

Whole vs. Pulped Turnips--Mr. Hallman to Mr. Taylor.

SIR,—In the January 1st issue of the *ADVOCATE*, Mr. John Taylor, Jr., endeavors to criticize my views regarding the use of the root pulper rather severely. I might say that I enjoy criticism, if it is of the right sort and to the point, but I do not like the idea of a man wasting time by introducing side issues. Had Mr. Taylor taken up the subject of "root pulping" pure and simple, and discussed it on its merits, giving practical experience, the article might have had some merit. It is largely devoted to emphasis of what nobody denies.

I admit the high value of turnips if fed in conjunction with other foods, also of ensilage and good pasture. Wherein did I deny their value? I consider it of the greatest importance to have an abundance of cheap, succulent food. Their value cannot be too highly estimated when judiciously fed. It is the manner of feeding turnips we wish to discuss at this juncture.

I desire to say to Mr. Taylor that what he terms "ideas" are the results of actual experience, but it is evident that his statements are simply expressions of "ideas." I never jump at conclusions, but weigh matters carefully before making important changes. I am not so conservative that I cannot change from former methods, especially when such important considerations are at stake as labor, time, and muscle. I do not work for sport. If Mr. Taylor does he is constructed upon a different plan from the most of us. I am sure pulping turnips is no recreation. Consider the immense amount of extra labor of handling from 2,000 to 4,000 bushels and upwards of turnips that some farmers grow from year to year without a remuneration therefor. Theory is one thing, and is all right, but practical experience is another.

I was among the first in this section to adopt the pulping and mixing system. It gave good satisfaction, and I pursued it for ten years, and was one of the last to abandon it, but I now have been feeding whole turnips for two years, and would say that I have no use for the pulper, except for purposes stated in my former article. It is freely admitted by drovers that in this and surrounding locality there are some of the best and most practical feeders in the country, who see that the cash balance is on the right side of the ledger. They formerly used the pulper, but are now almost entirely feeding whole turnips. This is to me sufficient evidence that the root pulper has seen its best day. It is true we should look to the comfort of our cattle, and I am sure mine have and are receiving due consideration. My cattle have all the comforts a modern barn can give; water inside, silo and everything complete. The little muscular exercise necessary to gouge and masticate turnips along with other food is greatly enjoyed, and I am confident it assists digestion and assimilation in a considerable degree. Now, friend Taylor, let us reason together. I am no scientist, but a common farmer endeavoring to apply the practical knowledge gained by my own and others' experience. You seem to be quite a theorist. You say, "When roots are pulped and mixed with cut feed and meal they help to assimilate the more fibrous and less digestible portions of hay and straw, and in this their value lies, more than the nutriment they contain"; also, "The water in the grass or turnips is worth more than it would be in the bucket." I shall not stop to discuss this question, but will allow every one to draw his own conclusion. If the succulent matter of the turnip is of such value, why not retain all possible moisture. A turnip is at no other time as crisp and juicy as when first broken. In no way will an animal receive the full value of its succulence except when eaten immediately after being broken, and in no way fresher than when eaten whole. Not only is the juice of the turnips more than that at any other time, but the great amount of saliva secreted while gnawing whole turnips greatly assists the digestive process. If turnips are pulped once a day, as is the case when other than man-power is used, they lose considerable moisture by evaporation. This is no theory, as I have proved it by experience. When cut feed, whole turnips, ensilage and meal are put into a clean manger, by the time the meal is over and the food passes out of the fourth stomach, I'll guarantee it is thoroughly mixed and digested.

In conclusion, I would say I do not condemn the mixing system, nor do I condemn the root pulper, and no one can infer such from my former article.

If many would practice mixing, it might probably be of more value than their present careless system; but for me, I have no use for it, except as I stated before, neither has any careful feeder with a modern barn and conveniences. If Mr. Taylor's horses require some mechanical exercise to keep the "puffs" down, the pulper will answer a good purpose: probably all the better for his horses if he would pulp his neighbors' turnips as well. I can keep my idle horses' legs clean and healthy by giving them a cheap ration composed of cut straw mixed with ensilage and a little grain, and a whole turnip thrown in their manger once a day. The spare time with me can be spent with more profit than in pulping turnips, by applying "elbow grease" to my cattle and horses. A. C. HALLMAN, Waterloo Co., Ont.

From the "Land o' Cakes."

Our readers, particularly those from the "Land of Brown Heath and Shaggy Wood," will appreciate the accompanying illustration. It represents a "threshing," at dinner hour, on the farm of one of our Scottish subscribers, Mr. J. Allen, Slydie Clung, Aberdeen, who, on seeing the "Manitoba Threshing Scene" in our November 15th issue, favored us with the photograph in sending across the Atlantic his renewal to the *ADVOCATE*, and from which our engraving has been prepared. Mr. Allen, in the illustration, occupies the position next to the left of the man with the dog at his side at the near end of the line, Mrs. Allen and three little daughters standing near the farther end, while their grown-up daughter and four sons are to be seen standing among the "hands."

