

Small versus Large Milkers.

Written for the Farmer's Advocate.

BY PROF. L. B. ARNOLD, SECRETARY OF THE AMERICAN DAIRYMEN'S ASS'N.

Success in dairy husbandry depends chiefly on the skill and exactness with which the various operations connected with it are performed. Loose and careless management is everywhere to be deprecated, but it is especially unfortunate in the dairy. Profits from dairying are only realized where a fine quality of goods is produced, and every avenue to waste is closely guarded.

The price at which dairy products are generally sold is not, as a rule, much more than the actual cost of production. From a paper prepared last winter for the American Dairymen's Association, by the Hon. Josiah Shull, of Herkimer, it appeared, upon close figuring, that in some dairies the cost of producing and marketing a pound of cheese was more than it would sell for. In others there was a small balance in favor of the farmer.— Taking an average, it was just about an even thing with the cost of production and net value, allowing the farmer and his family the market price for their labor. The figures were derived from the results and prices of 1873. To accumulate anything that may be counted as profit, therefore, requires the best quality and a large yield, and that the closest economy be observed.

There are many ways in dairy management by which steady losses creep in, as it were, by stealth, that lop off the farmer's income and keep him struggling with the world, which a closer watchfulness might avoid. A few poor cows are quite apt, in one way or another, to work into a dairy, and by their diminutive yield barely pay for their keeping and perhaps not even that, and occasion the hard-working farmer a great many hours and days of hard labor to care for them and their milk, from which he will get no adequate return. Aside from such a waste of labor, which is grievous enough, it is not uncommon that the poorer cows, even in what are reckoned when taken together, as good dairies, cause an actual loss. A dairyman of my acquaintance, having forty cows, found by measuring the milk that he had five in his flock which did not give milk enough in the whole season to pay for their keeping, into \$5 a piece. He had five others that paid their keeping and \$5 a head more. The profit and loss on these cows just balanced each other, and he kept the ten cows a year for nothing, losing the whole of his time and labor in caring for them and their milk, besides the depreciation of stock and the interest on their cost, which were not taken into the reckoning.

When I was collecting cows for the first dairy I set up, an aged and observing dairyman said to me: "look out for poor cows; there is a great deal of money made in this country by dairying, but it is all made from the good cows." I have often been reminded of this remark, and have always found it true. The injunction is a good one, and well worth remembering.

The difference between a good cow and a poor one is not generally appreciated. Oftener than otherwise the price at which cows are bought and sold is made to accord with the amount of milk they will give. But this is not a sound way of estimating their value. Beef cattle may be estimated by the pounds of beef they will make. A bullock that will make 500 lbs. of beef may be worth half as much as one that will make 1000 lbs., but the cow that produces only 100 lbs. of butter a year is not worth half as much as one that will make 200 lbs. in the same time. As it will take the former cow two years to make as much butter as the latter will in one, she will cost her owner a year's keeping more than the other cow will to get the same amount. The butter from

the poor cow costs double what it does from the good one, and is produced at a ruinous rate for the farmer. Such a cow will not pay the cost of keeping, and is only fit for the shambles. She ought certainly never to occupy a place in the dairy. A herd of such cows would make any dairyman grow poor, while with a herd of the other class he could hardly fail to grow rich.

But the loss sustained by a small yield of milk is not all occasioned by a bad selection of cows. Many cows which otherwise might be classed as profitable milkers, are made unprofitable by the treatment they receive at the hands of the dairyman. Careless milking, harsh treatment, worrying and exposure to severe storms and to extremes of heat and cold, abate the flow of milk and occasion much needless loss. The difference in the yield of milk from a herd having such treatment and one in all respects the same, but which are milked regularly and quickly, which are treated with a caressing care, and are kept quiet and comfortable, is much greater than those who allow the careless and unkind treatment are apt to suppose. Twenty-five per cent. variation in the annual product is easily made by kindness and severity. Comfort and a satisfied quietude are very efficient in promoting a liberal flow of milk. Full feeding is equally important, and the want of it is, perhaps, the most prolific cause of abatement in the returns of the dairy.

