

cost, hay was valued at \$15 per ton, silage \$1, and dried beet-pulp \$20 per ton, these being retail prices where experiment was conducted. It cost, to produce 100 pounds milk from beet-pulp ration, 84.5 cents; from silage ration, 81.7 cents—about three per cent. in favor of silage. Some of our readers may think that the silage in the experiment was valued too high, and that the percentage ought to be greater in its favor. It may be noticed, in that connection, that retail price for sugar-beet pulp was used. In an experiment conducted the year previous, in which wholesale rates were charged, the value of the dried beet-pulp is given at \$13.80 per ton.

While the fat percentage varied slightly in individual tests, the quality of the milk from the two rations remained practically the same.

The animals gained in flesh on silage, but lost slightly on the dried beet-pulp.

The conclusion of the experimenter, on the whole, is that, where corn silage is not available, dried beet-pulp furnishes an excellent substitute.

Another by-product of the beet factories, Molasses Beet Pulp, is now on the market. This is but the dried pulp with waste molasses added. It was indicated by experiment that, while the cost was greater than that of the plain pulp, the food value per ton was not increased.

At What Price Can We Afford to Raise Hogs.

Editor "The Farmer's Advocate":

As a constant reader of your valuable paper (the most so of any of the six coming to my home) I have been greatly interested in the discussion re raising and marketing Canadian hogs, and beg space in your popular journal—popular among the farmers at least, if not among the packers—to present my views, and if possible show that the farmers of Canada have not made rich from producing hogs, neither will the packers make money out of hog products if present relations are continued.

Assistant General Manager, Dr. F. J. Smale, of the Wm. Davies Co., Toronto, said at Guelph Fat-stock Show, as reported in "The Farmer's Advocate," "That the packer could make as much money packing one kind of hog as another." Why does he say over his own signature, in a letter to "The Farmer's Advocate," of January 11th, that "the breed and type of Canadian hogs have been improved; the packers have spent time and money in helping to do it, and continue to do it?"

If the packers can make money out of any kind of hog, it is reasonable to infer from Dr. Smale's letter that they can make more money out of the correct type of hogs, or else they would not continue to spend valuable time and large sums of money to improve the breeds, as indicated in Dr. Smale's letter. It would be very interesting reading to know just how the packers have spent so much time and money teaching the farmers of Canada how to grow bacon hogs. I have been in the hog-raising business for the past fourteen years, and during that time I have read nearly all available literature as to the proper type of hog best suited to the packers' requirements; I have attended a great many Institute meetings, and heard practical men discuss the problem of growing the much-talked-of bacon hog, and I have never read or heard from the platform where any Canadian packer has placed a boar in a neighborhood where the farmers could have their sows improved upon, even by paying service fee in full. Now, Mr. Editor, I claim whatever improvement has been brought about in the type of our hogs is a direct result of the farmers' personal effort, through the educational medium of "The Farmer's Advocate," Institute meetings, and experiments conducted at O. A. C., Guelph, and Central Experimental Farm, Ottawa, and that the farmers of Canada owe nothing to the packers in this regard.

Much has been written by the packers of Canada and the Wm. Davies Co. in particular, in the early days of the bacon industry, asking the farmers of this country to grow a certain type of hog, as being best suited to their particular needs for the production of Wiltshire sides. This—characteristic of their enterprise—the farmers quickly set out to do, and have so admirably succeeded that to-day we are able to produce the raw material in almost perfect form. Then the packers, by carefully looking after the manufacture of the almost perfect raw material into the finished product, have been able, through the untiring efforts and hearty co-operation of the farmers of Canada, to establish an enviable reputation in England for Canadian bacon; and now, after years of persistent labors to bring about this high state of superior excellence of the raw material, we, as farmers, are on the verge of seeing this great industry practically destroyed.

HOW BROUGHT ABOUT.

I think, sir, the farmers of Canada are well agreed that the present hog famine is caused by three things, namely:

1st.—Want of discrimination by packers in buying hogs.

2nd.—Lack of uniformity in prices paid.

3rd.—Unprofitable prices paid.

It is useless for the packers to lay the blame on the drovers for not discriminating when purchasing from the farmer; if the packers refused to pay a flat rate to the drovers, when they, the drovers, buy on specula-

tion, then they in turn would be more careful in making their purchases from the grower; the drover would pay the highest price for selects only, while the under-finished hogs would be held by the feeder until they would grade No. 1, and the over-finished ones would bring such a comparatively small price that the farmer would be caught only once with this class of hog.

Again, when the drover buys on commission, he has only the interests of the firm he represents to look after, and would buy only the class of hogs he was instructed to place on the cars.

Perhaps the second point under discussion as to the "hog famine" is the most important of the three. I believe the intelligent farmers of Canada are ready to accept the statement of Dr. Smale, that the packers cannot pay a fixed price at all times for hogs, but when the price fluctuates all the way from 25c. to \$1 per 100 lbs. within a week, without apparent cause, it looks as if the packers had some secret compact by which they were trying to control things. It makes no difference how high in price hogs are in April and May, so far as the packers are concerned, so long as they can buy their hogs at an average low price. High prices paid during these months stimulates the breeder and feeder, and he is more inclined to hope for some money to be made from the prospective litter of the dam bred in the spring of the year, hence the packers, in order to keep up the supply of hogs, generally pay comparatively high prices about this season of the year (April and May), when hogs are not coming forward so plentifully, to be followed by a lower price when the cheese-factory fed hogs are ready for market, and still another sharp decline in price when the great bulk of summer-fed hogs are ready for shipment, namely, October and November.

