

must give as much thought to the selection of both dam and sire as they do to the breeding of cattle and other live stock. Of course, it is not in the power of many to raise champions, but a coach horse that will sell for \$300 is as easily raised as one that will bring \$45. Such a horse is useful on the farm until the time when he is ready for the market, and can be used both on the plow and on the wagon. In case he lacks the style or action necessary to bring a fancy price, he is still a general-purpose horse that will be profitable to the owner.

Norfolk Co., Ont.

Crib-biting and Wind-sucking.

I couple these two together because they often co-exist, but I distinguish between the two, writes a veterinarian. Either may exist without the other, but one (crib-biting) may lead to and end in the establishment of the other. Crib-biting is a habit contracted by idle horses that start by playing with the manger—licking or biting it. It may be copied from the habit of another horse, and therefore a crib-biter in a stable is undesirable, because it may teach other horses the habit. Just how and when it arises is a difficult question to answer. I remember one case in which the habit was contracted in only a few days. A horse may "crib" and not wind-suck, in which state I hold the horse has a vice. When he wind-sucks, he is vicious or unsound? Mere cribbing does not diminish his usefulness. Wind-sucking may not interfere with the working capacity of a horse doing regular, constant work, but should anything occur to prevent his working—as, for instance, a lame leg or a sore back—he will soon diminish his capacity for work. Most horses require some resting place for their teeth or jaws before they wind-suck, but a few are able to do so with no fixed point to rest against. The evil of wind-sucking, I assume, is the distension of the stomach by swallowed air. This leads to gastric defect. I do not believe that the habit has, as a predisposing cause, a gastric affection, nor do I recognize any evidence that indigestion leads to wind-sucking. I consider it merely a bad habit—a vice leading to unsoundness.

Points of the Draft Horse.

In his recent bulletin on "The Principles and Practice of Horse-breeding," Dr. A. S. Alexander, of the University of Wisconsin, very lucidly explains some of the points and characteristics of the typical draft horse.

Height.—A typical draft horse should stand sixteen hands high, or somewhat over that height. Extra tall, leggy drafters, deficient in weight, width and quality, are unlike in the market, and many of them are prone to chorea (St. Vitus' dance). Abnormally tall horses, unless wonderfully good in conformation, so that the height is not ungainly, are difficult to match, and, therefore, not in demand in the market. Such horses are used for single work, or as the middle horse of a three-horse team for hauling coal, etc.

Weight.—A draft horse should weigh sixteen hundred pounds and upwards. Weight is absolutely necessary for the hauling of heavy loads. It enables the horse to derive full benefit from the strength of his muscles and tendons, adds to the effect of his levers in motion, and gives him a firm grip upon the ground. It is a burden and practically useless when not associated with perfectly developed, exercised muscles, so far as actual work is concerned, but is requisite in every draft horse offered upon the market if he is to command a high price. Where the frame shows adaptability in a thin horse to put on flesh, he is bought by the professional feeder, who finishes him for the market. In a well-developed draft horse extra condition is considered worth twenty-five cents per pound in the Chicago market. For practical purposes, the great weight of a draft horse should be made up of large, strong bones and powerful muscles throughout the frame. Fat should be discounted in buying a draft horse for work, and, in judging, one should note development of muscle rather than wealth of flesh and fat. A typical draft horse should still weigh sixteen hundred pounds or over when deprived of the condition referred to.

Form.—The entire make-up of the draft horse should suggest strength for heavy hauling. He should be broad, deep, thick, round, with each part in keeping with its neighboring parts, giving an appearance of symmetry and massiveness. He should be low-down, blocky and compact, on short, strong-boned, clean legs, showing marked prominence and development of tendons, and the legs should be properly placed and set to ensure correct, straight action at the walk or trot.

Quality.—This term applies to evident refinement in character of skin, muscles, bone, tendons and hair. It infers, also, aristocratic breeding and all the attributes of pure blood. It is indicated by high spirits, vigor, sprightly action, endurance, stamina and intelligence, and is plainly indicated when the legs are free from meatiness, appear broad, flat, "clefty," and, if furnished with "feather," the hair under knee and hock springs as a silky fringe from the rear of the ten-

dons. Quality offsets grossness, and combines grace with great weight and power in the best types of draft horses.

