grain farming.

It would seem, therefore, that the easiest and most logical procedure in developing a permanent agriculture would be to work out a variety of systems of live stock husbandry which would retain as much as possible of the fertility removed in cropping, supplementing whatever lack of fertility there may be by the purchase of mineral fertilizers, or the purchase for feeding purposes of the large supplies of grain produced and bound to be produced by
grain farmers. This buying of grain to feed need not be done with the thought of building up the stock farmer's farm at the expense of his neighbors but in a public spirited and economic sense assist in making a good market for the grain produced by those who for personal reasons prefer to remain grain farmers who do not need the fertility in the crops they sell because they may follow a carefully planned and scientifically sound system of grain farming,—of permanent agriculture without live stock.

Exact statistics showing the amount of farm products shipped out of the state and those used for manufacturing purposes are not available. It is believed, however, that the amount of corn reserved on the farms for feeding purposes would fall considerably short of fifty percent of the total production of the state. Illinois produced in 1908 approximately 300,000,000 bushels of corn. Assuming that one-half of this is shipped off our Illinois farms, we wish to call attention to the fact that the 150,000,000 bushels so shipped, would fatten each year over 2,500,000 steers, or their equivalent in other live stock, and that the fertilizer produced by this feeding would increase the annual possible production of the state $15,000,000. But it is argued that Illinois is primarily a grain growing section and that its agricultural development lies along grain growing lines. Undoubtedly grain growing is to be a leading and permanent branch of the agricultural endeavor of the state, but there are several systems of live stock farming that are not incompatible with grain growing and that are necessary for its permanent success. I believe the time will come when it will be considered bad economics to transport numberless car loads and ship loads of grain to far distant lands for feeding purposes. It may be even practically impossible for transportation companies to handle such traffic. Already railroads are having difficulty in handling the present volume of business. The necessity of keeping the cost of foods within reach of the masses, that is, at such a level that the laboring man can be well nourished and highly efficient, will eventually demand that the distance between the producer and consumer be shortened.

One statement will doubtless be sufficient to illustrate the point. In most, perhaps all, European countries food stuffs are offered consumers at a price which is noticeably closer to the price which the producer receives than is the case in this country. There are some legitimate reasons perhaps to account for part of the discrepancy but by no means all of it.

2. Live stock farming furnishes the opportunity to many intelligent workmen for continuous remunerative work in the country. In other words live stock farming calls for greater intelligence and skill in the farm laborer while such systems of farming
distribute the work to be done more evenly throughout the year. Some systems of live stock farming, especially the more intensive forms, like dairying furnish a greater amount of work. Looking at the subject from the standpoint of public good, therefore, it would seem highly desirable to encourage systems of live stock production particularly as population increases.

I do not wish to be understood as pleading for the extension or even the preservation of particular systems of live stock farming that do not fit the times and conditions. Some forms of live stock production should and will be abandoned; others, noticeably dairying and poultry raising will be greatly extended.

Contrary to the opinion that has been frequently expressed, it is not true, except in minor instances, that older agricultural countries like Germany, France, Holland and Denmark, are abandoning live stock production because of increases in population. In most instances, as has been shown elsewhere, live stock bear about the same relation to population that they did several generations ago. Whether or not live stock will ultimately disappear from the farms of the United States is largely a matter of conjecture. Such an exigency is so far removed from being a present day problem that its consideration should be deferred for several generations.

It is reasonably certain, however, that it is not absolutely necessary and that the highest type of agriculture is not possible without live stock. If the highest type of intelligent citizenship is to prevail in this country, it will rest largely upon the possibility of developing standards of living among country folk which will necessitate systems of agricultural practice which constitute the highest type of agriculture. In other words, it is possible to build up an enduring civilization around systems of farming which do not exclude live stock and which will not only profitably utilize to the fullest extent the agricultural resources of the United States but develop an intelligent and influential yeomanry.