It will be very difficult for the packers to convince, not only the farmers of Canada, but the public gener-

ally, that there has not been an understanding at least among themselves, by which prices have not been controlled in some form or other, to the great disadvantage of the grower.

Undoubtedly there will be quite a number of farmers make up their minds to engage in the hog business again, on account of the present comparatively high prices, which have been current for some time since, but I wish to point out that those who are seriously thinking of so doing had better not "rush" into the business without due consideration. It is well for us to stop, look around, reflect, and ask ourselves the question, "Are present prices likely to continue?" I think not very long.

If there were no "hog famine," what would be the prices of grain to-day? I am sure if we look back to a year ago, we will remember that Ontario grain prices were considerably higher, and I believe principally on account of the greater number of hogs being fed. Last fall the feed merchants bought freely and liberally of millfeed, in anticipation of a sharp rise in price, owing, as they said, to a scarcity of oats, the market for which opened at about 28c. per bushel, and gradually rose to 36c., while to-day in Belleville 33c. is the top price. Now, why this decline in price, in face of a short crop? Simply because there is a decline in the demand—although, perhaps, not wholly, yet largely—due to the hog famine, and, of course, millfeed, in sympathy with other grains, has not assumed the almost prohibitive prices of a year ago. But just here it is well for the man who is thinking of getting rich by growing hogs to bear in mind that if no hog famine existed he would be paying to-day from one-third to one-half more for oats, shorts (without which farmers generally cannot successfully grow hogs) would be considerably higher in price, while barley also would follow in price these two important hog foods, yet the farmers would be compelled to accept very much lower prices for their hogs, although the cost of production would necessarily be very much greater, owing to millers forcing up prices of their products through the increased demand. This is what causes hog famine—high cost of production; low selling price.

If the packers want a continuous liberal supply of hogs, then they must pay a continuous liberal, fairly uniform price at all seasons of the year, as an inducement to farmers to meet their requirements. It is nonsense to ask farmers generally to have a bunch of hogs ready to ship each month, and thereby catch what the packers might call a good average price, for this is wholly out of the range of possibility for the average Canadian farmer, and will never be done. Many farmers who have been lured into hog-raising by attractive high prices at a time when feedstuffs of all kinds were low in price, have found by sad experience that by the time their hogs were ready for market, the price had fallen to such a low level that they not only yielded no profit themselves, but had eaten up the margin of profit which the grain grown and fed would have given if sold on the market at current prices, whereas if the packers paid a reasonably uniform price all this would be overcome and the Canadian bacon industry placed on a far more substantial footing, because the farmers would produce the right type of hog in sufficient numbers to keep the packing-houses continuously engaged, thereby obviating not only the necessity of the packers endangering the health of our hogs by importing from the United States in bond to keep their plants running, but also the good name of our bacon in England.

In discussing the third and last reason as to the cause of the hog famine, namely, "The unprofitable prices paid," I am

sure that Dr. Smale will agree with me, that past experiments conducted at Ontario Agricultural College, Guelph, under Prof. Day, have been carried out under the most favorable circumstances. In the first place, Prof. Day I believe to be a most careful and painstaking experimenter, one who thoroughly understands his business, and a man who will tabulate the results of his experiment just as he has personally found it to work out in actual practice. Secondly, we must all concede that the pens, feeds and all other conditions at O. A. C. are as near perfection (or should be) as human ingenuity can make them, and after years of experimenting, Prof. Day finds the normal cost of pork production to be about \$4.50 per 100 lbs. If we refer



A Happy Family.

to the bulletin from Central Experimental Farm, Ottawa, showing the experiments as conducted by Prof. Grisdale, we find practically the same results as those at Guelph; hence it would seem that under the most favorable conditions, when grain and millfeed are only worth from 90c. to \$1.00 per 100 lbs., it costs \$4.50 to produce 100 lbs. pork, live weight. Now, on this basis of cost, it will be quite easy for any farmer to know what he has made in profit on his hogs, provided he has been able to grow them at a cost not exceeding this figure. Accepting Dr. Smale's average price of \$5.49 paid farmers during the past three years, we have a profit of about \$2.00 on a hog weighing 200 lbs. Just what number of hogs the average farmer produces in a year, is perhaps a difficult question to get at, but if he ships 25 during the year I believe that is the limit. This would give him the enormous sum of \$50 to recompense him for his laborious year's work, interest on capital invested in pens, etc., provided he has been fortunate enough not to lose one or two pigs through disease of some kind. Of course this showing is very unfavorable to the producer, because any person who has grown hogs during the last three years knows well that grain prices have been away above the cent a pound mark, often going 1½c., and even higher; but I have used the figures of Profs. Day and Grisdale, to show that the farmers of Canada have been getting rich at a very slow pace from "hog-raising."

Now, I do not pretend to know what the packers can afford to pay farmers for raising and feeding hogs, but I believe they (the farmers) should receive from 6c. to 7c. per pound, in order that they may be induced to grow them in sufficient quantities to supply the packers. Eggs and poultry of all kinds are high in price; sheep are scarce and mutton dear, and unless farmers can get