

profits from the beginning, on the simplest operations. And the federated associations could undertake construction and operation of abattoirs, etc., without any alteration of or addition to the charters of the associations whatever. It is earnestly to be hoped, in the interests of the beef-raisers, that they will do something in this direction.

AUSTIN L. McCREDIE.

Gluten Meal as Stock Food.

I have noticed gluten meal recommended in your columns as being about as good feed as one could buy for the price. About what price per ton, f. o. b. at nearest firm to the Island? What is the feeding value as compared with that of corn meal? What is it composed of, and how made?

East Prince, P. E. I.

SUBSCRIBER.

Ans.—We are not aware at what price gluten meal is held by Maritime firms, but would expect it to be somewhere in the neighborhood of \$30 to \$35 per ton, depending upon the brand and upon market fluctuations. If not kept in stock by Charlottetown and St. John wholesale feed dealers it could doubtless be ordered through them.

2.—In estimating values, it must be kept in mind that the gluten products vary widely in composition. Gluten meal and gluten feed are the residues or parts of the residues resulting from the manufacture of starch and glucose from corn. The processes of manufacture consist essentially of (1) the separation of the germ and hull from the starch and gluten, and (2) the final separation of the gluten from the starch. The residue may consist of three products, the gluten, germ and hulls, or a mixture of any two or three of these.

The entire residue mixed together is, in color, a brighter yellow than corn meal, and of a much more bulky character, owing to the presence of a larger proportion of bran. The trade name of this product is "gluten feed." The gluten, by itself, is distinguished by a deeper yellow color, and is called gluten meal. Gluten meal is thus much richer than gluten feed. Both are very rich in protein, and thus adapted to substitute for bran, cottonseed meal, oil meal, etc. They, therefore, differ entirely from whole or ground corn, which is rich in carbohydrates, by reason of containing the starch, which is abstracted in the manufacturing process.

An approximate idea of relative value of some of these nitrogenous feeds may be gained from the subjoined table of comparative analyses compiled in 1902 by Prof. Voorhees, of the New Jersey Experiment Station, and rating the feeds in order of protein content:

	Per cent. protein.
Cottonseed meal	44.40
Linseed meal	35.49
Gluten meal	35.07
Gluten feeds	25.88
Winter wheat bran	15.96
Corn meal	9.09

Dip the Lambs.

In a few days after the ewes of the flock are sheared, any ticks remaining upon them will transfer themselves to the lambs, where they will find more comfortable quarters. At this time the lambs should be dipped in a solution of one of the advertised proprietary dips to rid them of these pests. If the flock is small and only a few lambs are to be dipped, a barrel may answer the purpose, with a tub in which to stand them for dripping, but where a large number are to be handled a tank or vat made after the fashion of a plank stock-watering trough, or a steel tank for the purpose, should be a part of the outfit, with a dripping stand attached in either case. It will pay in the improved condition and growth of wool to dip the ewes at the same time, or at least to pour a quart or two of the solution on the back of each sheep, rubbing it well in with the hands. If there is any suspicion of scab in the flock, a thorough dipping with a strong solution should be given. When shearing the sheep it is well to trim their hoofs well with a knife, as they are apt to be overgrown from standing on the soft bedding of the winter quarters, and filth accumulating under the overgrown horn of the hoof is liable to provoke an outbreak of foot-rot, a scourge scarcely less dreadful than scab itself. It is wise at all times to keep on hand a small phial full of powdered bluestone to apply where anything like foot-rot or soreness between the hoofs causes lameness. The sooner such is checked the better, for if neglected it may become serious. With the flock well cleaned of ticks and lice, little attention is required until weaning time comes round, further than to see and count them once a day to make sure that they are all right. To guard against attacks by dogs, it is a good plan to have a small cow-bell hung to the necks of a couple of sheep in each flock. As a rule, this will frighten dogs away, and in case it fails, the bells sounding may wake some one of the household in time to prevent an attack.

Rearing Orphan Stock.