A system of exclusive grain farming will necessarily find a large place in the agriculture of Illinois and no one should rejoice in this fact more than the live stock producer. Exclusive grain growing increases the available supply of feeds used in animal production on the one hand and on the other, removes increased competition and the probability of an over-production of live stock. It should not be forgotten that live stock husbandry is the most important factor in the corn market. As nearly as can be estimated 80 percent of the corn produced in the United States is fed to live stock. Then too, there are large areas where the production of live stock will long prove not only the most profitable but also practically the only use which can be made of these lands. This is a fact which should not be overlooked in any effort looking toward the development of the agricultural resources of all the
Intelligent systems of live stock production are feasible and profitable not only on lands not adapted for grain growing but upon lands especially suited to grain growing. If, therefore, an individual adopts a system of exclusive grain farming he does so from choice and not because systems of live stock farming are not profitable.

It seems clear that the large problem is not what system of exclusive grain farming shall replace Animal Husbandry but what systems of live stock production enter into our farm practice and are best suited to the conditions that obtain. Because agricultural and economic conditions are changing and will continue to change it is to be expected that the most profitable Animal Husbandry of today may give place to an entirely different system in the years to come. It should be the business of Animal Husbandry investigators to anticipate these conditions and to point the way as far as possible. The collection of data upon which definite systems of live stock husbandry may be intelligently established under prevailing conditions is the most important service the Animal Husbandry Department can render the state as a whole and the live stock interests in particular. It is absolutely impossible to do this with any such amounts of money as have yet been appropriated for live stock investigations. In other words, while we are dealing with a problem many times as difficult as grain farming, we have had only sufficient funds to investigate matters of details in live stock husbandry. The need is now imperative that we take up these larger questions which will necessarily involve larger amounts of money. It cannot be too strongly urged that systems of live stock husbandry in which corn, clover, and alfalfa are leading factors, in other words, systems of live stock production that meet modern conditions, should be worked out as speedily as possible.

3. The keeping of more and better live stock on the farm promotes greater interest in farm life. The tendency for the boys and girls, the young men and the young women to early leave the farm is a tendency which is universally regretted. I venture to say that no single agricultural reconstruction would increase this tendency more certainly and more rapidly than a general abandonment of live stock husbandry. In other words, eliminate live stock as an important factor in agricultural practice and you remove forever the most powerful magnet that attracts and holds the brightest and best among our farm raised young men and young women. An agriculture without live stock is threatened with becoming a business prosecuted by a relatively ignorant class who are not farmers from choice but because it furnishes as remunerative employment for the laboring man as factory, shop or mine. Do we wish nothing better for Illinois and American agriculture?
It may be argued that the average farmer and especially the tenant is not sufficiently skilled and informed to make live stock farming profitable. This fact multiplies the difficulties surrounding the future of the live stock industry. If, however, systems of live stock husbandry are, broadly speaking, worth while, ought we to shrink from the effort that it will take to put our Illinois farmers out of the class of average farmers? May I ask who is responsible for this lack of skill and information concerning successful live stock management on the part of the average farmer? I fear we must admit that until we who are charged with representing this interest have done all within our power to change these conditions we have not lived up to our opportunity. It does not lessen our responsibility to point with pride to the achievements of our Illinois breeders and feeders, or to the fact that we have done more than some of our sister states. The fact remains that with all that has been done by various agencies we have yet but made a respectable beginning. If our present system of tenant farming is incompatible with live stock production, would it not be well to work out and establish tenantry systems which would encourage live stock production?

4. If advocates of a system of live stock husbandry could put forth no stronger argument than that it encourages and, speaking broadly, necessitates the residence of the owner of the farm on the farm it would indeed be sufficient. I take it that we are interested in the ultimate status of the farmer as a class as well as the financial possibilities of land ownership. It is a deplorable condition in the trend of the agricultural practice of a state when intelligent and successful farmers forsake their farm homes for town or city, while their farms pass to the control of tenants whose chief interest is in mining the soil and who seldom care for the best development of country life.*

There are several agencies for improving the interests of live stock producers of Illinois, and I am pleased to say that as far as my knowledge goes all of these agencies have directly or indirectly benefited the industry to the extent of many times their cost. Great as have been these agencies and their benefits, the live stock producers have been modest in their requests and still more modest in their demands. While each of the agencies is doing much, their good work in some lines at least should be greatly extended.

