

The Farmer's Advocate and Home Magazine

PERSEVERE
AND
SUCCEED

ESTABLISHED
1866

REGISTERED IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE COPYRIGHT ACT OF 1875

LI.

LONDON, ONTARIO, NOVEMBER 23, 1916.

1261

EDITORIAL.

Round up the work. Winter is just around the corner.

The careful feeder will be most careful early in the feeding season.

Canada's reputation for pure-dairy products must remain unsullied.

The only way to avoid the high cost of living is to stop living so high.

Look at the high prices! Yes, but keep one eye on the wee bit to sell.

Fast in most things, the United States sets a snail pace in getting correct election reports.

If you have anything to sell, fit it so that you are not ashamed to show it to prospective buyers.

It is almost sickening to hear some learned people of countries not in the war talk about making a permanent peace.

In experimental work it is good practice to have actual figures to back up statements made. The eye is often deceived.

Peter McArthur puts it right when he says that both political parties will be loyal to the source of their campaign funds.

It is time, in this year 1916, that the spokesmen of both of our political parties knew better than to accuse the other party of disloyalty.

Who wants oleo? A handful of packing-house men who would make money out of selling it. These are the men ready to help the "poor consumer."

When arranging for the winter's reading in the farm home, do not forget "The Farmer's Advocate," the paper that fights for the rights of every member of the home.

The keeping of live stock is the very foundation of our national prosperity. Every high-producing dairy cow, good-breeding beef heifer, young, breeding ewe, or long, brood sow sold off the farms weakens the foundation.

Scrubby calves are worth more as steers than bulls, even though they may be pure-breds. A pure-bred scrub is the most dangerous kind, for someone will be foolish enough to use him for breeding purposes because he has a pedigree.

Every voter should keep an eye on the doings of his representative in parliament and should help keep him posted in the interests of Canadian agriculture. Those who would undermine it, for their own ends, are never idle and they must be watched. Let us all help to turn on the light.

The horse is not the only thing in the world that knows how to "balk." We were out the other day in an ordinarily well-behaved horseless buggy that balked, but we believe we had less trouble in getting started than we might have had with the balky mare. The thing stood still and had no feet to brace against being pushed ahead.

The Problem.

More men, more food, more labor—these are the calls which the country must prepare to face in 1917. The army must have more men to maintain Canada's strength at the front. The nation must have more food to meet the necessities of life. The farmer must have more labor if he is to produce more food. This is the problem of the country. We are told that the required number of men can be secured for the army during the coming winter if the proper methods are used. We would like to see these methods take the men who could most easily be spared and leave those who would be worth more and able to do more toward the final outcome of the war by staying at home and working as they never worked before. There are few farms upon which there are shirkers. Farmers, farmers' sons and farm laborers, who have not enlisted have, for the most part, worked hard and faithfully since the war to increase production. The unusually bad season made their efforts more difficult this year, and results rather disappointing. Nevertheless they tried. True, a few farms are over-manned, but very few, and for the occupants of such who could be spared to fight there is only one term, "shirkers." But where there is one farm that could easily spare a man there are scores which, to maintain a high production, would require one or two more men. When a campaign is considered to get the necessary troops to bring the Canadian expeditionary forces up to 500,000 men, it might be well to remember that the farms of the country also require a few tens of thousands if next year's production is to reach such magnitude as to bring down the high cost of living. The army must eat or it cannot fight. Its dependents at home must have food at a reasonable cost or they suffer. The farm is the only source of supply. Farmers now on the land work harder longer hours and more days in the year than any other class. They do their best. They need more help. There doesn't seem to be much relief in sight. Farms will be undermanned in 1917. A favorable season will make a difference, but in getting the rest of the men for the army it would be well to remember that the army and all others must eat. A campaign which will get the young men who have little depending upon them and who can be spared from their twelve-dollar-a-week jobs, from the pool-rooms and from the dance halls, and from any other business which can spare them, farms included, and which would send to the farms men who are physically unfit yet useful—all men who could work to increase the output of the farms should receive undivided support.