During the spring-time the farmer is kept busy looking after the welfare of new arrivals among his live stock. When all goes well with the dams, and they have plenty of milk, the youngsters thrive apace, and the labor of the attendant is somewhat lessened. But should the death of the mother occur, and natural nursing be impossible, then very frequently the process of bringing the orphans up by hand has to be resorted to. Lambs take more readily to hand feeding, as a rule, than any other stock. If strong and healthy they are almost sure to thrive; if weaklings, they might go to the wall in any case. It is very necessary to remember that "little and often" is the rule to observe, and that the little creatures are not killed by too much kindness, or rather, by too much food. The women-folk usually take the work in hand, and with no little success. The lamb's feeding tin or bottle should be kept clean, and be frequently scalded, and the piece of soft rag which is usually twisted round the spout of the vessel, be frequently renewed, as it will otherwise become foul and ill-smelling from getting soaked with milk. If used in a dirty state, it will be quite sufficient to set up scour in the lambs.

Select a cow the quality of whose milk can be depended upon as good, and do not change about, but keep to her milk for the lambs. This will be far better than feeding them indiscriminately with the milk from any cow. The better the milk, the better will the lambs thrive. Ewe's milk is richer in all solids than cow's milk. Add a little sugar and lime-water, and feed just nicely warm, as though it were newly drawn from the cow.

Young pigs are more troublesome to bring up by hand as a general thing, but this method is often practiced with success. The small farmer is anxious to lose no stock that can be reared, and so any trouble involved is not minded. It is not worth while bothering with weaklings, but in the case of valuable stock and strong, lively youngsters it is another thing.

Here, again, it is best to use milk from one cow all along, and to choose one who gives good milk. The milk of the sow is very rich; feed warm, adding just a small portion of sugar and a drop or two of cod liver oil. "Little and often" should be the motto.

In the case of a motherless foal, cow's milk, with a teaspoonful of sugar, and half a cup of warm water added to each pint of milk, may be successfully used.—[Agr. Gazette.]

They Must Have Our Cattle.

Things have been again moving in regard to the embargo. On Thursday, May 17th, in London, England, a deputation, consisting of Canadian, Scotch and English representatives, wended their way to Whitehall, and interviewed Mr. Fellowes, President of the Board of Agriculture, in regard to having the incubus removed. There existed no reason, so it was explained, why the embargo should remain, inasmuch as there is no contagious disease among Canadian herds; nor no sense, inasmuch as hides, which are infinitely more likely to carry in disease than live animals, are permitted to enter. It was pointed out by Mr. William Henderson, of Lawton, Coupar-Angus, that the only reason for maintaining the policy of 1896 is protection—"and protection of the most absurd kind, because it is an exclusion of the raw material, while there is an absolutely free importation of the finished article in tins, or chilled. The loss to farmers in Britain is, accordingly, a most serious matter." He estimated that from 1897 to 1902 they had failed to earn a sum exceeding £5,000,000—a sum which they would have earned if they had been permitted to purchase Canadian cattle and fatten them on their own farms.

[Note.—If the fattening of Canadian store cattle would have been such a good thing for the Old Countrymen, one would naturally think it might not be a bad thing for Canadians to do more of it.—Ed.]

Mr. J. B. Simpson, of Moose Jaw, N.-W. T., spoke strongly in favor of the removal of the embargo, a step which would, he contended, help most materially in establishing friendly relations between the West and Great Britain. He also stated that the Northwest farmers and ranchers had tried to feed and ship cattle direct to the British market, but found themselves crippled by the Eastern combines, who had secured the freight space at special rates, and, indeed, controlled the whole trade, so that the ranchers found themselves compelled to desist. The present policy filled the pockets of the combine, and robbed the poor ranchers.

After other speakers had expressed their views, the President gave his reply, which was by no means in favor of the petition. So long as he held his position, he stated, he could give no hope that the restrictions would be removed. He was aware that there is at present no proof of disease in Canada, but he was not convinced that in so large a territory there might not be risk of it.