Legislative appropriations to encourage industries which impoverish the state are a waste of public funds and a menace to the

*The writer does not wish to be understood as even intimating that all tenants are undesirable citizens. As a matter of fact there are tenants in Illinois who, if left to themselves would better care for the farms they occupy than the owners. It is highly desirable that since a certain percent of Illinois farms must be occupied by tenants that some serious attention be given to developing tenants who shall be a credit to agriculture as they are in Great Britain and not a reproach as is frequently the case in this country. Lengthening the term of lease would help materially.
best interests of every citizen of the state. No member of this Association would knowingly lend his influence or his support to such a cause. On the other hand, if as individuals or as an association we fail to give our enthusiastic support to any and all agencies which will conscientiously and effectively aid in working out the problem of more and better live stock for Illinois farms we will fail to render a distinct service to Illinois agriculture.

These matters have rested heavily upon my mind and heart. I am willing to continue to bear them without a murmur if I thought it would contribute in the largest and best sense to the good of Illinois agriculture, but after looking at the question fairly and squarely and from all angles, I have come to the conclusion that it is my duty as a public servant to present the subject to you as I see it and ask for your careful consideration. I believe that there is in the heart and mind of every loyal citizen of the state a determination to assist in a positive way a movement which looks to the agricultural betterment of the state.

I strive for nothing less than that Illinois live stock producers thru the assistance and leadership of those charged with the Animal Husbandry interests at the University shall take the lead in a distinctive movement for the preservation and extension of the live stock industry in the United States along rational lines and until such time as some other system of farm management shall be demonstrated to be more profitable and better suited to develop larger interest in farm life and greater intelligence among farmers.

I believe you ought to know that the Animal Husbandry interests at the University are not in a position to further extend their usefulness either inside or outside the Agricultural College and Experiment Station of the University of Illinois. Increased appropriations for Live Stock Investigations were asked from the last General Assembly but they were not granted. Additional equipment in the way of a suitable and adequate stock judging pavilion, a horse building, and a clinic were badly needed. They were asked for and not granted. These askings were also denied by the preceding General Assembly. Needs then have become necessities now unless farmers and live stock producers particularly are willing to let this important industry of the farm fall into disfavor and oblivion.

To emphasize the need of inaugurating an active and vigorous campaign looking to according to Animal Husbandry interests the position they should hold in the agriculture of Illinois, I need but call attention to the fact that there was a proposition before the last General Assembly of Illinois to discontinue altogether live stock investigations, and but for the prompt action and work of a few loyal men such an action would have been taken. As it was the proposition met with the reception it deserved, namely, it was
killed, yet that any legislator should even dare to make such a proposition illustrates the lack of insistence on the part of the livestock interests of the state to demand that adequate legislative recognition should be accorded this industry.

If our needs have lacked urgency in the past that condition no longer obtains. I would sooner expect to be criticised for not placing these needs forcibly before you at an earlier date than for having asked for too liberal support of the Animal Husbandry work of the College and Station. Nor do I wish to be understood as scolding at those who have loyally and freely given of their thought and time. I personally feel that I owe a debt of gratitude to these men, which I can never repay. The state owes a still greater debt which it will be equally unable to meet. These loyal men have been powerless in their attempts to make an impression on the situation.

The great need now is that the number of men should be greatly multiplied who feel the burden of responsibility for existing animal husbandry affairs. A large and influential representative body of Illinois stockmen, if you will, who are willing to make a little personal sacrifice if need be, in taking advantage of every legitimate opportunity to make stockmen generally acquainted with the situation. The insistence of such representative men at the next General Assembly that ample support be accorded this interest would be effective. It should be remembered that the work has already received a setback of four years, and that it has always been impossible to attempt to investigate the larger problems such as are suggested here and which changed conditions are now forcing upon us. As a result of insufficient appropriations the Department is seriously hampered in its efforts to carry forward its work of teaching and investigation even on the present basis, saying nothing of what the conditions now demand. Members of the recent Corn Growers' and Stockmen's Convention will testify, I am sure, that our facilities for giving instruction in stock judging to a large number of people are totally inadequate. The unfortunate position in which the Department is placed will continue until such time as stockmen and those interested in the best agricultural development of the state insist that their interests in the legislature shall be cared for.

