

taker provides the dinner and lemonade, this being deemed better than the usual "all carry something and have a picnic dinner." While the law is that the dinner should be plain, the actual bill of fare is left to the entertainer. The family has but one dinner to look after during the twelve months, and this is found in every way better than the dinner of the contributed basket. The committee on program meet in October, and make out a program for the full year, assign topics, give out the subjects for the essays, publish the names for recitations and "orations" for the boys and girls, notify the musicians of their parts, and so, for fourteen months ahead, all know when and where to meet, who is to take part, what part, and the order. This program is printed in book form and mailed to each family. The fee of membership is somewhat elastic, being governed by the actual needs of the society, and only amounts to a few dollars in the year.

There is a regular order of business for each meeting. Every one goes in the forenoon, and after dinner the company is called to order by the president, the minutes read and the regular program taken up. The roll call is often responded to by quotations which frequently take a wide range, Jon's ideas in farming often being drawn upon. Then some lady gives a resume of current events—the most striking things she has noticed in her previous month's reading. Recitations follow, and then the men take up some timely farm topics, followed by a lady on some domestic theme, or possibly wholly literary. Some topic is now and then "broken up," and different divisions of it assigned to different ones, and the final speaker puts the whole together so that it may be seen in its new light. Criticism and discussion follow, in which all are free to join. Farm troubles are brought up, and each seeks to aid the other.

At each meeting the men look over the plan and style of farming of their host, and the ladies talk flowers, lawn improvement, swap receipts for cake and pickles, and all make ready for the dinner and dessert. From start to finish the social is well mingled with the practical and helpful things which make for the better in farm life and management, and when, about 4 p.m., the carriages are brought, each and all say that the meeting was the best one yet.

CORRESPONDENCE

More "New" Methods Suggested for Conducting a Milk Test, "Wise and Otherwise"

To the Editor of FARMING:

In a multitude of counsel there is wisdom, or it may be confusion. Let us notice the *new* plan. Since a 1,000-lb. cow eats 40 lbs. ensilage and produces 1 lb. butter and a 1,100 lb. cow eats 44 lbs. ensilage and produces 1½ lbs. butter, etc.

All that is wanted is to tell how much a cow eats and how much a cow gives is her weight; no use whatever for the habcock scales, lactometer, or anything else. There would then be no use for the presence of the cows. All that is wanted is the weight, and then, W. E. B. says, we can figure it out "almost mathematically." Well, as this is holiday time, I suppose it is no use taking life too seriously; but if we can get at the weight of these cows, and leave them at home, how much trouble we would save for all hands. I will tell you how that can be done. There is a quack doctor over in Michigan, and if you are sick and send him a lock of your hair he can tell you all that ails you (and a good deal more), and I think if we would take to the milking test a lock of hair from our cow's tail W. E. B. could tell us the exact weight of the cow. That would be a much easier thing to do than tell how much a cow would eat and produce from her weight.

Whilst the English tests recognize that the small cow is at a disadvantage in competition with the large cow, I think they are wise "in not going far enough" and laying down a

fixed scale, because a cow has an individuality all her own, as experiments have shown. In a general way it is stated that a large cow eats more than a small one, but in proportion to her weight she eats less. Also, a cow producing 3 lbs. of butter would eat more than a cow producing 1 lb. of butter (regardless of weight), but in proportion to production she eats less. If this were not so there would be no object in having a better cow.

The little Jerseys ate more than the big Shorthorns in the World's Fair test. As they also produced more they proved themselves the better of the two breeds, with butter at 40¢ per lb. Again, bulletin 149, Michigan Agricultural College: "A study of the experiments shows conclusively that an expert feeder varies the size of the ration, not according to the weight of the animal alone or primarily, but according to her capacity to receive and her ability to yield." This I know is so from my own experience. The heifer Daisy Texal 2nd, in present condition, does not weigh 1,000 pounds, yet she was ahead of all the 36 cows but Calamity Jane in the Brantford test (and it is no disgrace to come behind her), and she asked no odds because of her weight, nor, to be candid, is she entitled to any, because she can assimilate and digest as much food as any cow in America, and that is why I have great expectations for her.

Again W. E. B. says "Fat gives milk almost its entire commercial value." I had an idea that it was the total solids. I believe there are some who claim that the solids, other than fat, are in proportion to the fat; but I don't see that the facts bear out any such conclusion. Take the following table from the recent dairy test and add the product of four cows of each breed together and it shows that the difference is not due to any one cow, but is a breed characteristic:

Breed.	Lbs. Solids Not Fat.	Lbs. Fat.	Total Solids.
4 Ayrshires . . .	21 608	8.847	30.455
4 Holsteins . . .	44 282	15.903	60.185
4 Jerseys	19.725	10.680	30.405

From this it will be seen that a test that fails to give value for total solids is "a very faulty and partial affair", and I will add that the rules that govern the Provincial test are fair, and show which is the best cow for Canadian dairymen as a whole. A cow that cannot win under those rules has no right to win. We want a cow for the production of cheese and butter. The total solids is what makes the cheese, and when it comes to butter-making the solids-not-fat are in the skim-milk, and our dairymen do not forget to take their skim-milk home (and if they get a chance, somebody else's too). Why? Because it has good value for anyone with pigs to feed and calves to raise. In fact the skim-milk is worth 25 per cent. or 30 per cent. of the whole milk at prices received by patrons for their butter fat. Indeed, one Professor says skim-milk is really worth more than the fat, because it contains those elements which are lacking in other food. So looking at it from any point of view we find that all products are valuable and should receive due value.

But what should be the purpose of these tests anyway? Not altogether to show which is the best breed. Even if such could be conclusively shown, we must make due allowance for individual preference; and, even if one breed was clearly shown to be the best, there would not be enough to go around. Whilst we may differ as to which is the best breed there should be no difference, as it is good for the country that all breeds should advance in productiveness. The question is then how best to encourage and stimulate breeders to greater efforts. Whilst I have a decided preference (and have tried to give some proof for the faith that in me lies) I am content to lay the facts and records before the public and let them use their own judgment. Look at the question from the higher and broader view of our country's good rather than as a breeder.

I considered from the start that it would be more practical to give each breed a class as in the Provincial Dairy Test, as it is poor encouragement for a breeder to enter a