

Canadian Live-Stock & Farm Journal

PUBLISHED MONTHLY BY

THE STOCK JOURNAL COMPANY,

48 John Street South, Hamilton, Ont.

Terms, \$1.00 per Annum in Advance.

THOMAS SHAW, RIVERSIDE FARM, EDITOR.

To Subscribers.—Subscription price, \$1.00 per annum in advance. Single copies, 10 cents each; sample copies free. No names will be removed from our subscription list when in arrears and without we receive instructions to that effect. Those in arrears will be charged \$1.25.

Clubs.—Any person is at liberty to form clubs. Clubs of five copies to any address, for one year, \$4.00. Clubs of ten copies to any address, \$7.50.

To Advertisers.—Advertisements of an appropriate nature will be inserted in the JOURNAL at the following rates: For a single insertion, 18c. per line, nonpareil (12 lines makes one inch); for three months, 15 cents per line each insertion; for six months, 13c. per line each insertion, for one year, 10c. per line each insertion. Cards in Breeders' Directory, not exceeding five lines \$1.50 per line per annum. Copy of advertisements should reach us not later than the 25th of each month (earlier, if possible). If later, it may be in time for insertion, but often too late for proper classification. Transient advertisements payable in advance. No advertisement inserted for less than 75c. Contracts broken by insolvency or otherwise will revert to the usual rate of 18 cents per line per insertion.

To Correspondents.—All communications intended for publication in the JOURNAL should reach us by the 20th of each month, sooner if possible. We do not hold ourselves responsible for the opinions of correspondents.

Remittances may be made in registered letter at our risk. The receipt of the JOURNAL will be sufficient evidence to subscribers that their remittances have been received.

All communications to be addressed STOCK JOURNAL CO., 48 John street south, Hamilton, Ont.

HAMILTON, CANADA, JUNE, 1888.

THERE is but little doubt that one of the most serious hindrances to the extension of improved stock production arises from the difficulty of isolated farmers to get a proper price for an improved steer from the local butcher. He knows that giving a better price to one man in a locality would increase the difficulty of all succeeding purchases, for a time at least, in that same neighborhood. The shipper avoids such a section for the reason that he cannot get sufficient improved stock there to encourage him to go. The farmer, then, who alone has been trying to improve his cattle, finds himself no better off than his neighbors, save in the less amount of food used in preparing his improved steer for market. What is to be done in such a case? Why, *persevere*. It is of itself encouraging to know that an important saving has been effected in feed in attaining the object sought. Work away till you can get several good steers ready for the market at one time, and then a shipper will visit you who will give you a price that will astonish your neighbors—that is, if you persist in asking it. One by one they will drop into your ways, and in due time your neighborhood may become a fine centre for the production of shipping steers.

THE past winter with its scarcity of food supplies has taught a very important lesson to many, if they will only try and profit by it. Their stock has been brought through and in condition not much below that of other years when food was plentiful. How is this to be accounted for? Why, simply in the better methods of feeding adopted. If, then, when feed is scarce, such and such results may be obtained by its judicious use, why may not equally good results be secured on similar principles when feed is plentiful, the farmer thus having a goodly surplus to be fed to an increased number of stock, or to dispose of in some other way? If we would lay these lessons to heart as we should, a pinch now and then in supplies like that of the past winter would doubtless prove a

profitable reminder. But there is a system of economy adopted by some, that is falsely so called. Because the price of hay has ruled high, and that of coarse grains has increased, they have withheld these and sold them, which has been most destructive to flesh sustenance in the stock. This is a kind of economy very much like those who adopt it, pretty narrow. If straw can be cut and fed in conjunction with a grain ration, and thereby hay sold, because dear, and some sort of fertilizer used to make up the loss, good and well; but to starve the stock that hay may be sold at a good price, is a practice unworthy of the most primitive times.

