

will come when the people of the United States will wish that they had never heard of Free Rural Mail Delivery.

Furthermore, we have been informed that our Postmaster General sent a commission to the United States to study the matter. That this Commission did study it thoroughly only to return with a report that indicated that the people of Canada would be swamped by a load of debt were they to introduce free rural mail delivery in this sparsely settled country.

Sir William Mulock, when Postmaster-General, on June 28, 1904, said, in reply to a question put to him in the Committee of Supply:

"The people of the United States were rather dragged into the establishment of a rural free mail delivery, and it has raised serious difficulties in that country."

When asked to explain how the United States was dragged into the system, Sir William Mulock replied that false returns had been made to the Postmaster General and he added:

"The unfortunate administration is evidently at its wits end to know what to do with this monster which has been raised up and it apparently has no way of controlling the thing. Fancy the establishment of a rural delivery system within an area the size of all Europe. That is what is involved in proposing to adopt rural delivery in Canada, and the first step of the Postmaster General would be to ask the House to vote \$5,000,000 or \$10,000,000, perhaps not the first year but in a very short time. The first year perhaps \$1,000,000 or \$2,000,000 would be sufficient but it would go on so that in five years the Postmaster General would have to ask the House to give \$10,000,000 or \$15,000,000 to establish rural delivery. Parliament would not be in favor of voting that sum of money. I doubt if the country could afford that amount of money. It might be that in a few years we would be called upon to vote an item of probably not less than \$25,000,000."

"The United States have taken hold of a problem which is alarming, and one which no prudent government would think of adopting in Canada at the present time."

OUR PRESENT POSTMASTER-GENERAL

In February 1907, according to "Hansard" Postmaster General Lemieux, said in reply to a question:

"When it was first suggested that we should adopt in Canada the rural free delivery system which they have in the United States, officials of the department were despatched to Washington to study that system. The result of their investigation can be summed up in two words. In the United States it has not been a great success, and it has involved the Post Office Department in a succession of annual deficits ranging from \$15,000,000 to \$16,000,000."

FAVORABLE OPINIONS

With such emphatic statements by leading members of the Canadian Government is it any wonder that we have hesitated to introduce free rural delivery into Canada? When, however, we read equally emphatic statements in favor of free rural delivery, made by men of the highest standing in the United States is it surprising if we wonder, Who is Right? Here are a few of them:

President Roosevelt, in his annual message of December, 1901, said:

"Among recent postal advances the success of rural free delivery, wherever established, has been so marked, and actual experience has made its benefits so plain, that the demand for its extension is general and urgent. It is just that the great agricultural population

should share in the improvement of the postal service."

Charles Emery Smith, Postmaster General of the United States, said, as early as November 25th, 1901:

"The policy of rural free delivery is no longer a subject of serious dispute. It has vindicated itself by its fruits. It has been made plain that this service is a potent, educational force, that it brings agricultural life into closer relations with the active business world, that it keeps the farmer in daily touch with markets and prices, that it advances general intelligence through the increased circulation of the journals and periodicals, stimulates correspondence, quickens all interchange, promotes good roads, enhances farm values, makes farm life less isolated and more attractive, and unites with other wholesome influences in checking and changing the hitherto prevailing current from country to city. On an average there are 12 families on a route. Under the old system they travelled from two to four miles in going to the post office. If the cost in time and other factors be reckoned at ten cents a day for each family, it is clearly a moderate estimate. That made an aggregate of \$12.50 a day. The government can deliver the mail at the doors of all at \$2 a day. Why shouldn't it do so, and save them the larger burden?"

DEFICIT HAS DECREASED.

If more recent evidence is required, it may be found in a speech delivered by Postmaster General Meyer, last October in Philadelphia, when he said:

"Often we hear criticisms of the enormous expenditures required in order to maintain the rural delivery service, which at first blush seem to be justified, when we recall that ten years ago the amount expended was only about \$15,000 for the year, whereas the cost for the year ended June 30th, 1907, a decade later, was about \$27,000,000. On the other hand, the deficit of the post office department ten years ago was \$11,500,000, while for the year ended June 30th, 1907, the deficit will be \$6,692,000; so that, notwithstanding this increase of nearly \$27,000,000, the deficit decreased nearly \$5,000,000, showing that rural delivery has added to the general revenue of the postal service."

