

able; but it will be sufficient for my present purpose to present a few of the more notable ones. Dot 2765—A 1, gave from Feb. 25, 1887, to Jan. 19, 1888, 9,345 lbs.; Red Daisy 2487—H 2, from Feb. 24, 1887, to Feb. 16, 1888, gave 9,555 lbs.; Marham 2356—M 2, from Feb. 11, 1887 (a month after calving), to Jan. 6, 1888, gave 8,397 lbs.; Broken-down 2658—P 3, from Feb. 25, 1887, to Jan. 19, 1888, gave 8,562 lbs.; another, Bracelet 2037—W 14, from Feb. 11, 1887 (eight days after calving), to Dec. 30, 1887 (when she calved again), 9,282 lbs. There are numerous other reported nearly as good, but this will be sufficient for a sample.

For the purpose of comparison Mr. Euren also gives, from the recently published report of the milk records at the Royal Agricultural College, Cirencester, the returns of all the different breeds. It is too much for your columns, but I condense as follows:—The best Shorthorn gave in the year 9,764 lbs. of milk; the best Ayrshire, 7,384 lbs.; the best Guernsey (said to be the largest yield ever reported for the breed), 10,487 lbs.; the best Kerry (about ten months), 6,769 lbs.; Red Poll (only one), 7,050 lbs. In comparing rations we find the Red Polled cow the smallest eater in the lot, except the Kerry. All were on grass part of the day. In addition they received:—Chaff, Shorthorns 20 lbs., Red Poll 15 lbs.; roots, Shorthorns 20 lbs., Red Poll 15 lbs.; cake, Shorthorns 2 lbs., Red Poll 1½ lbs.; meal, Shorthorns 4 lbs., Red Poll 3 lbs. An analysis of the milk made March 23 showed as follows:—

	Short-horns.	Red Polls.	Ayr-shires.	Guern-seys.	Kerrys.
Total solids	10.78	13.14	11.35	14.63	12.55
Fat.....	2.77	4.20	2.97	4.00	3.28

The comparison is not quite fair to the Red Polled cow, as all the other breeds had two representatives, and the best is taken for comparison, except in the case of the Ayrshire, where the milk of the one giving a little the most does not appear in the table of analysis. However, the Red Polled cow makes a creditable showing. It is a little surprising that she should head the list in percentage of butter fat. As a rule this would doubtless not hold true in comparison with the Guernseys; but it is not to be expected that a Guernsey giving so exceptionally large a quantity of milk should make a very high percentage of butter fat. The other Guernsey gave only 6,044 lbs. of milk, but the analysis is omitted. One of the two Jerseys in the herd shows a larger per cent. of butter than the Red Poll—4.50 to 4.20—but through inadvertence, doubtless, the milk yield is omitted.

Assuming them to be representative cows of their respective breeds, the Red Poll is shown to be decidedly the best dairy cow of the lot, except the Guernsey. According to the analysis, the Shorthorn cow gave in a year 269.69 lbs. of butter fat, the Ayrshire 217.81 lbs., the Red Poll 296.10 lbs., the Kerry 215.25 lbs., and the Guernsey 419.48 lbs. The Guernsey yield, however, is stated to be the largest on record in England, while the yield of the Red Poll, in quantity at least, is exceeded by a dozen or more cows in the single herd of Mr. Garrett Taylor. If we take the other Guernsey, with a yield of 6,044 lbs. for the year, and assume that it was as rich in butter fat as the best of the two Jerseys, viz., 4.50 per cent., she would be credited with a total yield of 271.98 lbs., leaving the Red Poll at the head of the list.

Unfortunately most of those breeding Red

Polls in this country have made their selections for size rather than milking qualities. But the above returns will show that the milking qualities are there, and that it needs only judicious selection and proper handling to put the breed in the very front rank in this respect, while the steers confessedly make beef second to none in quality. —[Breeder's Gazette]

Reforms in Pork Raising.

A little more philosophy in the rearing of swine would lay a broader foundation for profit, says F. D. Curtis, in the Country Gentleman. The popular idea is to hurry things. The pigs must "mature" early. To bring this ultimate result about, there must be a constant stuffing. The pig is made a sort of crucible for rendering vegetable oils into animal, and its skin is used as the vessels to hold the same. When the vessel is full enough to satisfy the fancies of the owner, or in other words, when the frame which supports this mass of fat is unable, or about unable, to support it any longer, the mass of blubber is declared to be matured and the pig is killed. It does not worry anybody to catch it, as it is about helpless; neither does it bleed much, for there is lack of this vital fluid. It weighs, and that is the end desired. It is cut up and cooked, and half of it goes into lard. It is not meat to eat, nor meat to be eaten. Swine breeding has run too long in this popular rut. For the good of the business and for the good of the people, it is time to get out of it. I like a coming breed of hogs—a breed not finished; most persons do not. The men who felled the forests and cleared the farms could relish and digest the fat of pork, but the present race cannot and do not. Pork is out of proportion. There is too much fat and too little lean. Can this drawback in the pork interest be removed? It is not possible to have good hogs with no fat, but it is possible to have them with a larger proportion of lean meat. Here is just where the "coming hog" counts. He is not finished, and it is possible to breed in him an inclination to form muscle. He must be made a muscular animal. I know this is quite contrary to the common idea of a hog, for the reason that we are not used to seeing the "coming hog" but the perfect breeds, and perfected on the wrong basis—following a fat line rather than one with vigor and muscle in it.