The House and the Barn.

In driving through the country one admires the farms upon which are set large, well-planned buildings. He is led to remark upon the degree of prosperity in evidence. He drives on into another community where buildings are smaller and present a less attractive and commanding appearance. He at once concludes that the first-noted section is the more fertile, is the better managed and farmed, and that there is something lacking in the owners or tenants of the latter. He may be right and he may be wrong.

Large buildings, expensively built and needlessly spread out look very fine, but do they pay? We are certain that a farm house bigger than is necessary is a millstone around the neck of the hard-worked housewife, and a needless expense to the purse of the farmer. What is the use of a twelve or fourteen-roomed "barracks" of a house when a tidy, little, six or seven-roomed home is all that is required? The first-named costs a little fortune to build and makes endless labor for hard-worked and over-tired women who cannot find time to make it homelike. The smaller house is more easily kept clean, and the woman in the home has more time to make it a

real home and to attend to social matters which should be a certain joy in life to all women. Sometimes poor farms carry big houses, and big houses carry bigger mortgages.

But the blame is not all on the dwelling. We have often wondered whether a man was doing justice to his live stock by "putting them up" in buildings so elaborate that they could not pay their hotel bills and leave enough profit to pay for entertaining them for their few months' or years' sojourn in the farm's big bovine sanatorium. It doesn't seem fair to load the stock down with unnecessary overhead expenses and then grumble if they do not yield a sufficient margin of profit. We are not attempting to make out a case for poor buildings—not at all. But it occurs to observant people that possibly too much money is spent in expensive and unnecessary luxuries in farm outbuildings for housing live stock. Some of the "best doers" we ever saw were housed in open sheds and had the run of an old-fashioned barnyard with its ever-present straw stack. They made quick growth and rapid gains. Last week there appeared in "The Farmer's Advocate and Home Journal," of Winnipeg, Man., three pages illustrating cheap yet efficient methods of sheltering stock, and none of the methods would cost much. In our issue of November 9, the same subject was gone into fully, and this was followed up last week by articles giving in detail how to feed. Housing cheaply enables a man to feed better and still make a higher profit. Housing cheaply should not mean housing badly.

Good housing for live stock must include fresh air without drafts, sunlight, cleanliness, simplicity, convenience.

The right kind of farm house is comparatively small, neat, compact, handy, a place of labor-saving devices, light, well ventilated, easily heated, and having some sort of running water supply.

Perhaps after all the community with the big, attractive barns and houses is not the more prosperous of the two. A closer scrutiny of the inside conditions and the bank account might tell a different tale. Good homes and good barns need not necessarily mean extravagance in this direction. Let the buildings meet the actual needs and cut out the frills.

"Oleo", an "Undesirable".

In our issue of November 9 the case against oleo-margarine entering this country and against its manufacture and sale in Canada was fully and exhaustively set forth. It was proved conclusively that oleo, if admitted, would jeopardize Canada's dairy industry, that the control of its manufacture and sale would cost the country about all it would get out of the trade in revenue, that it leaves too many loopholes for deception, and that the consumer in the end would lose by its introduction into Canada. At the same time it was clearly shown that present conditions are abnormal and will continue so for, at most, a very short time. Next year feed may be plentiful and dairy products more abundant. Even as a War Measure, the Canadian Government would not be justified in giving in to the oleo manufacturers and those interested in the oleo trade. It should be remembered that these are the people responsible for the agitation for the admittance to Canada of their product. Under the guise of doing something for the poor man they ask for an amendment to our present excellent Dairy Act which excludes all butter substitutes. They themselves are the men, not poor either, mark you, who would stand to benefit most. They haven't struggled for years to build up a high-producing dairy herd or dairy products business, neither have they anywhere from ten to fifty dairy cows on hand to feed high-priced feed, a great deal of which, owing to crop failure must be purchased. They would feed the