MR. BOLLERT'S EXTRAVAGANT CLAIMS.

Editor "The Farmer's Advocate":

Were it not so important to our stockmen to have our different industries given their proper consideration, it would be easy to pass over Mr. Bollert's wonderful statements regarding his ideal "fifteen miles square" in Oxford County, his extraordinary returns from his Holsteins, and other statements, which he cannot possibly verify —statements which, when explained by Mr. Bollert, fizzle out in sound only; or, when compared with some of his bygone years' remarkable claims for his and other Holsteins, provoke a smile.

I wish, Mr. Editor, you could afford space to give us an article which appeared in your May, 1891, issue, under the title, "Are the Holstein-Friesians a General-purpose Breed?" by H. Bollert, Cassel. As that is too much to ask, kindly allow me to quote some from it:

"The cow which to the highest degree combines the qualities of producing milk, butter and beef, is the most profitable. The breeding of superior dairy stock is much more difficult than the breeding of beef cattle. No matter how skillful a breeder is, and how well-laid his plans, and selected his foundation stock, he will yet find that he will occasionally produce animals which are not up to the standard as profitable dairy cows. He will have to feed her three years before he definitely knows what she is."

In that Mr. Bollert admits the breeding of beef cattle a more certain business than the rearing of dairy cattle.

Carefully and wonderingly, let us note this extract from the same article: "A large book could be filled with records from individual cows and entire herds, ranging from 12,000 to 30,000 lbs. of milk in a year. These figures must seem incredible to the dairyman who keeps the ordinary cow, which yields from 3,000 to 4,000 pounds per year, but they are, nevertheless, true and undeniable facts."

Need we wonder that Mr. Bollert's mind appeared troubled about how "The Farmer's Advocate" readers would swallow such strong doses. With his seventeen years' added experience, does he himself believe that a single Holstein herd exists, or ever existed, with a genuine record of 30,000 lbs., or even down to 20,000 lbs. When a single cow at the O. A C. produced 20,000 lbs. last year, it was considered—and rightly so—a great performance, the greatest ever heard of as made in our Province. But in my hearing, last winter, a dairyman, on several occasions, stated that another cow under test at the same time, giving half the quantity, proved the more profitable cow of the two, cost of feed considered.

The largest record for a cow on the American side for years, as reported by the press, has been 27,000 lbs. Will Mr. Bollert tell us what is the matter with the breeders of Holsteins, when the record annual milk yield of the Holsteins is falling so rapidly. Will he kindly give us out of that large book the names and addresses of a few owners of genuine record 30,000 lbs. per year of single cows and herds. If that fails, let us have the herds making 20,000 lbs. annually, as proved by official tests.

Allow me to ask, Mr. Editor, if it is true, as reported in some newspapers last winter, that the butter-fat percentage of the milk of the Holstein herd which won the Ryrie Bros. medal last season in Oxford County, was only 2.3?

Again, we note: "Yes, the Holstein-Friesian is truly a general-purpose cow." We also read, "Again, for the buttermaker she is a special-purpose cow, for the better strains of Holsteins have no superiors, if equals, as butter-producers of the finest quality and texture."

What have the breeders of Jerseys and Guernseys to say to that?

But the end is not yet: "Only the other day I was in my neighbor's barn. He is feeding some grade Holsteins and grade Shorthorns; they were raised together, were of the same age, and had the same care and food to the present day. While there, a drover came along and tried to purchase the cattle. He offered $5 more per head for the Holsteins than the Shorthorns."

Nowadays, cattle-feeders would prefer a stag in their bunch of bullocks to a Holstein. In fact, it is only at a largely-reduced price that grade Holstein steers will be handled by feeders or drovers. It is universally admitted that Jerseys these years furnish the best butter of all breeds, in quality and texture. What, then, is wrong with the Holstein breeders in doings, or undoings, rather? According to Mr. Bollert's testimony of many years ago, the record Holstein's annual milk yield is largely decreased, taking present-day reports for comparison. According to feeders' and dealers' reports, the Holstein steer has sadly depreciated in market qualities, when compared with Mr. Bollert's stated quality of the long ago. And I am quite sure the butter consumers of the present day are with me when I remark that no Holstein butter these years will favorably compare with that made from Guernsey and Jersey cream.

Then, from the Holstein's doings seventeen years ago we have depreciation all along the line. Annual milk yields are less, the quality of Holstein beef is left away behind in the race, and either the quality of Holstein butter has deteriorated, or the quality of other makes of butter has so greatly improved that comparisons are needless.

From all that, it is easily seen how Mr. Bollert sees through spectacles which magnify Holsteins into mountains, and thereby warp his better judgment. It is time, apparently, for Mr. Bollert to aim at regaining lost ground; otherwise, he and his fellow-breeders will be in the same class as the owners of the average 3,000-pounds cow, instead of advancement and progress, making way for lower levels of usefulness.

