

How the New Rule Affects Clydesdales.

Following is a copy of a recent letter (dated January 21th), written by the Accountant of the National Live-stock Records to a prominent firm of Canadian Clydesdale importers and breeders:

"In reference to the new American customs regulation governing the free admission of pure-breds, animals, to be eligible for free entry, must trace in all their crosses to imported animals recorded in the country of the origin of the breed. There are a great number of animals recorded in Clydesdale volume 1 which were imported before the Scottish Clydesdale Studbook was established, consequently could not be recorded in the country of the origin of the breed. The American regulation means that any animal tracing to those not recorded are not eligible for free admission. For instance, Gray Clyde, Sir Wm. Wallace, and Wonderful Lad were not recorded in Scotland, and anything tracing to them will not be admitted free. To illustrate, tabulate any pedigree fully, and if any of the horses named, or any other similar horses (there are many of them) appear, the animal is disqualified. As you are no doubt aware, probably 75 per cent. of our Canadian-bred stock trace in one of their crosses to one of these three animals. The only horses which will be given free admission will be the ones which are bred from recent importations.

"We are preparing to issue an export certificate which will cover documents required by the Bureau of Animal Industry. Our export will be a certification that the animal is recorded in the Clydesdale Studbook of Canada; there will also be vendor's certificate, which the exporter will have to sign. In addition, an application to the Bureau of Animal Industry for pure-bred export certificate will be included. This latter specifies, as required by the United States regulation, the place in the United States where an animal is to be shipped, the point in Canada from where shipped, the point where animal will enter the country, the date on which it will enter, and the railway by which it will travel. The United States owner, importer or agent must sign and forward the Canadian export and the Canadian certificate of registration to Washington.

"Animals will have to be transferred on our books to the ownership of the American purchaser before Canadian export will be issued; and, although we are prepared to issue these certificates, we cannot undertake to specify what animals will enter the States free, and cannot guarantee that the officers of the Bureau of Animal Industry at Washington will issue pure-bred import certificates.

"It is, therefore, not advisable for you to ship until you have received notification that pure-bred import certificates are being sent from Washington to an officer at the point where animals will enter the United States. They will not be sent to you or your American customer. Under the old regulations, when American import certificates were issued by the American Clydesdale Association, they were either sent to you or the purchaser."

The territory contiguous to Ottawa had an excellent opportunity during the Winter Fair not only to see the best type of Clydesdales in Canada, but also to buy them. It is a common cry that there are only a very few good sires in Eastern Ontario, wherefore the people cannot raise good horses. There were good stallions—many of them—at the Winter Fair, and most of them were purchasable. Some of the best were already contracted for, but not all, and if farmers of Eastern Ontario do not have more good sires this year than last year, they at least have this consolation, that they had a chance to look at the horses, a chance to buy—and did not do so; but that is mighty poor consolation.

LIVE STOCK.

One Sow to Two Cows.

Editor "The Farmer's Advocate":

The year 1910 has passed, and, from the viewpoint of the Maritime agriculturist, it will be remembered as a good year. Weather conditions in the spring and early summer were most favorable, and hay, grain, forage crops and pasture grew abundantly. "The first real hay crop in twelve years," was the verdict of one farmer in this vicinity, and truly there is abundance of hay in this county at present writing. A few years ago there came a spring when hay became very scarce, and many farmers went far and paid high for enough hay to bring their cattle through. This was followed by a short crop, and farmers went panicky, and sold off their stock for about anything it would bring. One man decided to me he would knock every animal he owned on the head, rather than face the winter with a shortage of hay, as I had confessed I expected to do. It proved that there was plenty of hay for all who wanted it, and a year from that season a cow of my acquaintance was offered by one of the hay-raising districts of the county at a low price.

tons of hay at \$3 per ton, as he had no room to store the crop that was coming on, and Albert County barns have not been empty since. It is not only in the hog business that a little courage would pay well when conditions look somewhat unfavorable. Grain crops were also good in the season just closed, oats especially so. Some complaint was made in regard to potatoes and roots, though our own were excellent, turnips being the heaviest in our experience. The one failure was fruit; a heavy frost on the night of the fourth of June practically wiped out the fruit crop in this vicinity, and injured it greatly throughout these Provinces. Along the valley of the Pollett River, from Egin, in Albert County, to Salisbury, in Westmoreland County, as far as I have made inquiries, there was not a barrel of apples. Wild fruit of all kinds shared in the general ruin. It must be a hard winter for the wee woods-people without their usual store of nuts.

But all this merely in passing. I was moved to open my ink-bottle by the remarks of "Berk Bacon," and the editorial desire for more on the subject, in your issue of January 12th.

If "Berk Bacon" can prove by the facts and figures of real experience that his estimates will hold water, certainly the sow is IT, for the difference in cost of attendance is decidedly in her favor. Also, I am inclined to believe that, given the type of farming that produces the 3,500-pound cow, the sow will give a good account of herself, comparatively. Give her a comfortable bed, and sufficient food to keep her from staggering, and she will "rustle" for the rest, and reproduce her kind apparently about as well as when better used. Indeed, it is one of the things I have against her, that, often when fed and cared for the best, she will use her owner the meanest. My own experience last year is a case in point, when I bred two sows repeatedly, both fall and spring, and got five pigs in the year.