In a large percentage of dairies the yield of milk is annually made to dwindle down to the limit of profitable production, and sometimes below, from deficiency and irregularity in the food supply. To make her largest and most profitable yield of milk, a cow should never lack for food or water, nor should she be required to make much exertion to obtain either. When suitable food is abundant and convenient, the diminution in the flow of milk as time recedes from the date of calving, is very slow and gradual. By such feeding, most cows can be made to give a good flow from the period of one birth to the next. This is so often done as to admit of no question. By full feeding and care Dr. B. W. Franklin, of Long Island, kept a two-year-old heifer of no unusual milking capacity, producing a pound of butter a day all the summer, fall and winter, and the dairy yield had but little abated in March, when it was deemed prudent to begin drying her off, as she would come in in the following April. After fattening her calf with the whole of her milk for the first four weeks, she made in the next 316 days, 291 pounds and 10 ounces of butter, besides furnishing a small amount of milk and cream used in the family.— This extraordinary result was due to extra feeding and care; she never lacked an hour either for food or drink, and was always comfortable and quiet. Had her food been deficient or irregular, no such yield could have been obtained.

Very few dairymen give their cows as much as they need to eat, except for a short time in the season. In the spring and early summer, when the ground is moist and warm, a vigorous growth of grass is produced and a flush of feed supplies the cows for a time with all they can appropriate, and crowded bags and flowing pails attest their full supply. But presently, in the long hot and dry days of July and August, the ground becomes parched and the grass stops growing and dries up. If the cows can fill themselves during the day, they are commonly allowed to run without any additional food. As grass fails in both quantity and quality, and more labor is required to get it, less is consumed, and the milk diminishes.

After a cow has been in milk three months or so, if she is allowed to shrink in her milk for any considerable length of time, she never comes up to the mess she would have given had the flow been continuous and unabated. From this shrinkage a heavy annual loss occurs. She is made a comparatively small milker for

the rest of the season, and that beyond redemption. Full feeding afterward will improve the quality of her milk, but it will augment the quantity very little. A circumstance will illustrate this fact:— Last September, after the long drought had abated in Herkimer, and the cows were getting a fresh supply in the form of after-feed and a new growth in the pastures, I found the cows which had been so long pinched were giving only 13 lbs. per day, notwithstanding their better feed.— Upon going to the farm of that sensible dairyman, the Hon. Harris Lewis, I found his flock of between 30 and 40 was averaging 24 lbs. In the early summer Mr. Lewis' cows gave no more than the rest. The secret of his greater yield in the fall was, he had dry soiling on wilted grass, prevented his cows from shrinking through the drought, and they retained their former flow with but little abatement. In the fall he was getting nearly double the yield that other cows, naturally just as good as his, were giving.

It is unfortunate enough to have poor cows get into the herd by bad selection; it makes a sad leak in the results of the season. But when a whole herd of naturally good cows are converted into one of scanty milkers by failing to provide good food enough for them to eat, the loss becomes a very serious one. It is one of the essential points in successful dairying to have none but large milkers in the herd, and to keep no more than can be fully provided for at any and all times.— Good milking capacity is of but little consequence if it is not made available, and it is but half used where cows are allowed to shrink in the middle of the season for the want of an adequate and convenient supply of milk-producing food or water. Dairyman are gradually beginning to appreciate the yearly loss from deficient midsummer feed, and to the extent of that appreciation are they making provision to bridge over the annually recurring pinch from drought by a resort to soiling as soon as any deficiency in grass occurs, and it proves a sovereign remedy for what may now be regarded as the greatest leak in the dairy.

Vineland.—Grapes and Wine.

When the Northerners, the first discoverers of America, landed in the new country, they were so surprised and delighted with the grape-vines in the woods that they gave the country the name of Vineland. The name was not at all inappropriate.— Often have Canadian lads enjoyed the shade of the natural arbor formed by the vines, and plucked the rich, dark clusters that hung overhead.

But our native forests are not turned to account as they should be. We can hardly be said to know the value of our country yet in its fruits. While cultivated grape vines are now highly esteemed, we overlook the grapes indigenous to the soil.

A dollar for one and a half pints of wine from the vineyards of Canada; this is the price we pay. We could save much of this. Mrs. D. makes excellent wine—as good as claret—out of the wild grapes from the woods, and she does it in the most primitive method. She merely bruises the grapes in a vessel, adds to every pint of grape juice a quart of water and a pound of sugar, and leaves it to ferment.

This would be not only good and economical; it would have also the advantage of being pure wine, while the foreign wine we get from Boston or Montreal often contains not one gill in a gallon.

Let us have pure Canadian wine, even made from the native grapes, and let us have, as in old England, the home brewed ale, the mellow October; and, we add, it would tend to the sobriety of our people.—S.

It is estimated that more cattle have died in Kansas this spring than during the entire five years preceding.

Patrons of Husbandry.

Dominion Grange.