I might go on to review some more statements in "The Farmer's Advocate" of Feb. 15th, 1904, but think my object in opening this discussion is fully accomplished, and no further demands on your valuable space need be made. The seed sown is bearing fruit, and our people are awakening to the fact that one-sided justice only has been done by governments the past twenty years to the different stock interests in our great Province.

Victoria Co., Ont. JOHN CAMPBELL.

[Note.—According to the statement of the owner of the winning herd in the competition referred to, the butter-fat average was 3.5 per cent.—Editor.]

BABY BEEVES FROM DUAL-PURPOSE HERDS.

When a champion of the beef industry, as a judicious line of breeding for a mixed-farming district to pursue, dilates exclusively on the profit of finishing cattle, he weaves an imperfect argument. That there is money in buying 4½-cent feeders, to be afterwards sold as 5½ or 6-cent beeves, no sane man will dispute. The profit comes from the increased value per pound of the original carcass. But what about the farmer who raised the

The Autocrat (7294).

Champion Hackney Stallion of Scottish Shows. Brown; foaled 1897; sire Garton Duke of Connaught.

steers. Any system of beef-raising that can be conscientiously recommended to an agricultural community must take account not only of the finishing stage, but of the whole process, from the breeding of the stock to the growing and fattening of the bullocks. When we get down to such a comprehensive study of the problem, we are forced to the conclusion that the economical production of first-class beef calls for the marketing of baby-beef produced by steers or heifers out of dual-purpose cows.

CHARCOAL FOR HOGS.

It is surprising the quantity of ashes a bunch of hogs will consume, provided they are penned up where they can have no access to the soil, and are fed entirely on a grain ration. Pigs fed purely on grain do not make a normal growth. Their feed does not contain a sufficiency of the mineral ingredients to supply the bones with material for growth. Calcium, generally, is the element that is lacking, and this the ashes supply in the lime which they contain.

Professor Henry, of the Wisconsin Experiment Station, was the first to demonstrate by actual feeding test the value of ashes and charcoal in hog-feeding. His investigations show that where hard-wood ashes are fed ad libitum to pigs there is a saving of 138 pounds of cornmeal per 100 pounds of pork produced, that the breaking strength of the thigh bones of ash-fed hogs was nearly twice as great as that of corn-fed, and that the average ash in the bones was 40 per cent. greater than where ashes were not fed.

There is still another advantage in feeding charcoal and ashes to pigs. The animals are less subject to attack by worms, and disorders of the digestive system are less likely to occur. There is less chance of epidemics of one kind or another going through the herd, causing a loss of hogs or necessitating that more high-priced feed must be fed per hog to produce a pound of gain.

WHAT STOCK PAYS BEST?

In any part of the world where land is of any considerable value, the farmer's cow, to be profitable, must be a milker. If she combines with liberal milking capacity a conformation and tendency that will make her male calves profitable to raise for beef, well and good—in fact, all the better—because then the arduous nature of specialized dairying may be relieved by devoting a portion of the farm produce to the feeding of beef cattle, but, as the returns for feed thus devoted are liable to be somewhat less than for the feed fed into a good dairy cow, it is manifestly unwise and unprofitable to sacrifice milking quality to any great extent in the dams in order to secure feeding steers. In short, a farmer on high-priced land had better leave beef-raising severely alone unless he can prosecute it with a strain of cows possessing liberal milking capacity. The cows of a special-purpose beef breed (except a pure-bred herd, kept to produce seed stock, to be sold at fancy prices) will have small place in the calculations of a shrewd commercial farmer in a district where land is relatively valuable in comparison with labor. A qualified exception might be made in the case of the corn belt, corn being a more suitable feed for beef-raising than for dairying. Generally speaking, however, the profitable farmer's cow must be either a dairy cow or a dual-purpose cow in which milk is the primary and beef the secondary consideration.

In this connection, let us quote briefly from an article which appeared serially in a couple of numbers of the Irish Farmers' Gazette, reproducing the two parts of a lecture delivered by Prof. Campbell, of the Irish Department of Agriculture, before a Co. Fermanagh agricultural and dairy society. The article was headed, "What Stock Pays Best?" and in the course of it the author discussed the returns from the rearing of store cattle under Irish conditions: "Let us assume," he says, "a calf born in March, reared for a short period on new milk, and for the rest of the summer on separated milk and a suitable meal. Let us assume that during winter it is housed and receives a moderate supply of roots, hay, cake or corn. Our calculations might be as follows'

	s.	d.
Cost of calf at birth	20	0
30 gallons new milk, at 5d.	12	6
180 gallons separated milk, at 1d.	15	0
60 lbs. calf meal	6	0
430 lbs. of meal and cake	30	6
6 months' hay, at 2s. per cwt.	26	6
20 cwt. roots	10	0
Grazing for summer	10	0
Labor and risk	10	0
	£7	0 6

"What would be the value of a beast so reared at twelve months old? Would you get as much as six guineas? If you get this for the best, what would you get for the worst? As a result of this and similar calculations, and of some experiments we have made, we have come to the conclusion that it is not very profitable to rear store calves, except those that are born early, preferably