

measured their milk during the season. The best averaged 554 gallons each, and the poorest 243 each. 11½ cents per gallon was obtained for the milk of the whole herd—somewhat above the average price—yet the poorer cows only brought a return of \$27.95, while the better ones yielded \$63.71. This man estimated the cost of keeping at \$30.50, so that he was out of pocket \$2.55 on each of his poorest cows, and threw away his labor into the bargain. A writer in the *Prairie Farmer* states that he was recently returning home from Elgin, the headquarters of Illinois dairying, and found himself in company with two fellow-travellers who were in the dairy business. The conversation drifted into dairying, and particularly the milk-giving qualities of cows. One said that the cows in his herd would average eight quarts per day for nine months, and the other said he would not keep a cow that would not average eight quarts a day for ten full months, but, he added, that he did not believe half the cows in the dairies of the west would average that quantity of milk per day for nine months in the year. And I do not believe half the cows in the dairy herds of Ontario will do it.

The *Prairie Farmer* says: "According to a paper read at the Dairy Fair in New York, it appears that Denmark, with about one-twentieth as many milch cows as the United States, exports as much butter as this country, although it can be produced on American farms at half what it costs in Denmark." There is only one explanation of such a significant fact as this. Making full allowance for the large home consumption in the United States, it is evident that the Danes keep far fewer poor cows.

We have heard much outcry of late concerning "over-production," and "a glutted market,"—with some show of reason, it must be admitted. Let me raise the outcry of "production at a loss." *That's what's the matter.* Whether such production be excessive or insufficient, it is a glaring mistake, that cannot be corrected too soon. It is

akin to the blunder committed by farmers who take in more land than they can till thoroughly. What is the use of working one hundred acres on a system of skim culture, when fifty acres better farmed will yield more profit? Compute the interest on first cost of land, expense of working and percentage of gain, and you will be convinced that

"A little farm well tilled,
A little barn well filled,"

is the true policy. In like manner, where is the wisdom of keeping a dairy herd of fifty cows when twenty-five, or even twenty, composed of really superior animals, will yield a better return? The old business maxim runs thus: "Cut short your losses and let your profits run on." But, unfortunately, most farms are not managed on business principles. Few farmers keep accounts. They have only a vague, general idea of profit and loss. A strict debtor and creditor account would be found highly beneficial. As Burns says on another subject:

"It wad frae mony a blunder free us,
An' foolish notion."

Enough has probably been said as to the importance of securing large yields of good milk and the question looms up, how to do it? In answering it honestly, I shall, as I have done before in this presence, expose myself to the charge of promulgating dairy heresy; but I cannot help it. The consolation is, that all reformers have been at first regarded as heretics. With a full consciousness of the great advantage that has accrued to certain districts of Ontario from dairying, I still believe that we have gone into this business too largely and exclusively. I am no advocate of farm specialties. On the contrary, it is my firm conviction that mixed husbandry pays best in the long run. Mankind are too much like sheep in this, as in some other particulars, that when one adventurous animal makes a rush or a leap the whole flock is too apt to follow. It is a good season for fall wheat! Then every-