Action.—A draft horse will have to do most of his hard work at a walking gait. It is, therefore, of supreme importance that he should be able to walk fast without tiring, and, in order to do this, his action must be perfectly straight and level. The joints must be easily and fully flexed, the feet must advance and be set down without deviations from a straight line. The soles of the feet should turn up and show plainly to the judge as the horse goes from him, at both walk and trot. The feet should be lifted quickly, fully and rhythmically, and set down squarely and firmly. There should be no paddling, dishing, cutting or interfering; nor should the fore legs roll or the hind legs be carried too close together or too far apart. In judging of action, note the movements of each leg and foot, the handling of each joint, and the carriage of the entire body as the horse walks and trots around an enclosure, from the observer and to him. Lameness should be absent. The hocks should be carried well together. Rolling in front is due to too great width of chest. Stubby, stilty action in front indicates straight or too upright pasterns or shoulders, foot troubles or weak knees. Similar action of the hind legs indicates upright pasterns, unsound feet, hock disease, weak stifles, hip weakness or kidney troubles. Knee and hock action should both be free and comparatively high.

Temperament.—A draft horse should have an energetic disposition, but should be free from vice, docile, tractable and intelligent. Sluggishness, associated with obesity, is objectionable, and induces diseases such as "grease," eczema, and "lymphangitis."

LIVE STOCK.

"Marketing Canadian Hogs."

To the Editor "The Farmer's Advocate":

Under the above heading, in a recent issue of your paper, you deal with the discussion which took place at the Winter Fair, in Guelph. Without questioning the accuracy of your report of that meeting, it would, at least, have been only common courtesy to report to your readers that the packers, through unfortunate interruptions to the afternoon's programme, were not given an opportunity to take up with any degree of completeness the three questions raised, namely:

1. The importation of American hogs.
2. The question of selection.
3. The desirability of a more uniform price for hogs.

This at least is true, that the representatives of the packers—your report to the contrary—neither evaded the question nor sought to divert the discussion into other channels. When you state that they failed to get down to the root of the question—the real reason of the shortage of hogs—you state what is not true. The reason we gave was that, rightly or wrongly, farmers believed that it did not pay to raise hogs, and acted upon their conviction. This is the bed-rock of the matter, and the question of interest at the moment is, Why are farmers raising less hogs than twelve months ago? Is it because they have had new light on the cost of raising and feeding hogs, which shows them that during the past few years they have been marketing hogs at a loss? Or is it because of the persistent campaign of misstatement and misrepresentation, carried on by "The Farmer's Advocate" and other farmers' journals, to set farmers and packers by the ears? One need go no farther than your article to obtain an answer to these questions: "The average pork-packer regards the farmer as his particular prey. . . . They will stand it for a while, but . . . a crisis, more or less acute, is bound to come, and when it does, the packer will have much more to lose than the farmer."

By such statements as the above, made without a vestige of proof to support them, you arouse suspicion in the mind of the farmer that he is not having a fair deal, and from that suspicion to the conclusion that there is no money in hogs is but a short step.

Is there no money in hogs? At the Guelph meeting, Prof. Day, of the Ontario Agricultural College, gave some very valuable figures on the cost of raising and feeding hogs, which you apparently thought unimportant, although by most people they were considered the most valuable contribution to the afternoon's proceedings. In tests conducted at the college, in which he was most careful to be conservative in his estimate, Prof. Day showed a cost of producing bacon hogs, under best conditions, of \$4.10, and under worse conditions of \$4.52 per 100 lbs., live weight. Perhaps the average of these two figures (\$4.30) might be taken as close to the actual cost of production. At this cost, does it pay to raise and feed hogs? The average price to farmers in the last six years has been \$5.70 per cwt.; or the average profit upon the above basis of cost has been a little over 32 per cent. The yearly marketings of hogs in Ontario have been, say 1,200,000 hogs, worth \$10.50 each, or \$12,500,000, in round figures. On this sale of product, the farmers of Ontario have cleared, over and above the market value of grain fed, something over \$4,000,000 in cash per year. Under such conditions, is hog-raising an industry that farmers can afford to go out of?

