

anything else. That this condition will last long no one believes. A renewed demand is among the certainties of the future, and when it does come there will be a short supply to meet it, because of the falling off in breeding for the past three years, and the probable continuance of it for a year or two to come.

Now, this fact alone to me is strong evidence of what is in store for those who keep on breeding first-class horses. Horses, as a rule, are short-lived animals; the visible supply is being used up at a very rapid rate, and the fact that it takes five years to produce a horse ready for market is lost sight of by the croakers who are now, and have been for three years, crying the horse business down. Another fact is, that the best time to engage in the production of any staple commodity is when it is down, and not when it is booming. There are two safe plans to follow: One is to fix upon a line of business and stick to it persistently, and another is to watch those who are producing the same article. Let up when they are persisting hardest, and be ready to go in when they let go. We have made good progress already, and now to drop it because of a temporary depression, that is liable to come to any business, is to lose ground and throw away good opportunities.

The manufacturer can stop his mill for a day, a week, or for months, and start up at practically the same place where he stopped, losing little more than the interest on his investment. Not so with the breeder that sells off his brood mares, or allows them to pass their bloom.

I have known farmers who had spent a great deal of money and many years in breeding up a nice class of mares, to sell them off in a fit of despondency, retaining only such as they could not sell. The present conditions are simply the result of bursting boom bubbles. This great country is not going to destruction; business is settling down to a sound basis, and a healthy reaction is sure to follow. A revival in general business will bring a quick and strong demand for horses, and the man who then has good Saddle horses, Coach horses and high-steppers to sell, can name his own price for them. It is the firm conviction of the best informed horsemen that that time will come before the foals of 1894 are ready for market. But they *must be good horses*. The "plug" now ranks with the yellow dog; there are mighty few people that have any use for him. The time was when the American Tramway Company used to gobble up hundreds every year. But electricity and McKinley knocked that trade on the head, and now the only class of horse there is any demand for is something worth looking at. Slab-sided, barrel-headed brutes have had their innings. Let farmers learn the lesson so plainly taught. Pay, if necessary, a few dollars more, secure the service of a well-bred stallion, feed the foal generously, and care for it well when it comes. Then, when it reaches a marketable age, the buyers will be hunting you up, instead of you hunting around for a buyer. Better not breed at all than breed scrubs—they will never pay.

The owners of mongrel stallions should not impose upon their neighbors by offering them the service of such horses, even at \$3 or \$5. The very best are none too good, but I would always prefer a poor specimen of a good breed to a good specimen of no breed—these quarter-bred Clydesdales, Hambletonians, Indian pony, Morgans, for example.

As a proof that good horses are in demand, I quote a few prices made on February 27th at the Union Stock Yards, Chicago, for some Coach horses, gathered for the occasion by Wengars & Son. Nearly 200 head averaged \$200, one pair of chestnuts bringing \$1,675; \$900 for a pair of browns; \$500 for a brown gelding; \$600 for a black mare. Several were bought for export to Scotland and France. With such prices as the above, I maintain that the high-class Carriage horse is the *money* horse for the farmers to breed.

I trust that these few points will cause some breeders to look at the prospect from a practical standpoint.

Clydesdale Spring Show.

In your report of the Spring Show, in the Advocate of 15th April, you close by saying:—"Through the unfortunate ruling by which the produce of imported mares had to be shown in the Canadian-bred class, and the absence of imported stallions in the younger classes, the prizes for three and two-year-olds went abegging, while the breeders of stallions from Canadian-bred mares, anticipating the strong show made in Canadian Clydesdales bred from imported mares, failed to appear."

Will some of the Clydesdale men explain why this ruling was made? Of course, they have some reason for making this rule, and I think the public would like to know what that reason is.

Is the produce of an imported mare and of an imported horse not good enough to compete with an imported animal? If not, why not?

Why should the produce of well-bred Canadian mares and of imported horses not have a class of their own, if this ruling is to stand?

Do the Clydesdale importers wish to force the produce of Canadian mares out of the show ring altogether, as was the case at this show?

I hope some of the Clydesdale men will be good enough to answer these questions. *Scor.*

On two previous occasions we dealt very fully with this question. We invite interested parties to send their views to us. In a later issue we may again treat this subject editorially.