SOME persons are disposed to take a somewhat gloomy view of the future of the live-stock trade, owing to the slackened prices that have been received during the two years that are past. We do not think that this view is sustained when one calmly reviews the situation. The larger portion of the available range territory of the Western States is already stocked to its full capacity, while the population of the country is increasing at the rate of one million a year. In ten years this means an increase of ten millions of people, to feed which would require more beef than is now exported annually from the United States. Of course better farming will likely result in the sustenance of a greater number of cattle on a given quantity of land, but this will not hold true of the range country, which is relatively a very large area. Our populations also will increase, though more slowly, and the consumption will be greater. It is true, however, that we have a large country in the Northwest, much of which is well adapted to growing good cattle, but the difficulties of transit increase with distance from the market. The two great markets for the live-stock of Canada are Great Britain and the United States, and contrary to the popular idea, we send greater values in live-stock to the United States now every year than to Great Britain. The export to the former is really much greater than the estimate, for, going as the greater proportion of it does in the face of a duty, the temptation is strong to make an entry much below the actual value. If we continue to furnish to both markets the class of stock that is wanted, the demand will increase rather than slacken, particularly as regards the trade with the United States.

THE breeders of improved stock are sometimes discouraged with the slow advances that their stock is making by way of supplanting the scrubs, and are ready to conclude that the scrub, like the poor, is one of the things that will always be found in the land. This much is sure, that so long as the scrub retains its footing the poor will remain with us, for since the world began it was never known that the scrubs made anybody rich. But the scrub will not always remain, or the breeders of pure-bred stock will not be true to themselves or to their high mission. It is true that in some benighted sections the sale of an improved class of stock is slow indeed, but so it was at one time in sections that are more advanced. Prejudices, like the ice of winter, are slow to break up ordinarily. It takes a deal of ocular demonstration to persuade the breeder of scrubs that his course is not a wise one, and that as a matter of duty he should forego these injudicious ways; but in no neighborhood is the case a hopeless one. The number of pure-breds is rapidly increasing, and the number of good grades in all the lines is increasing equally fast. The character of the highway sheep even has changed, through the general diffusion of better blood, and the best of our home markets are regularly supplied with meat that is not scrubby in its character, to say nothing of the large

trade with Britain and the United States, all of which is done in beasts of an improved order. We do not find any instances of breeders going back from improved to non-improved, so that every inch of ground that is won is sure to be retained. In this way hundreds of farms are being reclaimed every year, every one of which narrows more and more the scrub-producing region.

The Outlook for Live-stock and Products in America.

Every year witnesses a large increase of population in the United States, which means an increased consumption of meat and live-stock products. Commissioner Colman, in his address, delivered in 1885 in Chicago, stated: "In 1880 we had 50,000,000 inhabitants; in 1905 we should have 100,000,000; in 1930, 200,000,000; in 1980, less than 100 years hence, 800,000,000 of inhabitants. Where are these teeming millions to live? On what are they to subsist? Where and how are the cattle to be bred and reared that must be relied upon to furnish beef? To keep up our present beef supply we must increase our stock of cattle to 70,000,000 within twenty years, and to 140,000,000 within forty-five years. Is it possible for us to accomplish this under the most favorable conditions? In the states east of the Mississippi in 1850 we had 15,300,000 head of cattle; in the 30 years from 1850 to 1880 the cattle in these States increased only 5,000,000 head, or 33 1/4 per cent. Taking the country as we find it to day, is there any reason to suppose that the percentage of increase will be any greater in the next thirty years than it has been in these States during the last thirty?"

These are very interesting figures, and coming from such a source should carry all the more weight. Their perusal should interest the farmers of Canada quite as much as those of the United States. We know that the western ranges are well nigh stocked to their full capacity. The ratio of increase of live-stock cannot therefore keep pace with the ratio of the increase of the population. The United States cannot continue to be so great an exporter of live-stock and products unless the increase of the product of these keeps pace with the increase of the population. In such a case estimating the population in 1887 at 60,000,000, and the number of cattle at 48,000,000, and basing the further calculation on Commissioner Colman's estimate as to population, the number of cattle in 1980, to keep pace with the increase of the population, would require to be 640,000,000 head. It seems unreasonable to suppose that the territory of the United States could ever support that number of bovines.

Now all this is full of hope for the future of the live-stock interest in Canada. With increased home consumption in the United States the price of meat must rise in that country; and could we but have free access to their markets, we would be sharers in the benefits of such rise. It is true that the Northwest can produce many millions more of live-stock of all kinds than it does, and this will have its influence upon market values, but will the relative increase in live-stock in the Northwest more than supply the increasing demands of our home population? Ontario has nearly reached the limit of the number of animals which it should sustain, and so of the older Provinces, but not of the out-put of live-stock or live-stock products, for the usual returns we get from the stock we have is not more than half what it would be if rightly fed and rightly managed.

It seems then impossible for us to err in the direction of stock improvement judiciously carried on.