Upon comparing the two threshing scenes, the characteristic leisure and order of the "canny"



A SCOTTISH THRESHING SCENE.

Scot at home is the more striking when viewed side by side with the decidedly "hustling" Western Manitoba farmer. Mr. Allen expresses himself as much pleased with the illustrations we give from time to time, and, on behalf of our readers in America, we thank him for his thoughtful greeting.

"Blue-Grays" Once More.

SIR,—In your issue of Jan. 1st, "Onlooker" has an article on "Blue-Grays," and suggests the propriety of starting a new breed of cattle. When I read it I thought it might have emanated from one who had a lot of white Shorthorns. But I did not feel deeply interested until, "lo and behold," out comes Mr. Keough, in your issue of the 15th, endorsing the scheme. Knowing Mr. Keough's fancy for Galloways, I thought we had surely found the pair who could do it up "brown" (or gray). Some years ago, when Shorthorn breeding was in its glory, the breeders were divided into two camps, one advocating line breeding and the other as bitterly opposed to it, on the ground that inbreeding destroyed the physical vitality of the animal. Now, the latter class might have some sympathy with Mr. Keough and "Onlooker," as the dreaded evil effects of consanguinity would be effectually removed. However, a trial might be made just now, along the line suggested, without any very great risk or sacrifice. X Y Z.

In our "Stock Gossip" Department, Mr. Wm. Rivers, Shorthorn breeder, of Bruce Co., Ont., writes commending the great practical value of the articles on Economical Feeding that have appeared in the *ADVOCATE* this season. He adds his testimony in favor of corn ensilage, and speaks highly of the root pulper, which he regards as an indispensable implement to the feeder.

DAIRY.

A "Travelling Dairy" Humbug.

Word has reached the *ADVOCATE* that a party calling himself "Marr" has been visiting farmers, representing himself as authorized by the Dominion Dairy Department to give them instructions in buttermaking—which he appears to understand. After doing so, he unfolds a tale about being a little short of funds till his next cheque comes, on the strength of which he has in several cases secured "temporary" loans, though the amounts were probably not large, but which, it is needless to say, were not repaid. One of the victims has reported his case to a lawyer. Dairy Commissioner Robertson was written to, and replies that the man has no authority whatever from him, but he has had a similar complaint from another quarter. Our readers will do well to give all such questionable gentry a wide berth. It is surprising, after the repeated warnings given against these plausible adventurers, that persons are still open to be gulled.

The Babcock Test—Its Cost and Labor in the Cheese Factory.

SIR,—All well-informed dairymen admit that the only just way to pay for milk delivered at the cheese factory is by the use of the Babcock test. It should be paid for according to the per cent. of butter-fat found in it. Adding the casein to the fat, as suggested by Prof. H. H. Dean (and adopted by many cheese factories), is the simpler and most just way to pay for milk, as his experiments will prove beyond all chance of successful contradiction. Can the outlay connected with the Babcock test be

adjusted satisfactorily? is the question put by patrons and managers of cheese factories. This is not as difficult a question to answer as many have been led to believe. First, composite sample bottles for 84 patrons, \$7.00; 3 pounds pulverized bichromate of potash, 75 cents; 20 pounds sulphuric acid (enough for one season), about \$1.00; 20-bottle Babcock tester, test-bottles, pipette, and acid measures, all complete, about \$16. Now, as experience demonstrates that the quality of the milk was improved where the Babcock test has been introduced, the patrons have been lifted above suspicion, and the necessity of looking after adulterated milk being almost entirely done away with, any cheesemaker with his business at heart, and who aims to make his factory a success, would be willing to take the samples daily free of charge, as many are doing, and others would rather than do without the Babcock test. When everything is made convenient for

taking samples the labor is not very great. Next, as to the cost of testing the milk: We will lessen this by testing only once a month, as many factories are doing. If sufficient quantity of bichromate is used, the milk will be preserved in good condition for testing purposes up to seven weeks, as we have proved by our experiments.

It is not necessary to employ an extra man for the season, to do the testing, but we will lessen the cost by arranging with some intelligent person to come to the factory on testing day to do the work. There is nothing so complicated about testing milk that such a man cannot learn in half an hour to do it with satisfaction to all concerned. Be sure he has the confidence of the patrons. As a man can test from 100 to 125 samples in a day, clean his bottles, and make ready for samples again, the cost will be from one to three dollars (according to size of factory) per month, and for six months from six to eighteen dollars. Some will criticize these figures, but as much work in other ways is being done for less money in some of our factories at the present time. Let the new beginner go to a factory and see the testing done for a day, notice the appliances and conveniences made use of to do the work quickly, then return to his own factory and make everything as convenient as possible for rapid work. If these suggestions are followed, there is no reason why the Babcock test should not be in every factory in the Dominion. The cost per patron would not exceed fifteen cents for the season. Any patron who values a good name would rather pay this amount than run the risk of being accused of dishonesty. Some would gladly pay a large amount if the charges made against them could be remembered no more. The Babcock test lifts a man above suspicion, and does justice to all. O. A. C. Dairy School. T. C. ROGERS.