May I sum up then by saying that—the importance of Animal Husbandry as a means of maintaining agricultural prosperity is clearly indicated by the history of nations. A mere comparison of the types of farmers found in England, Scotland, Denmark, and Holland with the peasant wheat-growers of Russia or with the wheat and rice farmers of India is sufficient to illustrate the close relation between live stock and agricultural progress.
Animal Husbandry necessitates rotation of crops and frequent seeding down. It requires activity and skillful management the year round. It compels the farmer to observe market conditions. It brings him in contact with men both as a buyer and as a seller. It enlarges his heart, and broadens his sympathies beyond the routine of sowing, cultivating and reaping.

Grain farming, on the other hand, leads to continuous cropping without proper rotations. It eliminates meadows and pastures. It involves the strenuous life for a short season of the year, followed by a long period of inactivity. It creates an itinerant laboring class and stimulates tenantry rather than permanent farm homes. It fosters the land-robbing spirit. Corn farmers, wheat farmers, cotton farmers, rice farmers, grain farmers as a class are strongly led to overdraw their soil-fertility account for most men engaged in exclusive grain growing manifest small interest in a permanent agriculture. The history of agriculture in this and other countries shows that the live stock producers have taken a leading part in efforts to maintain and increase the fertility of soils, and in my judgment the live stock producers can now be relied upon more than any other class of farmers to carry forward the gospel and practice of the highest type of permanent agriculture.

While it is conceded that permanent maintenance of soil fertility without live stock is possible, it is not practicable as a statewide policy because it is not the highest type of agriculture and because few farmers can be induced to comply with all the conditions necessary to make it effective. While grain farming will ultimately supplant live stock husbandry where conditions make such a system of agriculture practicable, it should be resorted to only when and where live stock husbandry proves less profitable.

A very considerable extension of live stock farming in Illinois would materially increase the cash output from her farms and at the same time save millions to the future wealth of the state by keeping on the farm a large percentage of the fertility that is now sold off in the form of corn, oats, and hay.

Not only so, but the temptation is strong to abandon stock farming for the (apparently) more profitable grain farming, but if stock farming is reduced, the need for grain is also reduced and the profits of grain farming will decline as well as the fertility of the land. The production of live stock is a supplement to grain growing, a further possible, entirely feasible and profitable step, a farm manufacturing process which converts raw material and by-products into more concentrated, valuable finished animal products, which readily command a cash market. It is a supplement to and not a substitute for grain growing. It not only increases the income but also, and at the same time, lessens the removal of plant food from the farm. It is an enterprise which aids materially
in the development of a well-balanced agriculture. The interests of all parties, therefore, demand that instead of allowing live stock farming to decline in Illinois, it is for the best interests of all that it should now be further developed.

The problem of a permanently profitable agriculture that is worth while is a problem of the farmer as well as a problem of the farm; and no other factor exerts such a profound influence upon the development of the farmer as the ownership of live stock. In other words it should not be lost sight of that aside from all elements of profit the establishment and maintenance of systems of farming involving the large use of live stock, means that inevitably farms will be occupied by men and women of a high order of intelligence with a full appreciation of the best standards of country life.

All interested should cooperate along two lines:—

1. The placing of the Agricultural Experiment Station thru its Animal Husbandry Department in a position and on a basis which will make it possible for them to work out and exploit thru demonstrations in various sections of the state, as is now being done in matters relating to soils, feasible systems of live stock farming.

2. The securing of a very large increase in the membership of the Illinois Live Stock Breeders' Association that it may fairly represent the great live stock breeding and feeding interests of the state. The president of the Illinois Live Stock Breeders' Association is Joseph R. Fulkerson, Jerseyville, Illinois. Wyman N. Lovejoy, Roscoe, Illinois, is the secretary.

Note—Those who are working on the problem of systems of live stock farming are requested to communicate with the Animal Husbandry Department, University of Illinois, Urbana, Illinois.