

THE CANADIAN BREEDER

AND AGRICULTURAL REVIEW.

Weekly Paper published in the Stock and Farming interests of Canada.

SUBSCRIPTION, - - \$2.00 per Annum

ADVERTISING RATES.

Per line, each insertion, 20 cents.
(Nonpareil measurement, 12 lines to one inch.)

Breeders' cards, five line space, \$20.00 per annum, each additional line \$5.00 per annum

Co. condensed advertisements under classified headings, one cent per word, each insertion, for which cash must accompany order, as accounts will not be opened for them.

Contract rates on application.

All communications to be addressed to

CANADIAN BREEDER,

COR. CHURCH AND FRONT STS.

TORONTO.

S. BEATTY, MANAGER.

Toronto, Friday, January 30th, 1885.

Advertisements of an objectionable or questionable character will not be received for insertion in this paper.

WHAT WE WASTE.

Could the average thrifty English farmer see the waste that goes on in this country from one year's end to another, he would be inclined to say that the Canadian farmer who found himself "hard up" year after year richly merited all the hardship he underwent. And yet old countrymen coming to Canada are more apt to fall into the wasteful slovenly ways of their neighbours than they are to effect anything like an industrial reformation among them. It would take many pages of THE CANADIAN BREEDER to contain even a brief summary of the different methods of waste and general unthrift that have been discovered and brought to a most discreditable degree of perfection by a large class of our Canadian farmers, but our purpose at present is to briefly notice only a few of these.

We could if we wished point out the almost total loss of liquid manure in Canada. We could figure up the loss arising from continually cropping fields till they are worn out. We have already (in a previous article) called the attention of farmers to the unprofitable practice of selling hay, straw, coarse grains, and roots off the farm and obtaining no compensation to the fertility of the soil in the shape of manure from outside sources. Sometimes farmers find themselves so excessively hard up that they are compelled to sell anything on which they can realize in order to "keep the wolf from the door." True, the man who "skins" his farm because he is hard up is likely to remain hard up because he skins his farm. But the whole of this wholesale waste that goes on in our farm management is not in the matter of manure alone. That is only one of many factors in this matter. There are many other leaks in our farm management quite as important as this one.

In the matter of stock-raising, for example, nearly one-half of our feed goes to waste—yes, absolutely to waste. Take for example the

farmer whose three-year-old colts average \$60 all around (and many do not even come up to that figure). How can such a man expect to get along as well as his neighbor who makes his colts average \$120 at the same age? And where is the difference in cost? Eight or ten dollars more for the service of a good stallion, and a little extra care and a warm, clean stable, will not only do all the rest but in all probability save considerable feed as well. And as far as cattle are concerned the case is if anything a still stronger one, as it is hard to estimate the difference in value between a two-year-old scrub and a good grade at that age. And the way in which they are kept makes such a difference. The feed that goes to waste in keeping animals warm in cold stables throughout Canada would be enough in itself to enrich a fair-sized township. But when one has counted the feed that is wasted in keeping alive scrub stock and that which is lost in keeping up animal heat in cold stables, the manure that is wasted in one way and another, and the loss that is brought about through "skinning" farms, he still finds himself as it were only on the threshold of this question of waste.

Take for example one item—"butter." If the reader will turn to the market reports he will probably find in it pretty much the same old story that is being told week after week. Plenty of inferior butter offered which will not bring more than ten or twelve cents per pound, while that which is ranked as good dairy butter brings from six to eight or nine cents more. Now, we are not about to lay the blame of this waste on the farmers' wives. It is true that some women make really good butter, while the majority of them make that which is very far from good, though no farmer's wife is quite willing to admit that she belongs to the latter class. The truth is that more than half the butter made in this country is of an inferior quality, while an exceedingly small proportion of it can be made to rank as first-class. It is a well-known fact that creamery butter is some six cents better than good dairy butter. Were all the cream that is churned in Ontario passed through a creamery and the product sold at creamery butter prices, what a gain would be effected in the aggregate, and how much hard work would be taken off the hands of our already over-worked farmers' wives. And all that is necessary to effect this and other similar reforms is that our farmers should learn the value of co-operating in those matters demanding more capital than they are likely to command individually. Let them learn to use their brains as well as their muscles; let them learn what creameries are doing for English and American farmers, and then ask themselves how much exertion it will take to set on foot projects for the establishment of creameries in their own neighborhoods. True, many neighborhoods are supplied with cheese factories, but these need not stand in the way of creameries. Butter is made and marketed in these same neighborhoods, and surely it would be better for farmers to co-operate in the production of good butter than to go on

making bad butter individually. Not one Canadian farm in a hundred is carrying all the live stock it can support, and under the existing state of things, as well as under that which is likely to continue for an indefinite period to come, no farm that is not stocked up to its full capacity is being worked to the best advantage. There is plenty of field for the creameries as well as the cheese factories, and when the former have become as numerous as the latter the farmers will still find their farms able to fatten goodly stables full of beef cattle in spite of the demand of both creameries and cheese factories, and they will find too that instead of running out through the increased drain upon it, the land is every year becoming more and more productive.

HOW FEED IS WASTED IN COLD WEATHER.

The month of January has been a very cold one, and it would be interesting to know how much of the feed consumed by cattle throughout Canada this month has gone to the building up or fattening of the animal consuming it, and how much has been wasted in merely maintaining animal heat. Good warm stables do not cost much more at the outset than cold ones, and this difference is more than made up in the saving of fodder effected by a warm stable in a single cold season. The feed that will keep an animal alive and healthy in some of our miserable shells of stables would fatten him in a good warm one. It costs a great deal to keep cattle warm with hay and grain.

HARD WINTERS AND HORSE-BREEDING.

Only a few years ago it was generally accepted as a fact even among our best horse-breeders that the climatic conditions of Canada were such as rendered the breeding of anything like high-class race horses here out of the question. "Lady D'Arcy," the game and speedy daughter of old "Thunder" and "Castaway," did much to dispel that foolish impression, but she was generally regarded as an altogether exceptional province-bred till "Bonnie Bird," "Disturbance," and "Fanny Wiser" came out and furnished the most substantial proof that "Lady D'Arcy" was not altogether an exceptional province-bred. It has remained, however, for "Princess," the stout and compact little daughter of "Princeton" and "Roxaline," to show what must be conceded to be the highest and altogether the best racing form ever attained to by a Canadian-bred animal. Not only has "Princess" shown herself a terrific sprinter, but she has shown in her turf career the rarest of campaigning qualities. The season of 1883-4 did not bring to light a better campaigner than "Princess," and perhaps the nearest parallel to be found for her case is that of the veteran Montana chestnut "Hickory Jim." And this brings us back to the subject which we intended at the outset very briefly to discuss. It certainly begins to