

Stabling and Feeding Horses.

(Ottawa correspondence.)

In a recent address before the Ottawa Agricultural Committee, on the "Construction of the Horse Stable and Care of the Horse," Prof. J. H. Grisdale, Agriculturist at the Central Experimental Farm, said that the horse stable must be economical in space, as it will be found much easier to keep a small stable warm than a large one. It must be conveniently arranged, in order that the horse can be properly cared for with as little trouble as possible, and he advised a separate building, in order to secure light and ventilation more easily; good ventilation is necessary.

Mr. Grisdale showed a diagram of what he considered a good horse stable for the average farm. On one side were shown six stalls, six feet wide, and on the other side a box stall, one single stall, harness room and feed room. The two latter should be boxed in closely. The feed room should be divided into two compartments, in one of which bins for grain should be arranged, and a space left for the rough fodder, while the other should be kept for a mixing room. It was a good plan to have a stove in the harness room. This would enable the farmer to keep the temperature of the room sufficiently warm to permit him making any repairs to the harness, etc., without unnecessary labor and inconvenience. The rough fodder could be stored overhead, and it was also thought advisable to have a small granary above the feeding room. This would economize labor considerably. For flooring, Mr. Grisdale recommended planks over a cement bottom, leaving a small space between. He did not consider that cement, without the planks, made a good floor, as it became too slippery. He did not recommend having a feeding alley in front of the horses, as he considered it a waste of space. The windows should be sliding or hinged, in order that they might be opened on warm days to admit air. Forty to forty-five degrees was about right temperature for a horse stable. A horse kept in a well-ventilated stable was less liable to attacks of distemper and pneumonia than one kept in a poorly-ventilated building. His digestion and health in general would also be better. For bedding, cut straw was one of the best materials, provided the farmer had plenty of it. If straw was scarce, however, it was more economical to use it without cutting, as it required a great deal more to bed a horse when cut than in its natural state. A member of the committee asked of what value was sawdust? It is very economical, but the manure with which it is mixed is not good for the land. Heavy clay is about the only soil that will be benefited by this kind of manure. It paid to use good heavy blankets on horses when they were in the stable during cool weather. They look better if kept blanketed, and are easily kept clean, although a certain amount of grooming is essential. The horses should be fed regularly, and at the same time each day. The morning feed should be given about 1½ hours before taking them out to work. They should be watered about fifteen minutes before getting their grain. In the evening they should be given all the water they could drink about two hours after they had finished their feed. Under ordinary conditions about one pound of roughage and one pound of meal per day was sufficient for every 100 lbs. weight of horse; that is, a horse weighing 1,300 pounds should receive 13 pounds of hay and a similar amount of meal per day. Mr. Grisdale recommended feeding about 1-5 of the hay and 1-8 of the meal in the morning, the same quantity at noon, and the balance in the evening. The horses should not have more hay put before them than they would eat with relish. Cut hay, with the meal mixed in it, Mr. Grisdale said, was about the best feed for horses.

Another Dislocated Neck Put Right.

To the Editor "Farmer's Advocate":

Sir,—In your issue of April 13th I notice an article under the heading "Put Neck Back into Joint," citing a remarkable case of veterinary practice by Dr. Mole, V. S., of Toronto, replacing the dislocated joint of a horse's neck, claiming that the operation stood unique in the annals of veterinary practice. I beg to state that this operation does not stand alone, as regards veterinary practice, as last year I had a Thoroughbred colt which dislocated the sixth cervical vertebra of his neck by running against a low wire fence, remaining partially dislocated for four weeks. Under the instructions received from Dr. Reed, veterinary adviser to the "Farmer's Advocate," and with the assistance of Dr. McVicar, V.S., of Newbury, Ont., we cast the colt on a barn floor, putting pressure on the dislocated joint, and it snapped back into position. In one week after I could notice the colt becoming steady, as there was such pressure on the spinal cord before that he was completely paralyzed. If this operation could have been performed the day after being hurt, or same day, this colt would have been without any noticeable blemish, but being out so long, it may not come to its normal shape, owing to the muscles having fallen away on neck. But colt is now growing, and will, no doubt, be a useful horse. J. P. McVICAR.

Lambton Co., Ont.

Get the Colts in Shape for Altering.

The favorite season for castration of colts is now on, and it behooves every farmer having a colt to be altered this spring, to have that colt in good condition for the knife and emasculator (or craseur).

Colts low in condition, or affected with distemper (strangles), or influenza (pinkeye), should not be operated upon till fully recovered, and should not be altered and then stabled with horses, some of which are affected with any equine contagious disease. If the colts are low in condition, and the old hair slow to come off, feed some bran, crushed oats and linseed meal, and get them up into shape. A run at grass is always considered good preparation for the necessary operation on grade (and many pure-bred) colts. The operation is preferably performed when the colt is about a year old. Do not expect good results from an operation performed on a manure pile; better put the colt down on a piece of grass, or have the operation done standing. Do not employ a dirty person to operate in any case; filthy, drug-soiled clothes, dirty instruments and hands, are not a safe criterion by which to judge as to an operator's success or size of his practice. The clean operator is the successful surgeon, and, while in many of his patients pus formation cannot be entirely avoided, such is limited to the smallest extent. After the operation let the colt run in a clean, dry pasture, and if taken up at night have the stall dry and well bedded with clean straw. Do not put into a stall in which a mare has recently foaled or cow calved. Exercise after the operation, cleanliness at and after the operation, and good health of the one operated upon, will ensure a successful castration.



