

matter that can take place in the body, and it is very slight.

Heavy protein feeding tends to increase this circulatory protein, which, in turn, seems to stimulate the vital activity of those cells with which it comes in contact. This explains, in part, at least, the greater storage of fat in animals fed carbohydrate rations to which is added a moderate amount of proteids. The storage of the fat requires an activity of the adipose tissue cells, whose foundation is proteid, and the increase in circulatory protein stimulates these cells, insuring a greater action and deposit of fat.

Reviewing the situation, proteids form the greater part of the animal body; they are essential to all the vital activities, even to the storage of fat; they can be formed in the animal body only from true proteids in the food, and are most jealously guarded by the animal itself. As producers of stock, we should work in harmony with our stock, supplying that which they demand, at the time and in the quantities required, stimulating, rather than retarding the animal economy.

J. A. McLEAN,
Assistant Professor of Animal Husbandry,
Iowa Agricultural College.

REGISTRATION OF STOCK-FARM NAMES AND OTHER SUGGESTIONS.

Editor "The Farmer's Advocate":

In concluding the foreword for 1908, discussing that general utility breed, the Shorthorn, it was stated that there were several other minor suggestions worthy of discussion, and, we may add, suggestions to make, which—horror of horrors!—might disturb a precedent so dear to ripened minds and mellowed intellects.

The breeder with ideas broad enough to think out his own mating problems, only now and again keeping in mind the advice on the blending of living beings, of those sages, Darwin and Mendel, is often momentarily perplexed when filling out the birth certificate for the breed registrar, to get a suitable name. Someone has said, "What's in a name?" The history of the Shorthorn breed shows there has been a great deal more at times than proved good for the breed. Still, individuals must be labelled to be identified. Registrars and herdbook editors have ideas on these subjects, and prefer short names and the avoidance of duplications. With regard to the latter point, we have arrived at a simple solution long ago, founded and acted upon by our Old Country friends and instructors in the art of breeding and feeding, namely, the use of prefixes or affixes. In Great Britain, the Shorthorn Society and the Shire Horse Society register, for a fee (\$2.50), the name selected, usually that of farm or estate, and no other person may use it for registration in that book. The practice is growing, more prefixes being registered each year than were the previous year, the advantage being that a well-bred animal is so named that his breeder, and no one else, can claim credit for it. We might do well to follow the idea here; in fact, the suggestion only awaits the endorsement of the annual meeting to pass upon it.

Everyone knows that the prefix "Bapton" signifies the place where the animal was bred, and so with "Dunsmore." Are not our Canadian breeding farms equally worthy of a distinctive title? We think so. Thistle Ha' and Maple Shade, in Ontario; Woodmere, Maple Grove, Fairview, Balgreggan, Craigie Mains, and Poplar Park, in the West—all names worthy of perpetuation, as the sole property of their owners; and why not make a rule that, for a fee of \$1.00, the name shall be registered with the Shorthorn Association, published in the herdbook together with the owner's name, so that none may use it except the one entitled to do so? The scheme is feasible, is justice, would render the naming of the live stock easier, and, as that stock improved and made its impress in the pure-bred stock marts, the prefix would become, as it were, a trademark, and an asset. The duplication of names tends to confusion, and it is the duty of the leaders in live-stock thought to plan so that confusion, unfairness or double-dealing shall be rendered difficult or impossible to carry out.

Secondly, it seems to me that the herdbooks might be made more useful if a list of winning sires were published year by year, and if, with a descriptive footnote of each, how much better; and still more so if a good picture from a half-toned of the grand, senior and junior champions at such big shows as Toronto and Winnipeg were published. At present we find one or two Shorthorn histories on the market, praised for the very fact that these works contain notes on certain bulls. Surely a breed society should preserve in archives of its own to hand down to posterity the records of achievement of its own particular breed. It's a new idea, some say. Oh, no, not a new idea. The Clydesdale Society of Great Britain, the Shire Horse Society of Great Britain are doing it, and doing it well, and the need is far greater here in our own country of magnificent distances, so expensive to travel over as to render

der but a limited knowledge of a breed in Canada available to the rank and file of stockmen. Others say we have no precedent for it. Referring to precedents, however, let me mention how one was disturbed, in order to make an improvement: An urbane Westerner floated into the National Records Office a short time since, and asked that genial gentleman, the polished-pated custodian of the breed societies' funds, "Why have the sex printed on the upper left-hand corner of each certificate?" "Why not?" "Well, if ever a certificate is pinned to another document, the pinning is done at the left-hand top corner, and the name cannot be seen; if any value on the certificate, better to have it where it may be seen and made use of?" The Accountant of the National Records being a business man, and not wedded to precedents, made the change.

Thirdly—and here I am reminded that I must avoid any semblance of preaching to my fellow breeders—why not do away with duplicate certificates, or, if to be furnished, to be so only when an affidavit is made by the applicant, that the original certificate has been destroyed? Why not have all transfers endorsed by the Records officers on the backs of certificates? Such a rule would render fraud almost impossible, and that is the duty of the society, as far as human means can devise, to make every pedigree certificate as reliable as Government currency. Some of the more gentle-minded and less suspicious may not think it necessary, but the executive officers of our breed societies and records could tell a different story. All the scalawags are not dead yet; in fact, it is even possible for such to be elected to office in a breed society.

