

Quantity vs. Quality in Sheep.

Two paragraphs appearing simultaneously in two agricultural journals, one in the United States, the other in Canada, written by two individuals, whose words should have weight with new beginners, demand, I think, a passing notice. The first paragraph appears in the issue of the *Breeders' Gazette* of January 1st, over the signature of E. M. Rees, and reads as follows:—

"The unprecedented award on the block at the last fat-stock show to the SHROPSHIRE-MERINO carcass, will set many a sheep breeder crazy for cross-bred sheep, and the demand may be unlimited for large mutton bucks to cross on the smaller ewes. *Go slow, gentlemen.* If you will watch the markets in Chicago, you will find the BIG CARCASSES are the ones that reach the top notch. There is no inquiry made as to what breed they belong to. Permit me to say to any beginner in the sheep business, purchase the *largest carcass, heavy-wooled buck*, and then breed up."

The second is from the pen of Canada's justly noted Cotswold breeder, Mr. J. C. Snell, Edmonton, Ont., and appeared in the January number of the *FARMER'S ADVOCATE*. It reads as follows:

"If our circumstances were such that we had a special market, and could secure special extra prices for a certain QUALITY of WOOL or MUTTON, one can readily understand the wisdom of breeding to meet the demands or requirements of such a market; but, what are the facts in regard to our markets? Is not both wool and mutton bought at *so much per pound*, and is there any considerable extra price paid for QUALITY in either case that will nearly compensate for the difference in *weight* in favor of the Cotswolds in carcass at any age, or in the annual clip of wool?"

Both these gentlemen, in their remarks, urge that quality counts for nothing in the markets of America and Great Britain, and that the prudent course for the sheep breeders would be to produce as many pounds of wool and mutton as possible, regardless altogether of QUALITY. I confess to having too much public spirit to allow a statement so mis-leading to go uncontradicted. It is mostly because of such advice as this, and of such opinions as these being prevalent that the American people hitherto have used such a small quantity of mutton in proportion to the other kinds of meat offered. My advice would be exactly the reverse. If the young breeder can determine what cross or what breed will produce the finest quality of mutton, then let him invest his money in them—always, of course, observing the motto, which I think is a good one, to seek to grow the GREATEST QUANTITY OF THE BEST QUALITY.

It was not many years ago since wheat was purchased in the same way as that suggested by my friends in their correspondence. A bushel of wheat counted for a bushel whether it weighed fifty pounds or sixty-two pounds. Whether it was carefully cleaned of filth and dirt, or otherwise, the price was always the same. But that day has gone by. The wheat and other grains are carefully graded according to quality, and he who grows the greatest quantity of the best quality counts the most dollars for his produce.

Give to your American friends a taste of the finest mutton, and let them use it upon their tables for a month, then pass off on them some of this mutton, which has been grown according to QUANTITY and not quality, and see whether

there will be any distinction made. I think that a taste can be created by producing the very best article possible; but, I think, on the contrary, that people who can well afford to buy the best, will become so disgusted with the inferior article that they will refuse to buy it at all. I am told by good authority, that there are, in New York city, more men having an annual income of \$25,000 and upwards than in any other city in the world. These persons demand the best of everything for their tables. Is it not prudence then on our part to seek to supply what they are willing to use, and equally willing to pay for?

But, the statement is misleading in another direction. Does it follow that because a man can send to market, an animal weighing fifty pounds more than one sent by his neighbor, and sell it for the same price per pound? I say does it follow that he is making more money by the operation? I contend that this would be an unfair, and very likely an improper inference. The question will be: Upon the same land, and upon the same feed, how many pounds can be produced at a given cost, regardless of the fact whether it travels on four legs or eight?

I have not a word to say against the long-wooled breeds advocated by these gentlemen, except that I have grown them myself, and have no desire to repeat the operation. If I were to accept the advice given by these gentlemen, I should feel that I was breeding DOWNWARD and not upward, as they suggest.

Let me, then, repeat my advice, which is, BREED THE BEST QUALITY, and in the GREATEST POSSIBLE QUANTITY, and you will be sure to win.

JOHN DRYDEN.

Clydesdale Sires.

Already in Scotland the services of most of the celebrated Clydesdale sires has been secured for the season of 1890. The way this is done is by the breeders of each district forming themselves into a society and appointing directors who look after their interests. Formerly, the Glasgow Spring Stallion Show was the favorite place for this selection, but of late years the best sires have all been secured in advance. The rates for service are very high compared with what stallion owners have to accept here in Canada, and as a consequence the large sums necessary to purchase a first class animal can not be paid by breeders or dealers from this side of the water. The only way our men can secure animals near the top is by buying young animals of the right kind and quality before their merits have been fully appreciated, this requires rare good judgment and skill—qualities which have been shown many times with good results by our Canadian buyers. During the past season "Prince of Albion" (6178) had a full season at \$50 service fee, and \$50 additional for foal money. Others have had a similar fee—\$100 each foal and \$50 for no foal, requires a good class of mares to pay the breeder. A very common rate is just half this—\$50 for foal and \$25 for service. The lowest rates for the better animals are \$15 service and \$15 more for foal. These rates are on a guarantee of eighty mares. This gives the stallion owner a sure \$1200 for the season and \$15 more for each foal.

