

THE SUPERIORITY OF CANADIAN HOGS

For some years past Canadian bacon manufacturers have been steadily improving the quality of their output, until now, on the English market, Canadian sides and Canadian ham have a well established reputation, and no matter how prices fluctuate our sides and hams always command very near the topmost price. For example, in the latest reports from London, Canadian hams were bringing from 64 shillings down to 57 shillings the hundred weight, whilst the nearest Americans in price were bringing only from 54 shillings down to 43 shillings the hundred weight. This means that Canadian hams are worth in the English market from ten to fourteen shillings (\$2.40 to \$3.36) more per hundred weight (112 lbs.) than corresponding American hams. The Canadian farmer has been getting the benefit of this. During the whole of the past season choice hogs for bacon or hams have been bringing in the Toronto market about \$2 a hundred pounds live weight more than the best hogs have brought in the Chicago market. The excuse of the American farmer is that it would never pay him to go to the trouble to feed hogs the way the Canadian farmer feeds them. The Canadian farmer is a mixed farmer, and keeps but a few hogs. But the American farmer likes to do things on a large scale and to do his work easily. He therefore likes to have a "hog farm," and to feed his big drove of easily fattening hogs on nothing but corn, although corn will never by itself make bacon suitable to the English market. The Canadian farmer, on the contrary, is satisfied with one or two litters, but these he personally attends to, and feeds them a mixed diet—skim-milk, roots, clover, garden refuse, with some peas and coarse grain—and keeps them supplied with the cleanest bedding and the purest of drinking water. The American farmer, however, has to fight with a falling market, a lowering reputation and the cholera.

FARMING.

KEEP MORE SHEEP.

In FARMING two weeks ago we spoke of some of the advantages that would accrue to the Canadian farmer if he kept more sheep. What we are contending for is that every farmer ought to keep some sheep; say twenty sheep on a hundred-acre farm. This number could be easily kept without in any way interfering with the rotation established on the farm, or causing any additional help to be hired; and without necessitating any different crops to be grown other than would be grown in any case, or the erection of any farm buildings other than which are usually found.

These twenty sheep, if purchased as lambs, would in one year, by the wool they would produce, pay for their own keep and the keep of their lambs; and the lambs they would produce would more than pay for their original cost. Every subsequent year there would be the profit on the sale of the lambs obtained from them. Finally, when it would be necessary to replace an old ewe by a young lamb, the carcass of the ewe would be worth to the farmer the cost to him of the lamb with which he supplied her place. There is thus to the farmer who keeps these twenty sheep an annual profit of the value of the lambs which he produces and sells. The twenty sheep, we are told by practical sheep raisers, may be safely reckoned upon to produce at least twenty-five lambs yearly.

There is not only this direct profit, but there is also an indirect profit. The twenty sheep upon a hundred-acre farm would do a great deal towards keeping the farm clear of weeds. Sheep will eat weeds which other stock will not eat. They will go into fence corners and keep them clean when other stock will pass all such places by. They will find food and act scavengers in and about stone-heaps, stump roots, etc., which cows and horses do not care to go near, and which cannot be touched by the plow. They will pick up a good living on pastures that cattle have finished. Finally, they will leave the best of manure on every part of the land they cover.

Another point is that sheep will do all this at no expense of money to the farmer who