The Dominion Grange Patrons of Husbandry was organized in London, Ontario, on the 2nd day of June, A.D. 1874, by delegates from the different Granges in the Dominion. The following Officers were appointed:—

Worthy Master—Bro. S. W. Hill, Ridgeville, Welland County.
Overseer—Bro. T. Leet, Danville, Quebec.
Lecturer—Bro. A. Gifford, Meaford.
Steward—Bro. W. Weld, London.
Asst.-Steward—Bro. Capt. Burgess, Hyde Park.

Chaplain—Bro. Wm. Cole, Sarnia.
Treasurer—Bro. Adam Nichol, London.
Secretary—Bro. T. W. Dyas, London.
Gatekeeper—Bro. L. Galer, Dunham Quebec.

Ceres—Sister Steed, Sarnia.
Pomona—Sister Whitelaw, Meaford.
Flora—Sister Weld, Delaware.
Deputy Asst.-Steward—Sister Armstrong, Plympton.

The following Executive Committee were appointed:—J. F. Cass, L'Original; Stephen Wade, Union; Matthew Garner, Woodford; James Armstrong, Camlachie; Captain Burgess, London; H. Anderson, London.

The following Resolutions were adopted by the DOMINION GRANGE at its sitting, June 2nd and 3rd, 1874.

- 1. That a minimum initiation fee of Three Dollars per man, and Fifty Cents per woman, be charged for all members, whether Charter or others.
- 2. That all Masters of Granges shall be authorized to organize Subordinate Granges, or appoint any other officer of his Grange, for that purpose.
- 3. That it shall not be lawful to establish a Grange within a distance of five miles from an established Grange. Allowing each Grange to take members 2 1/2 miles from each centre; providing that any person by obtaining the sanction of the Grange in his vicinity may join any other Grange.
- 4. That upon the application of three Subordinate Granges they shall be set apart as a Division Grange. This resolution to remain in force only until the next meeting of the Dominion Grange.
- 5. That the first annual meeting of the Dominion Grange be held in Toronto, Ontario, on Tuesday of Provincial Exhibition week, at 2 P. M.
- 6. That the first annual meeting of the Dominion Grange shall be composed of two delegates from each Subordinate Grange in the Dominion, and the present officers of the Dominion Grange and their wives who have taken the Fourth Degree.
- 7. That in consideration of the fact that Toronto is at such a distance from our Quebec brethren, it is resolved that the Quebec Granges be allowed to appear at the first annual meeting by proxy, provided the regular delegates cannot attend. Such proxy, on presenting their proper credentials, to have a vote for each Grange they represent.

Extracts from the Constitution:— ARTICLE V.—MEMBERSHIP.

Any person engaged in agricultural pursuits, and having no interests conflicting with our purposes, of the age of sixteen years (female), and eighteen years (male), duly proposed, elected and complying with the rules and regulations of the Order, is entitled to membership and the benefit of the degrees taken. Every application must be accompanied by the fee of membership. If rejected the money will be refunded. Applications must be certified by members and balloted for at a subsequent meeting. It shall require three negative votes to reject an applicant.

ARTICLE VII.—DUES.

SECTION 1. The minimum of regular monthly dues shall be ten cents from each member, and each Grange may otherwise regulate its own dues.

SEC. 2. The Secretary of each Subordinate Grange shall report quarterly to the Secretary of the Dominion Grange the names of all persons initiated or passed to higher degrees.

SEC. 3. The Treasurer of each Subordinate Grange shall report quarterly, and pay to the Treasurer of the Dominion Grange the sum of Fifty Cents for each man and twenty-five cents for each woman initiated during that quarter; also, a quarterly due of six cents from each member.

Sec. 4. Grange shall of the Div for each m the quart

AR SECTION Granges re or any th minion Gr Master an Grange gi

Sec. 2. subject, at minion or shall be m unnessar

SEC. 3. Order are Patrons to well provi

ARTICLE I SECTION issue direc

SEC. 2. received th receive a c ate Grange

SEC. 3. be made Grange, a for the as fifteen dol

SEC. 4. only whos organization SEC. 5. ply for aut

A Religio tolerated of the Or for membe

Extract The St of the D brated as

At the Grange, t represent and an c Granges c ter shall b

1. Divi Masters a dinat Gr Delegates shall be wives who be honora not entitl

2. The shall be l of the D of the desir ing for th the same t the Mast

3. It s Secretary Committee respon dealers i arrangem and shall the Domi

4. It s of Divisi other doc of the D and to rep sion Gran Grange.

Council Yester cultural a bon, in t

The S bring bef fact, as l grab, t place wit going to consulti though t to the at ment we for evr.

The fo London "Tha