Are there precedents for the suggestions above? Yes, the Clydesdale men have made one, and it is a common-sense business proposition, and, therefore, should be adopted by the Shorthorn Society. One might go on with a fourthly and fifthly, and even further, but we refrain for this time, to let our words sink in and provoke discussion.

HOME CROFT.



Chancellor's Stamp.

Grade Shorthorn steer; calved Sept. 17th, 1906. First in class under one year, Ontario Winter Fair, Guelph, 1907. Exhibited by Kyle Bros., Ayr, Ont. Sire, Bapton Chancellor (imp.).

ROOTS FOR HORSE FEEDING.

The chief value of roots for horses is not their nourishment, so much as their succulence. So far as composition goes, carrots, turnips and mangels, owing largely to their high water content, contain a smaller percentage of nutrients than almost any other food; or, as one writer expresses it, arguing from composition alone, one might place their food value at slightly less than one-third that of wheat straw per pound. The value of roots in animal feeding is not, however, measurable by the quantities of digestible nutrients they contain, but rather through the effect which they have on the digestion and assimilation of the other materials fed, and the action on the excretory organs. A horse subsisting on oat straw will derive from his fodder a larger proportion of nutriment if he is given along with the straw some succulent feed, such as roots.

The manner in which a succulent food aids the digestive and assimilative organs to more thoroughly perform their work has never been clearly shown by agricultural chemists, but the fact that they do aid these organs in this work has been recognized by feeders for many years.

For horse feeding, carrots have always been regarded as peculiarly well adapted, although, when fed in large quantities, they are inclined to act too strongly upon the kidneys; but this does not result from moderation, but from excess. While carrots are the horseman's choice, carefully-conducted experiments have indicated that turnips are readily eaten by horses that become ac-

customed to them, and are seemingly quite as valuable in maintaining them in condition. Even mangels may be used, though the other roots are better. One or two carrots or turnips thrown into the manger every day will be sufficient, and it is surprising how efficacious roots are, even in such small quantities, in maintaining thrift and condition. Indeed, a few are nearly as good as a larger quantity, and far better than an excess.

Potatoes have been used in horse feeding to some extent, where other feed was scarce. They may be steamed, lightly mashed, and mixed with cut straw, but they are not so satisfactory as roots.

THE FARMER AND THE HOG MARKET.

Editor "The Farmer's Advocate":

I have read a number of articles in your valuable paper in reference to the hog trade. Some of the advice appears to be first-class, while other letters do not come up to that standard. I have been expecting someone with better ability than I possess to criticise some of these matters, but others appear to think that it does not make much difference, or, for some other reason, remain the silent partners in this important business.

From present conditions it would seem as if the packers were sharp in reducing prices to the level of a couple of weeks back, but even if they have to deal with "careless, improvident" farmers, it might some day dawn upon these gentlemen, as able advisers, that the driving is poor. While not rising to the point of advice, but merely as a suggestion, why not have raised the price of the hog that is nearest ideal, instead of simply discriminating against the poor quality the way they did? By so doing the packer would have induced the raising of better hogs. However, it was with no intent to criticise the packer that I commenced this article, but rather in relation to an article in December 5th issue.

The packers' point of view, whether from a selfish point of view or not, did not seem so hard (to me, at least) as this article by

D. C. Platt & Son. In the first place, instead of 6c. per lb., the farmer in different districts has received \$4.75 per hundred lately. Why this price? How long since that price was offered before? How do prices compare with what was offered when a number of farmers' co-operative packing establishments were in operation? Has the price of hogs struck as high a level and continued so for as long a time this year as last? Last year, as the year before? Or what reason is there that they will this year? These are questions which come (by intuition, shall I say?) to the forgotten-brain fellow.

While there are a great number of successful hog-raisers in this country who can feed hogs and make a good profit above market price of feed, there are others who just clear even—that is, sell their feed for market

price, in the form of hogs. There are a number, and a larger number than one not posted would suppose, to whom hogs are a loss. To the first two the advice found in various sources will be carefully considered, and a great number will hang on even if there is less in it this year than formerly; and it does not appear to be avoidable at the present prices of grains, which were from 25 to 50 per cent. higher than last year. Of course feed is down to what it was, but the hog-feeder depending on boughten feed had to have a good supply on hand. To the latter class, if you are successful at anything else, this is a good year to let up on the hog.

According to the law of nature, effect follows cause, and I could assure Messrs. Platt & Son that there are other causes than the one they mention. There are some in this locality who bought most of the feed for their hogs, and one who is in a good position to judge hog markets and feeds, and who intended feeding about 200 this winter, has none at all. Another, with a small herd, has reduced his brood sows from 13 to 8. Others have not the feed they generally have, or, at least, have had the last few years. Of course, high price for feed and low price of pigs had a considerable influence.

So far as the predictions of the packers goes as regards high prices later and shortage of hogs, you may have that for what it is worth, but if you have cut down the number of hogs don't get excited.

The climax is reached in this article when the farmers are loaded with the sole responsibility. Well, it does seem as if forgetfulness were not as bad as to use one's brain in such a way as that. When did the pages of history in any sphere record a case in which one party was "wholly responsible"? Or have we reached