The Secretary of the Clydesdale Society, in the Live Stock Journal Almanac of London, England, gives a tabulated list of awards; gives descendants of the best Clydesdale sires, and places them in the following order:—

- | | |
|--------------------|-----------------------|
| 1 Darnley. | 6 St. Lawrence. |
| 2 Prince of Wales. | 7 Prince of Avondale. |
| 3 Macgregor. | 8 Lord Erskine. |
| 4 Prince Lawrence. | 9 McCamon. |
| 5 Top Gallant. | 10 Castlereagh. |

Well Balanced Rations.

The following daily rations for cows are given by the Vermont Experimental Station. The formulas are intended to furnish ordinary cows of 1,000 pounds live weight the different elements of plant food in the most economical proportions:

Wheat bran 9 lbs., 3 lbs. linseed meal (new process), 10 lbs. corn stalks, 5 lbs. wheat straw, 3 lbs. oat straw.

Corn meal 8 lbs., 5 lbs. linseed meal, 10 lbs. corn stalks, 2 lbs. oat straw.

Cottonseed meal 3 lbs., 4 lbs. corn meal, 4 lbs. bran, 9 lbs. hay, 9 lbs. corn fodder.

Cottonseed meal 2 lbs., 2 lbs. linseed meal, 6 lbs. barley meal, 8 lbs. wheat straw, 12 lbs. hay.

Cottonseed meal 2 lbs., 3 lbs. linseed meal, 4 lbs. barley meal, 13 lbs. straw, 8 lbs. hay.

Linseed meal 5 lbs., 5 lbs. bran or middlings, 15 lbs. straw, 5 lbs. hay.

Gluten meal 4 lbs., 5 lbs. wheat bran, 3 lbs. corn meal, 20 lbs. ensilage, 10 lbs. hay.

Linseed meal 3 lbs., 4 lbs. bran or middlings, 4 lbs. corn meal, 10 lbs. clover hay, 30 lbs. ensilage.

Linseed meal 4 lbs., 30 lbs. ensilage, 9 lbs. clover hay, 9 lbs. timothy hay.

The following are calculated per head per day for milch cows weighing from 800 to 900 lbs.:

Linseed meal 2 lbs., 4 lbs. bran, 5 lbs. hay, 60 lbs. corn ensilage.

Bran or middlings 4 lbs., 40 lbs. corn ensilage, 40 lbs. clover ensilage.

Cottonseed meal 2 lbs., 4 lbs. bran, 1 lb. corn meal, 6 lbs. corn stalks, 6 lbs. straw, 2 lbs. clover hay, 30 lbs. mangolds.

For heavy cows, large milkers:

Corn meal 4 lbs., 2 lbs. cottonseed meal, 4 lbs. wheat bran, 2 lbs. linseed meal, 10 lbs. straw, 10 lbs. clover hay.

Corn meal 4 lbs., 4 lbs. cottonseed meal, 8 lbs. wheat bran, 16 lbs. hay.

Corn meal 4 lbs., 4 lbs. cottonseed meal, 8 lbs. wheat bran, 18 lbs. corn fodder.

Linseed meal 4 lbs., 1 lb. cottonseed meal, 5 lbs. barley meal, 5 lbs. cob meal, 16 lbs. corn stover.

Cottonseed meal 3 lbs., 2 lbs. bran, 30 lbs. ensilage, 17 lbs. hay.

For fattening cattle for each 1,000 lbs. live weight of the animals fed:

Linseed meal 6 lbs., 6 lbs. corn meal, 20 lbs. corn fodder.

Cottonseed meal 5 lbs., 20 lbs. hay.

For 800 lbs. weight:

Linseed meal 5 lbs., 3 lbs. bran, 10 lbs. rye straw, 10 lbs. hay.

Corn meal 10 lbs., 5 lbs. corn stalks, 18 lbs. clover hay.

Corn meal 10 lbs., 25 lbs. pea and oat hay.

For horses heavily worked per day per 1,000 lbs. live weight:

Linseed meal 2 lbs., 6 lbs. rye bran, 10 lbs. corn meal, 6 lbs. corn fodder, 8 lbs. clover hay.

Bran 6 lbs., 12 lbs. corn meal, 6 lbs. meadow hay, 6 lbs. clover hay.

Bran 2 lbs., 6 lbs. oats, 8 lbs. corn meal, 6 lbs. wheat straw, 8 lbs. meadow hay.

For horses at light work per 1,000 lbs.:

Oats 12 lbs., 12 lbs. hay.

Oats 6 lbs., 4 lbs. of corn meal, 3 lbs. wheat bran, 12 lbs. hay.

The London Live Stock Journal thinks "It seems very curious, considering that there is such a demand in America for action horses, that no society should be instituted to take up the interests of the Hackney. We believe there is a great future for the Hackney in Canada."