An Equine Baby.

Treat the Foal's Navel.

It is pretty well accepted that prevention is better than cure in navel-ill of foals, and that prevention consists in swabbing the navel as soon after the birth of the foal as possible, with a strong antiseptic, such as formalin 1, water 4, or carbolic acid 1, water 10 (some people prefer the undiluted acid, thus forming a scab), or paint with iodoformized collodion, 1 to 10. By the above means the ingress of germs that cause the disease is, to some extent, stopped, although in many cases the opinion is held that the foal may be infected in the mare before foaling. Bacteriological examinations have shown similar germs in the genital passages of mares to those found causing the disease in foals. It might be advisable for a stallion owner to refuse the services of his horse to a mare whose recent foal was affected with navel-ill, until the said mare had received an antiseptic douche of some sort. Where the farmer is so unfortunate as to have a case in his breeding stud, he should adopt stringent measures to disinfect the boxes in which such occurred, and, if possible, a mare should not be allowed to foal in a box stall in which a previous foaling had developed a case of navel-ill.

STOCK.**For the Benefit of Farmers and Graziers.**

To the Editor "Farmer's Advocate":

Sir,—We wish to call the attention of Canadian farmers and graziers to the advantages of dehorning cattle. At this season of the year we are doing a large business with American exporters, and they do not want to handle any horned cattle, as they claim in transportation they lose from \$2.00 to \$3.00 per head on account of scored hides and bruised beef. As they positively refuse to handle any horned cattle, this means a great loss to our cattle raisers. On Chicago market they can buy train-loads of export cattle, and every one of them dehorned; therefore, they prefer them to our cattle, as they bring a much higher price on the British markets. Now, we have as well-bred cattle here as in any country, and in order to obtain good prices, we would strongly advise dehorning cattle.

McDONALD & MAYBEE,

Live-stock Commission Agents, Toronto.

P. S.—We enclose you herewith a letter we have just received from Messrs. J. Shamberg & Son, of New York, one of the foremost exporting firms in America, who have made a reputation by handling only high-class finished cattle:

New York, April 21, 1905.

Messrs. McDonald & Maybee,

Toronto, Ont.:

Dear Sirs,—We are in receipt of your favor, enclosing a clipping relative to dehorning cattle in Canada, which we note with much interest, and you should have the thanks of your community for agitating this matter. At present your Canadian markets offer limited encouragement to our placing much reliance in being able to secure at any one time enough finished cattle of the dehorned sort for our regular requirements. If you and other up-to-date commission men will educate your cattle raisers and feeders, as they have in Chicago, to exclusively graze and fatten dehorned cattle of good quality, the owners of same would get, when offered for sale, the keen competition that such sorts enjoy over horned animals. Accept our congratulations on your having at last started the dehorning campaign in Canada, and with persistent assistance from Canadian Governmental interests, agricultural periodicals, the newspapers, and the stock-yards and commission firm interests, you will, in a short time, be able to prove by sound arguments, and getting the "sleepy ones" to follow, eventually to secure receipts on the Toronto market of a class and sort to command regular export patronage, to the mutual benefit of all interests.

J. SHAMBERG & SON.

Who Does the Cattle Embargo Injure?

To the Editor "Farmer's Advocate":

Sir,—The discussion which has recently taken place in different parts of the Dominion on the British embargo on Canadian cattle, is full of interest to the farmers and stock-graziers of Canada, although it is doubtful whether this subject is understood by them and given that careful consideration which is due to a matter of so much importance.

It is asserted in some quarters that the embargo is based on "falschhood," and that a repeal should be demanded on these grounds alone. When the act was passed in 1896 it was necessary to take prompt measures to protect the United Kingdom from a disease which had been traced to imported cattle, and here let it be clearly understood, Canada is not alone in the importation of live stock; the embargo is applied to South American, European, and all other States exporting cattle to Great Britain, therefore all have equal treatment. If Canada suffers, the other States suffer also. Indeed, it is doubtful if the embargo is an injury to this country, taking a broad view of the question. The effect of the embargo is to cause young cattle which would be shipped to Britain to be fattened there, to be raised at home and fattened here for the British market. Further, the more cattle raised and fed in Canada, the more fertile will be the soil on which they are raised. It is generally admitted that cattle give back to the soil as much fertility as they take from it. I ask, then, is it not in the interest of Canada to export her products in finished state as far as possible, in order that so much more labor may be employed in the country?

We have all recently heard of the great trek of American farmers to the Northwest of Canada. It is alleged that many of these farmers have taken all they possibly could out of American soil, and given nothing back to the land, which has lessened its productiveness, consequently they are looking for pastures new. Had they raised stock in proportion to their crops, the necessity for changing locations would not have happened.

I trust every stock raiser and grazer in the Dominion will study this embargo question in a broad and liberal spirit. A dealer, who, perhaps,