

"The Suffolk is unchanging with each generation." We mean the ideal of the Suffolks which the breeders are breeding for, is unchanged, that he has never been the slave of any useless fashion, but the Suffolk today is the result of centuries of practical work and improvement by selection in the show ring, sound, because no Suffolk is allowed to take a prize without being passed by a vet. He is by far the oldest breed of heavy horse, as proved by his unchanging color, our pedigrees go back through seventeen generations to a horse foaled in the year 1768, and they were then an old breed as contemporary writers of that time show.

What the Suffolk breeder aims at is a horse 16 hands high, great width fore and aft, deep in the rib from elbow to flank, with a back like a South-down ram and no diminution in width forward of the hips, short legs and hard feet, a good swinging walk and well-balanced movement all round.

The graceful outline is rarely absent, the plain head, ewe neck and drooped rump are no features of the Suffolk. Long muscular shoulders widening out at the point from a front view, great width over the hips and massive quarters. Quality he must have, a coarse hairy leg and a skin which will not do credit to the man in charge condemn him at once. As an easy keeper there is nothing to compete with him. His gentle temper is proverbial. In the words of the stud book, if this be doubted, all we ask is that the unbeliever should come and see.

As a proof of their longevity, soundness and toughness, stallions have travelled twenty-five seasons, a brewery has a gelding that stood the London streets for twenty-three years, a team of four horses walked together for fifteen years without missing a day through sickness. A Suffolk has been known to move a truck weighing 40 tons on the level. A Scotch veterinary in Cardiff told us that they stood the cobbles better than any other horse. In Australia they stand the heat better than other breeds, make the best cross on native mares, and when going long distances get their living on the grass at night, which they claim no other horse can do. At this year's International show in London the Suffolks won the championship for heavy draft over old breeds and were judged by a Shire man. But we could fill a book with records of their endurance, etc.

Now as to crossing with light mares, for which Mr. Turner claims they are a failure, what is the experience of men all over the world, possibly as good horsemen as he is? In Ireland they use him for giving strength and substance to their light mares. In Australia they breed their most saleable horses with him and their light mares, selling them to India for artillery horses.

Mr. Alex Galbraith says that "on account of their smoothness of build, uniformity of color, and excellent disposition, I think that no better horse can be found for crossing on light mares, the results of the past justifying me in recommending the Suffolk horse as an improver of other breeds, especially *Western or range bred mares*."

The various European governments use him for breeding their artillery horses, and we fail to see the reason of their wishing to breed the poorest kind of horses. How does this evidence compare with Mr. Turner's statements of their breeding "cheap chunks?" We have been in Alberta ten years, long enough for us to know what we want, and if the average team to be seen today in the country is the result of thirty odd years of Clyde improvement, it's a mighty poor one. Mr. Turner makes much of the fact that one man owning a Suffolk wishes to go into Clydes, what does he wish to pay for a horse? Many Clydes are to be bought at a lower figure than our Suffolks. Against this, we have received many letters from men owning Clydes wishing to go into Suffolks. We thank Mr. Turner for his warning, but we have no intention of hurting ourselves financially with the breed, we import as our sales warrant it, up to now we have imported fourteen stallions and fifteen mares, and having set the ball rolling we mean to keep it going. It is true that a few Suffolks had been used before we started with ours, and with what we have always been told and have seen, excellent results, at any rate those old stallions have been the cause of our selling ours. We buy only the best that can be bought and feel sure they have only to become known to be appreciated. We had the pleasure of leading Mr. Turner's Suffolk to the station when he left his old home, and a good horse he is, or was. Our own experience of crossing is gained from a bunch of about fifty range mares, besides

some hundreds of outside mares, and if these colts grow into "cheap chunks," we miss our guess. We intend to show a few colts at the March Calgary show, and we are not afraid even with the Clyde judges.

In the twenty-three years of Royal shows, before the breeds were separated, the Suffolks won fourteen times and took more than half the second prizes against all breeds. Prejudice now runs higher than formerly and while not expecting to win in the show ring with Clyde men judging, we are content to leave the result with the public, who, as Mr. Turner very truly says, are the best judges.

Ingleton, Alta.

JAQUES BROS.

A Shire Man Who Likes Cross Breeding

EDITOR FARMER'S ADVOCATE:—

I must write a line protesting against Mr. Jaques' saying "there are no English stockmen in Canada." I think I am one, and I know a good many more. Anyhow, I was one of the first members of the Shire Horse Society in England, and helped to get the pedigrees of horses for the first stud book in my part of Leicestershire, and my ancestors always had some very good black horses of that breed. I think I also have some pretty good cow stock, too, out here, (Shorthorns), some registered.

I am sure Mr. Jaques is doing good by bringing some good horses into our neighborhood, and as many of the new settlers are from the States, and incline to the Percheron breed, with absence of feather on the legs, probably the Suffolk Punch would suit them.

Why are there so many more Clydes than Shires in Canada? It seems to me we have not enough money to spare to purchase the best Shires for one thing (that is, the majority of us), and again, our mares are too small for so violent a cross. That is my case, anyway. I am a Shire man all out, but last winter I went to Ontario and bought a Clyde, a Shire, and a half Clyde and half Shire, all from registered parents, and good individuals. Now, I wish those people who get so hot about Clydes and Shires would come to my ranch and tell me which is which. They are all running out together. I think the Shire will be too big and heavy for me at present. He was a late foal and badly summered, and wintered too. The Clyde, on the contrary, was a well grown and fairly early foal, and was lucky enough to win two firsts and one second prize the only times shown. But the Shire is now growing away from the Clyde. I wish the two books were one—it seems absurd to have two.—I like the cross-bred the best of the three.