But, it is objected, the price has fallen away below \$5.70 per cwt., live weight. Yes, and it has gone away above that figure. Average conditions must guide the farmer in estimating the value of this business to him. For one period of six weeks only, during the past six years, prices dropped to the figure given above, which we take as actual cost. All the rest of the time the market price of hogs showed a profit over the market value of grain used for feed up to 75 per cent., and showing on an average 32 per cent.

Again, it is objected that the bulk of hogs are marketed in the fall of the year, when prices are always lower than the average. It is true that deliveries are, as a rule, heavier in November and December than during the other months. The packers are in nowise to blame for this; neither are they to blame for the lower prices which obtain at that time of the year. The heavier deliveries arise naturally out of a necessitous condition with many farmers. They are not fortunate enough to have warm enough quarters in which their brood sows may litter before April; hence these pigs are on the market in December. Again, feed may be scarce, and the hogs which should have been ready in August or September are not put on the market until a couple months later. This period of heavy deliveries unfortunately coincides with a period of heavy deliveries in other countries supplying the English market with bacon; hence the market is over supplied, demand is lessened on account of the consumption of poultry at that time of the year, and prices are invariably lower. But, to a large extent, farmers have the remedy in their own hands. As Mr. Simpson Rennie put it at Guelph: "I never have any hogs ready to sell in November or December. I always sell mine when prices are high." All farmers cannot do this. Those farmers who have good accommodation for their hogs can, and if they were to stay out during these months, deliveries would be nearer normal, and prices more regular as a consequence.

But this fact remains, that only for six weeks in six years did prices reach a basis of cost, even in the fall of the year. What about all the months that the hogs were the best profit-earners on the farm?

Again, you state that, "farmers want an understanding whereby prices may be more uniformly sustained." The only answer to this is that the packer would be happy to name such a uniform price, if such a uniform condition of sale of bacon existed on the English market. The English market absorbs 85 per cent. of the product of Canadian hogs. The bacon is mild-cured; deteriorates, if carried, and must be sold upon arrival. Irrespective of cost or of loss, it must be cleared each week. Its value is determined by the quantity of bacon of all kinds offering on the market, and by other factors affecting the bacon market, more or less directly, such as the price of beef, the price of poultry, general trade conditions, etc. There are no average conditions governing such a market. With all available sources of information at hand, the packer endeavors to gauge the course of a market upon which supplies bought to-day will be sold six weeks from now. His point of view is colored naturally by the cables he receives from week to week, showing the sales actually being made for his bacon, and by advices from his agent showing the general market conditions in England. Upon these advices, and his general knowledge of the market, gained by the experience of years, the packer names a price for hogs. But, someone objects: "Why should the packer have the right to determine the price? He should consult the 'interested partner'—the farmer."

Why should he set the price? Simply because he has to protect himself. No one else will. The English market won't protect him. It will sell the bacon at what it is worth that week, no matter what the cost or loss. Will the "interested partner" protect him, if the market goes against him? No. The "interested partner" has the money in his pocket for his hogs, and it is the packer's own business to shift for himself. This sentimental talk about partnership—"business partners" and "interested partners"—is all in the air. There are three phases to the business—raw material, manufacture and sale. They are all independent, but the nature of the business, the thousands of holders from whom the raw material comes, precludes the idea of partnership. What the hog and bacon industry needs is co-operation, not partnership. That co-operation has always existed, in spite of the meddling of mischief mongers. 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 so; hogs are worth more to the Ontario farmers than ever before; packers have shown their confidence in the business by investing money in plants, and creating a healthy buying competition; the reputation of Canadian bacon has improved in England; Canadian packers have done it by care in cure, selection and marketing.

There has also been co-operation in price—the only kind of co-operation which can obtain in this field, namely, the absence of combination or agreement, and the keenest kind of competition among packers. This statement has been challenged, but the absolute facts of the case are that the Wm. Davies Company, buying from 25 to 35 per cent. of the hogs marketed in Ontario, has not now, nor ever has had, any agreement with other packers in regard to the buying price of hogs. We have believed it to be in our interests, and in the interests of the whole industry, to develop the business along these lines, and the price paid each week to the farmers of Ontario for their hogs has been the highest price which we believed we could pay and show any profit to ourselves. We are not in the business for health, neither do we pose as business philanthropists. We do profess, however, to have some sense of business.