Undismayed, however, the deputation after-

ward met at the Westminster Palace Hotel, in a conference at which many members of Parliament were present. On the motion of the Earl of Aberdeen, Baillie Watson was called to the chair, and announced that, since the reply of the President of the Board of Agriculture had been unsatisfactory, the present conference had been called for the purpose of making an appeal to Parliament. Subsequently the following resolutions were adopted:

1. "That this conference, having regard to the admitted fact that the herds of Canada are the healthiest in the world, and free of contagious disease, is of opinion that the Diseases of Animals Act of 1896 should be so amended as to give power to the Board of Agriculture to permit of the entry into Great Britain of cattle and sheep without their being required to be slaughtered at the port of landing, and resolves that all necessary steps be taken to promote and attain this object."

2. "That this conference is of opinion that the laws regulating the importation and exportation of live animals to and from Great Britain, tend to cause and perpetuate disease and degeneracy in our herds, in respect that they prevent the introduction of fresh blood to our herds, while, at the same time, they permit the exportation of sound breeding animals and the retention for breeding purposes in this country of the weaklings and of the unsound cattle rejected by foreign buyers."

3. "That this conference is of opinion that the operation of the law requiring the slaughter of cattle at the ports of disembarkation in Great Britain is a grave injustice to our colonial interests, highly injurious to consumers, and disastrous to all branches of the agricultural interests."

In order to carry into effect the objects of the conference, it was decided to form a United Kingdom Association.

The conference then ended.

Artificial and Natural Dehorning.

To the Editor "Farmer's Advocate":

I have read several letters lately in regard to dehorning of beef cattle, and also the speech of Mr. Thos. Crawford, M. P. P., who is a cattle-buyer of large experience, in support of his bill providing for compulsory dehorning. There is no doubt that it would be a great advantage to every farmer and cattle-buyer to have cattle without horns. I have raised Shorthorn cattle and also grades for the last thirty years, and I had so much trouble with them that I had them all dehorned; that was about twelve years ago, and I have never had any trouble with them since. I kill the horns with caustic potash when the calves are about three days old; it is easily done. It is no detriment to the sale of pure-bred Shorthorn cattle to have no horns, and most farmers in our district would sooner have them without. Several buyers have come a long distance to buy my cattle for the reason that they had no horns. Last year I bought two Polled-Angus or Aberdeen-Angus cattle, and I have bred my grade Durham cows to the Angus bull. The calves are now coming, and they are very nice ones, not one having horns.

The Aberdeen-Angus are very fine cattle, equal to the Shorthorns, are easily fattened, and are very hardy. They have taken the first prize at the fat-stock shows at Chicago, London (Eng.), and several other places this year over all the other beef breeds, and their meat is of very superior quality. I am sure that by using these bulls the horns would be done away with, and it would be a great advantage to the farmers of Canada. The Angus cattle have not been very numerous in Canada in the past because it was not the fashion, and people did not know much about them till lately; but at the present time they are increasing rapidly, as you can see by the advertisements in the papers. Nearly all the beef cattle in the States are dehorned, and I am informed that the buyers at Chicago will not buy cattle with horns if they can get enough others, except at a reduced price. I think it would be well for the buyers of Canada to do the same, as I think it would have a tendency to reduce the number of horned cattle.

Bruce Co., Ont.

JOHN ELDRIDGE.

The Canadian Mutual Live-stock Insurance Company is the name of a new concern that has been granted a license in the Province of Ontario to carry on the business of insuring live stock on the premium-note plan. It is the only company of the kind in Canada, although a similar one was formed some time ago, and has since gone out of business. Mr. Frank Britton, of Toronto, is one of the chief promoters.

Tell Your Wants

TO OVER 30,000 OF CANADA'S BEST FARMERS BY ADVERTISING IN THE "WANT AND FOR SALE" COLUMN OF THE "FARMER'S ADVOCATE AND HOME MAGAZINE," LONDON, ONT.