I was brought up near Waltham-on-the-Wold, and attended that great fair for two-year-old Shire horses for many years, and the Scotchmen were always the best customers we had for a good filly. Were those mares Clydes after they got over the border? There must be hundreds of them in Scotland. It seems to me the best individual of either breed is the best, only we cannot exhibit our best horses when we cross them, and so we lose the greater weight of one sort, and the fine feet and clean bone of the other, for a fad, and yet they are all the same breed run on different lines.

M. M. Ranch, Alta.

W. S. BLACK.

STOCK

Discussions on Live-Stock subjects welcomed.

The Department of Agriculture, Ottawa, has issued a directory of the breeders of pure-bred stock throughout Canada. The preface to the volume explains that the list is by no means complete, but the lists are submitted as an approximation of the total number of breeders and pure-bred stock. A casual glance will show anyone that there are many prominent exhibitors not catalogued, which might have been avoided by checking over exhibition reports.

* * *

Promises were made at the convention of the Central Alberta Stock Growers' Association that a concrete plan for the establishment of a chilled meat plant would be submitted to the public. That is good news. Let us hope that the plans will be complete, and solve the financial aspect of the case. The Canadian farms and ranches will furnish cattle in gradually increasing quantities, and the world's markets will take the finished product, but the problem is to get someone who is sufficiently supplied with and careful of capital to make a success of turning live cattle into chilled meat.

Also a Cattle Producer

EDITOR FARMER'S ADVOCATE:—

In the November 18th issue of the FARMER'S ADVOCATE I saw an article on cattle raising signed "Producer." An editorial of the same issue states that "Producer" represents the attitude of the majority of our Manitoba farmers on the cattle raising question, and being of the same opinion myself as to the condition of things as they exist, I thought I might try and represent to "Producer" wherein the trouble lies—as I see it.

I might state at the commencement that I have been a producer also for the last twenty-five years in this country, but, I think, of a different kind from what "Producer" pictures in his article. I do not want to discredit "Producer," and I hope he will take it in good part. His article is a pretty true picture of the cattle industry as it exists. Where I disagree with him is in his trying to push all the blame off his own shoulders on to the other man. This is one of our besetting sins. We farmers, as a rule, are like the Irishman, "Ag'in everything." We like to pounce down on the other fellow to relieve our feelings or cover our own negligence.

Now, I do not want "Producer" to think that I am upholding the other man. There is no doubt that we do not receive what we should for our stock. They never pay more than they are compelled to. There is no doubt in my mind that a monopoly exists, although it was beyond the vision of the Royal Commission that was appointed to look into it. But, notwithstanding all this, some of us have made money in the cattle industry, and if you will follow me for a few minutes I will try and show where "Producer" is at fault.

Wheat is admitted to be king in Manitoba, and everything else has to go before it. A Manitoba farmer may talk horse, as the horse is a necessity in the production of wheat, but cattle he has no time for. There is no money in them he will tell you, as "Producer" does; that there was a day when we made money out of cattle. Does he ever stop to think that there was a day when he had cattle? Cattle that were worthy of the name, then wheat was not king. He paid attention to his stock then, and reaped a reward. "Producer's" own figures go to prove what I am saying. Eleven hundred and fifty pounds for a three-year-old; just an average weight of a two-year-old that has been raised under favorable conditions. There is a year lost somewhere—how can we account for this condition of things? Breed may be responsible for a part, as "Producer" states that only a few dairy cows are kept to supply the requirements of the farmer's family now, but on breed all the responsibility cannot be thrown. We will take this 1,150 pound steer. Look into his early history, commencing at his birth. The calves are mostly raised on skim-milk, and through negligence it is more often sour than sweet. How few of our farmers ever substitute anything for the butterfat they have taken away. The quantity of milk that a calf gets is seldom gauged by what it requires; it is by what the owner has to spare. It may be a quart at one meal, and a pailful the next. Then he wonders why that calf does not thrive. The result is that the calf is stunted at the start, and no matter what hands he falls into, he will never make the beast that he would have if reared under favorable conditions. "Producer" says that there was a time when we got twelve and fifteen dollars per head for our calves. Will he be honest and tell us if they were raised under similar conditions? I think not. In the majority of cases they were raised on their mothers, and I can assure you they were calves.

These poor animals, after the first winter, are raised at the straw stack, and in the summer are put out to the herd, as the wheat farmer does not want them around in his way. They return in the fall almost as poor, in the majority of cases, as when they left in the spring. Now, "Producer," is it any wonder that you have lost a year? Still you say (when that butcher comes around in his top buggy) that you have some good three-year-olds for sale, and feel hurt when he offers you a two-year-old price for them.

It is not necessary for me to say how they should be raised, for there was a time when "Producer" made money out of them. Let him return to the old way, and the old profit will return to pay him for his labor. I live in a good wheat district, but have always seen a profit in cattle when handled properly, and I can see large profits not far distant for the cattlemen.

ROBERT M. DOUGLAS.