

I don't think it is indifference. The supposed expense and delay of the process are probably the chief hindrances. Most people have the idea they must begin with a fabulous priced Jersey or Shorthorn, and that discourages them. Then they want immediate results, forgetting that "the more haste the worse speed." To start and build up a "Cream-pot" breed of cows, is within the ability of every thrifty, well-to-do dairyman, and he will become more thrifty, and better-to-do, by taking this course. Fewer and better cows; more calves and heifers; less of dairying as a specialty, and greater attention to a mixed husbandry; these are the milestones of progress, that measure the road along which our dairymen ought to travel.

We are constantly reading of incredible sums of money having been paid for fancy cows and bulls of popular and fashionable breeds. The Shorthorn craze reached its acme in the \$40,600 cow sold at the New York State Mills auction in September, 1873. The Jersey craze is now on its upward march. It has reached \$1,400, \$2,500, and \$3,000 for cows; \$3,500 for the bull "Farmers' Glory," and \$4,500 for the bull "Polonius," and how much higher it will go, goodness only knows. Meantime, it is undeniably on record, that grade Shorthorns have beaten the thoroughbreds as beef producers, and that grade Jerseys have equalled those with all the fashionable points in milk-pail performance. Farmers and dairymen are shrewd enough surely to draw their own inferences from such facts, and to leave speculating in fancy animals to the class of whom it is proverbial that they and their money are easily parted. Meantime we shall not err, if we go on quietly improving the best strains of native cattle.

It will be inferred from what has been said, that I go in for dairymen raising their own cows. I do, most decidedly, and for this reason, if there were no other, that I do not see how we are going to get rid of the scrub bulls until it becomes an object with dairymen to raise choice calves. Just so long as the only aim is to get a cow pregnant in order to renew her yield of milk, we shall have our dairy districts infested with worthless male bovines. It may be said, what matter, if the calves are all deaconed? They will not all be deaconed. Some will be permitted to live. All calves, like all babies, are pretty, and there are sentimental people who will spare a calf because it looks pretty, and it will survive to perpetuate the evil qualities of an unworthy ancestry. But, even if all worthless calves were sure to be slaughtered at three days old, the question arises where is our supply of good cows to come from? We will suppose that in every dairy neighbourhood, one or more breeders make it their business to raise first-class milking stock. They do it at the risk of their best cows forming a chance acquaintance with the worst bull in the region round about. Cows, like human beings, are given to sly courtships, and apt to contract foolish marriages. You can only influence human beings by reason, persuasion, and motive; but you can absolutely control cows and bulls; you can render it impossible that there should be improper mating, and the best interests of

dairying demand that it be done. Beside all this, there are other good and sufficient reasons why dairymen should raise their own cows. It is the true business-like way of going to work. The law of supply and demand requires it. I hold that every calf should live until it either produces beef or milk. When calves are too valuable to be sacrificed for "deacon skins" or for veal, they will be allowed to live. Is it objected, that then there will be no veal in the shambles? It would be a good thing if there were none. Veal is no more fit for human food than an unripe apple or a green blackberry. I don't subscribe to the old English doggerel:

"Winegar, veal and wenison.  
Are wery good wittles I wov."

Besides, a fatted calf is never converted into veal except at a dead loss to somebody. I defy any man to produce a six weeks' old calf fit for butchering at a less cost than \$10, and \$5 is about the top market price for it. With the large and growing demand for beef and dairy stock, there is no need and no excuse for killing a single calf unless it be hopelessly deformed, and I wish there were a law against it. We have laws for the protection of game and wild animals; why not have similar laws to prevent the destruction of calves? Every slaughtered calf is a loss to the country. If it were once made illegal to kill calves, very few would be raised but such as are fit to live, and the gain to our stock interests would be immense.

Further, I would ask, is there any more profitable mode of farming than to raise a creature that, at from two to three years old, will be worth \$50 or \$60, either for beef or milk? Then, there is the satisfaction of raising your own stock, and seeing it improve before your eyes. Every man should pursue his business so as to derive the largest amount of pride and pleasure from it, and there is honest pride,—there is a pleasure in surveying a herd of sleek animals, every one of which has a well-known history, and belongs to your own out-door family. Moreover, it is a well-attested fact, that cows do best on the farms where they have been born and bred. They have a home feeling, as well as human beings, which it is well to cultivate.

I think I have made out a strong case in favour of dairymen rearing their own cows. But if you are not convinced—if for any reason you think you cannot be your own cow producer—still heed the advice to keep no animal that you are not sure yields a profit. Have no *cow devils* about your premises, to deceive you with delusive hopes of gain, that never can and never will be realized.

I am glad to know that this subject attracted prominent attention at the recent meeting of the American Dairymen's Association, held at Syracuse, N.Y. No less than three of the leading speakers read papers on it. Hon. J. Shull, of Ilion, spoke on the improvement of dairy stock by selection, transmission, training and feeding. Mr. S. Hoxie, of Whitestown, pointed out the possibilities and ways and means by which new breeds, better adapted to the wants of different sections of our broad domain, might be developed from the stock now in hand, building up on the soil and in the

climate and environs where they are to live, American breeds, as, for example, a breed for New England; for New York and the Middle States; for the present West and North-west; and one for the trans-Mississippi. Prof. I. P. Roberts, of Cornell University, presented an excellent discourse on improving *milking qualities* through the selection of milking animals from milking ancestors, and maintaining them with high feeding and extraordinary care; and he condemned emphatically the one-sided practice so much in vogue with dairymen, of selecting choice dams for breeding, but disregarding the qualities of the sires.

I do not take much stock in the anxiety to get up distinctively American breeds. It seems to be a kind of needless aching for something purely national, and even sectional. Surely there is more of sentiment and fancy than of sound common-sense in aiming to get one breed for New England, another for New York and the Middle States, a third for the present West and North-west, and a fourth for the trans-Mississippi region. What is the use of throwing away the labours of others? Cattle are cosmopolitan. The Shorthorn, a native of England, improves by emigration, and specimens have been sent back to the old world from the new, that have commanded the highest prices in the British market. Herefords, Ayrshires, Jerseys, Holsteins, and Polled Angus cattle, all take kindly to the climate of this country, and make themselves at home here. He must be fastidious, indeed, and little better than a patriotic crank, who, for the sake of earning a national name, would start to do over again what has already been done so well, that it is doubtful if it can be done any better. If an improved American edition of the Shorthorn or any other breed can be got out, all right, but there is no necessity for going back to the place of beginning, in order to make progress. I notice with pleasure that our able friends Prof. Wetherell and Hon. Harris Lewis warned their dairy brethren against *in-breeding*, scouted the idea of American breeds, and urged building on the foundations already laid so well by European agriculturists and stock raisers.

The N. Y. *Tribune*, in reporting the meeting just referred to, makes the following excellent comments:—

"Though seeking it in different ways, all seemed intently aiming for the same end. The earnestness, readiness and force with which the speakers presented and defended their positions, showed that a good deal of attention has been devoted to the matter, and that a strong conviction is entertained of the necessity for, in some way, changing the *non-paying 'scrubs'* for animals that will turn out better yields of butter and cheese. That this is not a spasmodic effort peculiar to this convention, is evidenced by the fact that it occupied equal attention at the late convention in Cedar Rapids, Iowa, and also at the recent meeting of the N. Y. State Dairymen's Association. There is clearly a thorough waking up in regard to the defects of cows now in use, running through the whole dairying fraternity, and a growing appreciation of the needless loss sustained by keeping so many inferior animals, which augurs well for improvement, and a consequent reduction in the cost of producing milk. It would have been fortunate if such a waking up had occurred years ago."