OUR FORTHCOMING ARTICLES ON RURAL DELIVERY.

With such conflicting statements before us, who are we to believe?

In the articles that are to follow, our readers will be given the facts about rural free mail delivery. They then will be asked to judge of the success of the system for themselves. THE CANADIAN DAIRYMAN AND FARMING WORLD feels that this is the most important question that confronts the farmers of Canada. It was this belief that led us to send our representative to the United States to make a study of the system. Our representative first of all visited Ottawa. He secured personal interviews with Postmaster General Rudolph Lemieux and with leading post office officials. Armed with their views, and with a special letter of introduction from Dr. Coulter, Deputy Postmaster General, he went direct to Washington, D.C., where he interviewed Postmaster General Meyer, Fourth Assistant Postmaster General DeGraw, and Mr. W. L. Spilman, Superintendent of Rural Free Delivery. The views of leading Democrats also were secured, as well as those of Republicans. The objections of our Government to introducing this system in Canada were laid before these men. Their views in regard thereto were secured. Later, our representative went out on the farms in several states and had personal interviews with farmers and their wives. He talked with postmasters

and with rural mail carriers. What all these people had to say about Rural Free Delivery will be told in the articles that are to follow.

In order that as many farmers as possible may read these articles, we would like to urge our readers to show their copies of THE CANADIAN DAIRYMAN AND FARMING WORLD to their friends. Tell them about these articles. Urge them to read them, that they may inform themselves on this great question. The second article in this series will contain the interview with Postmaster General Lemieux, and will give more fully the objections of our Canadian Government to the introduction of this system into Canada.—H. B. C.

The Cost of Producing Milk

J. Trudel, Department Agriculture, Ottawa.

The cost of producing milk varies greatly. This is shown by the records of the Cow-testing Associations. It depends upon whether the man who is engaged in it is a real dairy farmer, attentive to the details of his business, or is merely keeping cows by routine, without any particular system of feeding and breeding. The records of some herds in Quebec which were tested for the whole 12 months in 1907 clearly demonstrated this.

The figures given herewith, which are obtained from the records of two herds in the same district, are more convincing than any arguments that can be put forward:—

Herd	No. of Cows	Average Milk	Production Fat	Total Production Milk lbs.	Estimated Cost of Feed.
A	20	6995 lbs.	3197 lbs.	131,900	\$50.00
B	22	3429 lbs.	1614 lbs.	75,427	\$6.00

Herd	Cost of 100 lbs. of Milk.	Average Per Cent. Butter Fat.	Value at 55 Cts. a lb. Fat	Profit on a 100 lbs. Milk	Net Profit on Total Production
A	\$0.75.8	4.8	\$1.20	\$0.44.8	\$52.90
B	\$1.02	4.7	\$1.17	\$0.15	\$113.14

Both herds are composed of mostly Jersey grades with some pure breeds, and test about the same, only the difference in profits earned comes from the lower cost of producing 100 of milk in herd A, which is only 75.8 cents compared with \$1.02 of herd B, although the average cost of keeping a cow 12 months is \$15 greater in herd A than in herd B.

The owner of herd A estimates the average cost of feed a cow at \$45 for the 12 months. To allow for the high prices of grain and bran in the latter half of the year, however, I have charged him with \$5 more a cow than his estimate. Thirty-five dollars a cow for the other herd is a very low estimate, as every one will agree, and would only be increased, I think, by closer enquiry. However, as the figures stand, the herd of 20 cows yielded a profit of \$470 more than the herd of 22 cows in one year, which would be increased still by \$100 if the estimate of \$45 a cow for herd A is correct.

Some particulars about these two herds will throw some light on how such differences are obtained.

Herd A is composed of 12 mature cows and 8 heifers, 5 of which were 2 years old, and 3 years old at the beginning of 1907. They all calved twice within 12 or 13 months, the average dry period for the 20 cows being 60 days out of the 12 months.

One cow whose period of lactation is only 8 months, was milked 10 months out of the 12, as she calved Dec. 31st, 1906 and again Nov. 3rd, 1907. The owner claims that he gets her to freshen every 10 months. For close attention to business, this is hard to beat.

Herd B is composed of mature cows except for 2 heifers, 3 years old at the beginning of the year. Four of the cows varying from 5 to 11 years of age were farrows. There is a dif-