The truth is, with the ridicule all thrown in, the old rail-splitter and the unsightly hog of the south really furnishes more and better food for the human family than the popular early-maturing hog which fills the eye of fancy with so much delight, and brings down the scales with heavy weight. Less mercenary spirit for the present and more looking to the future, will enlarge the foundation of the pork business. It is queer that the whole world should have gone agog in the rearing of swine. There has been a woeful lack of thought. How breeders have striven, and pushed, and fairly ground up common sense in order to stuff their hogs and to infuse the stuffed propensity-hereditary principle into them!

My notion is right the opposite—I want to stuff it out of them. The coming hog must be reared in the field; it should be born there. The green grass and the "bubbling brook" should furnish the food and drink for its mother. A sty on the ground always dry should be its bed. After the pigs are two or three days old, the owner may try his skill in supplementing the natural food of the field, beginning with little

and gradually increasing. In all cases the food should be of a succulent nature, and never in excess of the appetite, and never so much but that the mother will graze and make a considerable portion of her food of grass. Whenever there cannot be a full supply of grass suited to the purpose, other green food must be supplied. This can easily be had in the form of green corn, etc. Food wanting in fat but rich in flesh-forming material must be constantly given. My hogs know not corn. It is the last food to be given swine while growing with lean meat in view. Rye ground entire and lightened with more bran and middlings, is a grand food for pigs, and the clear rye entire is excellent to finish off porkers.

Corn may be used for the same purpose, but the time of feeding should be limited. The pork will be more desirable if the hog, or pig, especially the latter, is not fed corn more than six weeks. Old hogs, if of large frames may be fed on it for two months, but not longer.

The coming hog must be a grazing hog. It must seek its food; for in this way it will add to itself another cardinal and necessary virtue, exercise. Without exercise there will never be a full development of muscle. The pig pen must only be a necessity of winter, and even then it should not be closed, but a sunny door to the south should ever invite its occupants to go out and stir about. The breeder must never lose sight of the philosophy of the thing. With a constant and careful attention to all the details of promoting vigor and exercise, and the development of muscle by the selection of proper foods, I have no doubt but that all breeds of hogs may be changed, so that they will fit the public wants better by supplying more lean meat. There are doubtless many who have such a complacency over their own, that they are now perfectly content. Very well, stay so; nevertheless there must be more lean meat produced in hogs or the consumption of their products will grow less. Do not build on conceit, but let swine breeders do their best to fit the animals they rear for the best demand. If they do not, the coming hog will be the accepted heir and win the laurels.

These ideas have been practically carried out, and the pork made after this teaching has sold for a dollar per hundred over the highest market price. The adaption of foods and the care of animals to make more wholesome meats, are interesting and profitable subjects for all classes of farmers, and especially for pork makers.

Against Dehorning.

Dr. William Horne, V. S., maintains that the whole animal economy suffers by what he characterizes as the "frightfully painful" practice, and "crime," of sawing off the horns of cattle; and the effect is, in his judgment, especially detrimental to the prepotent powers. He reports, through "The Country Gentleman," cases of suffering and injury which deserve attention amid the many current—and some of them interested—expressions on the other side of the question:—"I know of total ruin in one case from dehorning a Jersey bull. One stockman had sixty cows dehorned, and in seven weeks the milk fell from thirteen to nine pounds, and he says that many of them are ruined entirely. I know of quite a number of animals whose heads are nearly rotted off. Five absolutely breathe through the enlarged apertures whence the horns came off. I know of twenty-seven animals which were dehorned; five of them came near dying, two did die, and all the rest degenerated."

The same paper has published other similar statements of experience or opinion. Dr. E. Moore, a veterinarian, declares it to be "horribly cruel and unnecessary."—Mr. A. W. Porter, who witnessed the operation on a number of cows, says they "crouched down and bellowed as though suffering intense pain, quantities of blood flowing." Another correspondent regards the practice as not only cruel but "destructive of the milk properties of the cow;" and on no account would he use a dehorned bull.