

The Slaughter Cure Condemned.

Dr. Edward Moore, V.S., a widely-known practitioner of Albany, N. Y., contributes to a contemporary the following letter, which specially emphasizes one or two points to which attention has frequently been drawn in the FARMER'S ADVOCATE:

"You are well aware that the slaughter cure for tuberculosis was started on the excuse that the tuberculosis of cattle was commonly communicated to the human subject, and it was therefore imperative that the disease should be stamped out in order to save the human race. Most of the leading advocates of general slaughter were the students of Prof. Law, or men closely associated with him. Thus Law, Pearson, Salmon and one or two others frightened the people into acquiescence with the methods they proposed. New York State passed a bovine tuberculosis law and put it in the hands of the State Board of Health, inspectors were appointed and slaughter commenced. Other States copied New York, and many veterinarians throughout the country took it for granted that the doctrine preached by Law and the others was correct. Now, they had no facts of their own to show that the disease was communicable to the human subject from the bovine; they simply accepted the teachings of Prof. Koch and three or four veterinarians, who many years ago arrived at this conclusion. Thus men in high positions simply accepted theories

Lines on the Death of Queen Victoria.

BY FRANK LAWSON.

O Queen! the monarch widely great—
O Queen! the woman and the wife—
Emblem of Good in home and state:
Could death o'ertake so grand a life?
A nation weeps—the world is bowed:
And sympathy binds land to land:
And Britons, prosperous and proud,
Reach each to each a kindlier hand.

Thy subjects felt a common thrill
At Triumph's shouts—at Envy's breath,
And feel but one pulsation still—
Thy power could not pass with death.
How'er the Empire Fate expand,
Fruit of thy love will not be vain;
Briton shall grasp a Briton's hand
In kindlier kinship for thy reign.

record was kept of the amount of water drunk daily. The pigs also had access to ashes and salt. The pigs were fed about 7 a. m. and 5.30 p. m., and were weighed once a week, about 11 in the morning. The pigs were fed in pens 7x8 feet in size, and occupied separate quarters for sleeping rooms. The animals were generally in first-class health during the experiment.

Lot A gained 634 pounds in 146 days, or 4 1-3 lbs. per day.

Lot B gained 644 1-2 pounds in 146 days, or 4 2-5 lbs. per day.

Lot C gained 650 1-2 pounds in 146 days, or 4 2-5 lbs. per day.

Lot D gained 614 pounds in 146 days, or 4 1-5 lbs. per day.

The amount of food consumed in relation to gain in weight is an important matter, as is also the amount of water drunk.

Lot A ate 2,282 lbs. corn meal and shorts or hominy, half and half.

Lot B ate 2,450 1-2 lbs. corn meal and shorts or hominy, half and half.

Lot C ate 2,436 1-2 lbs. corn meal and shorts or hominy, half and half.

Lot D ate 2,302 1-2 lbs. corn meal and shorts or hominy, half and half.



HIS MAJESTY KING EDWARD VII.



HER MAJESTY QUEEN ALEXANDRA.

handed down to them, and have not attempted to verify them, but foisted them upon the people of this nation. The cost has been something awful, and up to date has been a damage rather than a benefit.

"If it were true that tuberculosis in cattle caused any amount of tuberculosis in the human, there could be some palliation for such methods; but that is not so. And again, if it were true that by the methods they have pursued they could in a short time eradicate tuberculosis from this country at anything like a reasonable cost, people everywhere would favor the plan, but tuberculosis is entirely different from the contagious pleuro-pneumonia which was eradicated from this country a few years ago by the stamping-out process. There is no possibility that they can handle tuberculosis in a similar way, and all the slaughter, expense and loss that we have thus far gone through have not resulted in ridding any one county, state or section of tuberculosis. While no one desires to cast reflection upon the veterinary profession for what a few of its members have done, people who pay taxes and stock-owners generally are entitled to protection. We must therefore condemn slaughter and expense and woe! waste of much of the best cattle blood in this country, when such methods absolutely fail to give the results aimed at. Therefore, before any general slaughter is allowed, it should be shown very clearly what is to be accomplished by it."

The suggestion that more attention should be given by the ADVOCATE to the subject of horse-breeding in its various phases meets with a generous response in this issue, and several excellent articles have been held over for future issues, owing to excess of matter in hand.

On the Amount of Water in Slop Fed Fattening Pigs.

From time to time the question arises, "How thin or how thick should the slop for pigs be made?" Many persons think that ground feed should be moistened just enough to pour it well from the pail to trough, yet not be very watery, while others desire the slop to be quite liquid. No one, however, seems to have thus far published any facts of importance in this interesting field. With a view of studying this subject, the following experiment was begun at Purdue University, Indiana, on January 24, 1900, and continued till June 19, a period of 146 days. The animals used were sixteen in number, consisting of eight pure-bred Chester Whites and eight Berkshires. These were divided into four lots of four each, with two of each breed in each lot. The foods used were a mixture of equal parts of pure corn meal and shorts till the period beginning May 9th, after which hominy feed took the place of the corn meal, and they were fed under these conditions:

Lot I was fed the food dry in the trough.
Lot II was fed the grain mixed with its weight of water.
Lot III was fed the grain mixed with twice its weight of water.
Lot IV was fed the grain mixed with three times its weight of water.

Each lot of pigs was given all the water desired additional to that mixed with the grain, and a

If these figures be compared with the gains in live weight, it will be seen that—

To make one pound of gain, Lot A ate 3.59 lbs. of grain.

To make one pound of gain, Lot B ate 3.80 lbs. of grain.

To make one pound of gain, Lot C ate 3.74 lbs. of grain.

To make one pound of gain, Lot D ate 3.75 lbs. of grain.

As the cost of the food fed averaged about 80 cents per hundred pounds:

The cost per pound of gain was 2.87 cents in Lot A.

The cost per pound of gain was 3.04 cents in Lot B.

The cost per pound of gain was 2.99 cents in Lot C.

The cost per pound of gain was 3 cents in Lot D.

The amount of water given the different lots is especially worthy of notice. No water was given with the grain in lot A, but such water as might be desired was weighed out and turned in the trough after the grain was eaten up clean. Neither did lot B receive sufficient water with its grain to meet natural demands, so that extra water was weighed to the pigs in this lot, while lots C and D required no more water than that in the grain.

There was no material difference in the appearance of the pigs in either lot, so far as quality is concerned, and so far as this one experiment goes, the use of about two times the weight of water to grain indicates a satisfactory proportion. In view of the fact that the pigs fed dry grain made slightly the best gains, it would appear that there is really no gain in feeding the pigs a slop instead of a dry grain, excepting as a feeder may regard it a matter of convenience.