Hog Raising from the Producer's Standpoint.

BY CAPT. A. W. YOUNG, TUPPERVILLE, ONT.

In your issue of April 15th I noticed two letters, one from Mr. Davies, of Toronto, and the other from J. Y. Griffin & Co., of Winnipeg, referring to the outlook for pork. As regards Mr. Davies' letter, he simply gives the oft repeated advice to produce the hog the market requires, not the heavy mass of fat that we see so often; the advice is not only timely but it is such that farmers and breeders must face successfully or ignominiously fail.

In reference to Mr. Griffin's letter, he seems by its tenor to fancy that only the Yorkshire and Tamworth are worthy to enter the "charmed circle;" that is, to produce the pork the packer requires to suit the consumers' demand. Now, sir, as far as the Berkshire and Suffolk not being what is required, I have nothing to say. There are doubtless those among the champions of the breeds condemned by Mr. Griffin who will take up the cudgel in their defence. It is all very well for a packer who does not furnish the feed to recommend such breeds as Tamworth and Yorkshire, but when the poor farmer tries a lot of spring Yorkshires or Tamworth's alongside of a pen of some of those very much condemned breeds, he will begin to see where the profit has gone, for the money is in the feed, not the machine. By judicious feeding a far better grade of pork may be produced than where, as is often the case, the principal diet is corn. Now, sir, in what we have to say about the improved Poland China, Mr. Griffin will likely claim I have an axe to grind, but all I have to say is let the farmer that produces the material for the packer try the machine we recommend alongside of the ones Mr. Griffin recommends, and be the judges. Does he stop to think that the bulk of the hogs slaughtered in Chicago and the Western States are Poland China crosses or pure ones, and are we to think that all these people have taken up with the wrong breed? Farmers do not think so, and when the packer gets the product of the improved strains crossed on the common stock of the country he will be satisfied. The Poland-China, if of the best improved strains, will produce pigs that will give good shoulders, but not thicker through than the hams; good sides well layered with lean and fat; will fatten as easily at six months as at 18 months, and should when at 7 months weigh not less than 225, with only ordinary feeding, while with extra feeding may do much better. Farmers are becoming awakened to the necessity of procuring the best that can be obtained, and the breeder must produce it or quit the business. The trouble is that each breeder claims his own the best, which leaves the farmer in the position of pay your money, shut your eyes, and I'll give you something to make you wise.

But when a packer puts in his oar and advises farmers to invest in any breeds, it goes a long way with many farmers who want the best. Again, all farmers cannot see their way clear to invest in more than one breed, but sooner or later there will get into a neighborhood different breeds, and where this happens the best is sure to predominate, as farmers must have the breeds that keep easiest.

Eleventh Ontario Provincial Fat Stock Show.

On the 15th of May a Provincial Fat Stock Show Association was again organized in the City of Guelph. The Association is composed of delegates elected by the following bodies:—

The Agriculture and Arts Association was represented by seven delegates, viz.: J. C. Snell, Edmonston; A. Rawlings, Forest; R. McEwen, Byron; J. Sissons, Crown Hill; Joshua Legg, Gananoque; Wm. Dawson, Vittoria, President of the Agriculture and Arts Association; and Mr. Henry Wade, Secretary of the same body.

The Sheep Breeders' Association and the Dominion Swine Breeders' Association were represented by five delegates, viz.: John Jackson, Abingdon; John Kelly, Shakespear; S. Coxworth, Claremont; J. E. Brethour, Burford; F. W. Hodson, London.

The Guelph Fat Stock Club was represented by four delegates, viz.: Jas. Anderson, J. I. Hobson, J. McCorkindale, Jas. Miller, all of Guelph.

Mr. J. C. Snell was unanimously elected President of the Club for the year 1894.

Mr. Henry Wade, Secretary of the Agriculture and Arts Association was by common consent chosen Secretary.

The prize list has received additions in several classes, especially in the pure-bred sheep division. In some classes new sections have been created. The classification is practically the same as last year. The rules and regulations have been somewhat altered; a few minor changes have been made. It is very desirable that a large number of pure-bred sheep, swine and cattle be shown. The prizes offered are larger, and should encourage live stock men to make barrows, wethers and steers. This show is attracting a great deal of attention, not only throughout this Province, but also across the lines and in Manitoba and the Canadian Northwest. Without doubt the exhibition last year was the best winter show ever held on this continent. The officers this year hope to make the coming display a still greater success than heretofore. The exhibition will be held December 11, 12 and 13.