According to my experience, in the hands of the dairyman who "sits up and takes notice," who has learned the lesson of "weed, breed, and feed," the sow will be merely a side-issue, handy to have to produce a market for the by-products, but not by any means "in it" with the cow as a revenue-producer. This is not a matter of prejudice with me, as I began farming some nine years ago with this idea: Cows will pay their way, and, with skim milk as a starter, there is money in pork. But, from the cold logic of figures, my agricultural creed has changed, for I have found that the money is in the cow, while the sow makes an excellent auxiliary in the way I have intimated. When, a few weeks ago, "The Farmer's Advocate" offered a prize on this subject, I started, one stormy day, to contribute to the competition, but failed to finish it at that time, and did not get at it again until the time limit had expired. I pitted two sows against one cow, counting them as representing about the same capital value, and requiring about the same attendance, outside of milking. I found that the sows were getting a little more than ten pounds middlings per day, which varies little the year round, except when suckling their litters, when, of course, the ration would be largely increased, so I calculated they would consume in the year just about two tons of middlings, which is here worth from \$26 to \$30 per ton; so they were consuming about \$28 worth of feed per year each. This is quite different from "Berk Bacon's" estimate of \$10. I subjoin the account, made up as fairly as I know how:

TWO SOWS, ONE YEAR.

Dr.	
Two tons middlings	\$56.00
Service fees	4.00
	\$60.00
Cr.	
15 spring pigs	\$45.00
15 fall pigs	30.00
	\$75.00
	60.00
Profit	\$15.00

ONE COW, ONE YEAR.

Dr.	
Two tons of hay	\$15.00
1,400 pounds bran	16.80
2 tons turnips	9.00
Pasture	2.50
Milking	3.50
Churning	10.00
Salt and butter paper	2.50
	1.00
	\$60.30
Cr.	
75 pounds butter, at 23c lb.	\$17.25
1,400 lbs. skim and buttermilk	12.00
	\$29.25
	60.30
Profit	\$37.95

Sometimes, when there is more milk than the young pigs need, the sows are fed the overplus, and get less grain, but there is not enough of this to change the year's cost appreciably. The cow I chose was not my best, nor poorest. We dried her up early in December, so she had finished her year's work when I started to write the article. She gave 5,183 pounds milk, testing 6.6. Adding the low overrun of 10 per cent. to the fat, gives 375 pounds butter, as per account.

"Berk Bacon" and others may ask me, Why don't you feed your sows cheaper feed—rape, clover, etc.? I answer, because the quantity of such feeds that I can raise is limited, and they are essential to the cows; and I have proved that it pays to farm for the cows and use other branches merely as aids to the leading one. My account with pigpen during year, on a turnover of over \$300 worth of feed, showed a profit of \$40; that of the dairy, on \$375 worth of feed, shows a profit of over \$350—feeding, attendance and manure left out in both cases, but the dairy charged with all the items which appear against the cow in above account.

Any weak spots in the foregoing I will be glad to have pointed out by the editor or his correspondents. I can substantiate all I have stated as facts, and will support my estimates as best I can.

As to number of sows to keep at one time, I kept four to six or seven cows, but found it too many, as there was not milk enough in the fall to give the youngsters a fair start; but I believe that one sow and litter can be successfully reared to every two cows, by having part of the herd freshen, say, in December. But, at the present prices of poultry, it is a question worth considering, whether or not a part, at least, of the milk could be more profitably marketed in that way.

Bringing, thus, a new element into the discussion, I go my way, for this time, wishing "The Farmer's Advocate" abundant success, and, if possible, increased popularity.

Albert Co., N. B. J. H. COLPITTS.

Are Beef-raisers "Dubs"?

"Do you know of a farm in Canada, where land is worth not less than fifty dollars an acre, on which beef is being raised profitably from cows that are not milked, but merely suckle their calves?" This question we have put time and again to opponents of the dual-purpose idea. We have yet to receive the first affirmative reply. The usual answer is, "No, I don't believe it can be done." Recent Michigan experiments in baby-beef production go to bear out this impression. Well, then, unless we have dual-purpose stock, whence is our beef supply to come? Every special-purpose champion hedges at this point. One lately ventured to suggest that it might be practicable to produce fancy Easter or Christmas beef profitably from special-purpose beef-bred cows. Yes, but how about the great staple supply? "Oh, well," he whispered, confidentially, "there will always be enough dubs to raise that," his implication being that no wide-awake farmer would keep any cows but special-purpose dairy animals. Now, the special-purpose dairy cow has a large and growing place to fill, but does it follow that she is the only cow to be kept upon our farms? "The Farmer's Advocate" believes there is considerable room in Eastern Canada for beef-production, and dual-purpose stock is required to produce good beef at a reasonable cost. The dairyman is the last man who should quarrel with that proposition. Of course, crossing may be resorted to, but that is open to serious objections. There are many people, and they are by no means "dubs," either, who believe that, under their particular conditions, they could make almost as much money out of dual-purpose cows as out of special-purpose dairy stock, and enjoy it better. But to this end the breeders of pure-breds must supply them with real dual-purpose stock. The Shorthorn breed, the grand dual-purpose breed of the past, is getting away from that ideal, and running to beef. The tendency can be corrected and the balance preserved by adopting a record of dairy performance. Now is the time to act.

Alfalfa as a Wool Producer.

During 1908-09 the sheep at the Ontario Agricultural College were wintered on timothy and clover, and in 1909-10 on alfalfa. In the spring, when the clipping was done, the wool was weighed both years. A comparison shows that with all the breeds there was a greater yield of wool when alfalfa was fed than in the previous winter.

	Avg. Weight of Wool		Per cent. increase with alfalfa
	When fed timothy and clover	When fed alfalfa	
Leicester	9.11	9.67	5.8
Shropshire	9.39	9.47	1.8
Oxford	9.57	10.35	8.1
Avg. of all breeds	9.34	9.83	5.2