The prize list is now in the printers' hands. Copies and full particulars may be obtained from Mr. Henry Wade, Toronto.

FARM.

Timely Notes for June—No. 1.

THE "AGGRESSIVE FARMER."

O, well for him whose will is strong!
He suffers, but he will not suffer long;
He suffers, but he cannot suffer wrong;

Who seems a promontory of rock.

But ill for him who, bettering not with time,
Corrupts the strength of heaven-descended will,
And ever weaker grows thro' acted crime,
Or seeming-genial venial fault,
Recurring and suggesting still!

—Tennyson.

Mr. Foster, with a great flourish of trumpets, and much self-applause, brought down his "revenue" tariff bill, declaring farmers ought to be now satisfied, as he had done so much to relieve them. In committee, the bill has been so remodelled as to become worse than the old tariff, in most instances, and the *specific* duties, acknowledged to be unfair, have in many cases been re-imposed, the strong wills of the manufacturers and their supporters in Parliament prevailing over the weaker wills and smaller numbers of the tariff reform delegates.

The "aggressive farmer" is a phrase I came across the other day, and, under the circumstances, it seems to be applied to the wrong party,—the aggressive manufacturer and boodler would be more correct. Many of us flatter ourselves that we are becoming more aggressive each year. Perhaps we are; but we want to be so in a somewhat sterner manner, if we are going to accomplish anything. We are steadily losing ground; many are losing their very farms, through their weakness in voting for the men who are robbing them of their birthright. Friends, are we to have a repetition of the total collapse in the United States before we awake from our slothful sleep, or will we act before it comes, and avert such a catastrophe? Why is it that men are being discharged from railways and other public concerns? Why is it that banks and other moneyed institutions are curtailing their credits? Is it because the farmers are so *prosperous* that they do not want money, and have no necessity to sell produce to keep the railways in operation, or is it that the farmers have already sold everything they can sell, or that can be squeezed out of them, and that in consequence there is no more work for the railways to do, and the banks consider it too risky to lend money to men who are already so deeply involved? "Open confession is food for the soul," and I think that the plain truth about the present state of the country should be made known, and then, if we farmers stick together, we *can, must and will* rise out of the mire into which we have allowed ourselves to be dragged. Let us work for our party—the farmers' party. Let Grits and Tories go to—well—Halifax, and we will make Canada what she should be—a good place to live in, and then:

"Whatever record leap to light,
It never shall be shamed."

THE SEPARATOR AGENTS.

I think you will agree with me that we have had enough declamation through the press, and through circulars by mail, about the merits of the De Laval and Alexandra machines. They each claim to be better than the other. Why don't they come down in their prices, and put them within reach of the general farming public; \$100 to \$125 is too much for a hand separator, and the power machines are also expensive, the charge for the tread or sweep power being exorbitant. At their prices, there must be a tremendous profit in them for someone—the patentees, the makers, or the agents. To meet the times, let them sell the machines at, say \$80 apiece, and mutually agree to let the prospective buyer take the one he likes best.

CHEAP WATER.

I want to know, in company with many more, the cheapest reliable way of having a constant supply of water. Given a good well and a warm stable close to it, can a tank be made to work in connection with a windmill, with a floating valve arrangement, cheaper than a hand-pump? The windmill, without a tank, is unreliable, as the wind does not always blow. Again, with a spring and a hydraulic ram, with a pipe laid six feet below the surface, it seems to me the supply of water could be obtained at a minimum cost. Again, it has been my experience, and that of many others near here, to have the pumps break down in the very coldest time, and it is well to have a reserve of water on hand. Which is the simplest form of pump for deep wells?

GENERAL.

Get that manure out on the summerfallow; plough it in; don't leave it round the stable for another year.

Set all the hens possible this month. Test the eggs for fertility before using. After two weeks, test again, then "double up" your settings under fewer hens, and give those that are left without eggs a fresh lot, and let them sit on for another three weeks. It is better than to let a hen fool away her time with a couple or so of chicks.

"INVICTA."