



We Welcome Practical Progressive Ideas

& RURAL HOME

The Recognized Exponent of Dairying in Canada

Trade increases the wealth and glory of a country; but its real strength and stamina are to be looked for among the cultivators of the land—Lord Chatham.

VOL. XXXVII

TORONTO, ONT., JULY 18, 1918

No. 29

The Live Stock Outlook for America*

If the War Ends Soon?—If It Continues for Years?—By Eugene Davenport

EVERYWHERE the question is asked,—what is the outlook for the live stock farmer? The very fact that the question is so frequently asked and so much discussed is best evidence that the production of live stock is one of the most expensive and one of the most hazardous forms of farming. For example, it takes two or three years to produce and prepare an animal of the cattle kind for market. During this time it is consuming a very large amount of feed which represents a large investment in land, money, and labor. In the meantime almost anything may have happened in the market and the enterprise may result in positive loss to the farmer, even though he is producing the standard food the world must have. It is perfectly natural, therefore, and inevitable that the live stock farmer should look carefully about him and as far into the future as possible, especially in this time of great disturbance.

It is the next to impossible for us to realize that actual starvation has probably destroyed more people during this war than have been killed by bullets or died by disease, and yet such is unquestionably the fact. One third of the population of Europe is determined to overrun the continent and ultimately the world, and it has pushed the struggle so far as to threaten not only its own existence but that of Europe as a whole. Russia is said to have destroyed more than half of its civil life no less than twenty millions of men, and in France every fifth person, including babies in arms, is now engaged in war. Clearly it is impossible to withdraw so large a proportion of people from production and turn their lives and energies to destruction without ultimately paying the debt in reduced supplies, particularly of food.

At first thought this would seem to argue unquestionably for an unlimited increase in live stock production, but such a hasty conclusion is not warranted, because of the fact that animal food is, roughly speaking, eight or ten times as expensive as in vegetable food. That is to say, one thousand bushels of corn, for example, if consumed directly, will sustain approximately ten times as many people as it could sustain if fed to animals and the animals consumed as food. Of course, it is true that the grass and other forage which animals eat are unequaled for human food, and yet the fact remains that in general the people can afford animal food in large quantities only when the population is scarce and land and labor plenty. For example, China has reached a state in which population may cause considerable production of animal food is impossible, and therefore the people must maintain themselves directly upon vegetable growth.

In this country, up to date, we have been able to support an enormous

population as compared to the number of our people. Meat, milk, wool, and animal labor have been abundant. It is safe to say that there are working for every man, woman, and child in the United States one large animal, like a horse or a cow, and one small one like a pig or a sheep. This is why a full eighty per cent of American farming is done for the support of animals, a much heavier proportion than we are likely to be able to maintain if we are to put five millions of men in the war, as now seems probable.

The time is doubtless here when America and her allies must somewhat reduce the luxury of animal food as it must reduce its luxuries of all kinds. In plain terms, we cannot afford to raise so many crops as heretofore for the feeding of animals, but must consume a larger proportion of the crops ourselves.

This all means that we must either reduce the number of our animals or reduce the expense of maintenance. As between the two it is wiser in every way to maintain numbers so far as possible, and make every saving within our power by reducing the cost of maintenance. For example, it is simpler to send our best cattle to the markets in a less highly finished condition than it is to feed our crops to a reduced number of animals for the

same of maintaining the old-time excessive fat, most of which will not be consumed. It is wiser to seek methods that reduce the production of milk by less intensive and go on feeding to the limit of consumption those now almost cut in the middle as to amount and which have doubted in value due to disturbed market conditions.

In this connection we must remember that the great question now is not what will pay the farmer the best, but what will serve us and our allies best in time of war when the nation is fighting for its life. Under these conditions the question is not how the farmer can make the most money, but how can he keep his farm at all. He knows well that if the Germans win, he will be taxed as he was never taxed before to pay the German war debt.

After the War, What? It would be a bold prophet who would attempt to answer this question. There is no doubt but that the live stock interests of our allies across the water have suffered deplorably. There is no doubt but that they will recoup themselves from and if they can find money for its purchase. In respect over here with the studying this question, it is in the opinion of the writer that large importations at the close of hostilities, if the war should end soon and if we are as breeders can be wise, there is no doubt in the opinion of the writer that large importations will be made by all the countries now at war, and at prices as generous as we are in honor bound to ask. If, on the other hand, a ten-year war is ahead of us, it spells exhaustion to everybody, and it might be that the nations in Europe would enter into a period of depression such as would make it impossible for them to carry out their present plans.

However, the chances would seem to be vastly in favor of the assumption that there will be a movement of our animals across the water even if facilitate the farmer's position, and I am one who believes that the farmer who facilitates the live stock breeder to-day can render his country, his allies, and himself as to have on hand a considerable quantity of useful breeding stock ready for immediate sale as soon as the war is over. It will not do, in the face of the present scarcity and prospective greater scarcity, to go on in allowing grain into our breeding animals without restriction as we have in the past.

The times indicate that our breeding herds should be maintained in a less highly finished condition, and our breeders should, during the period of the war, cut out those classes which require a wastage of feed for finishing. The times indicate, too, that old inferior animals should be rapidly eliminated, and a large herd kept in a young, growing, and prosperous condition.

All these are problems which require the careful consideration of the live stock men who would best serve their country at a time like the present.

WHAT SIZE OF SILO DO I NEED?

FROM the accompanying table the prospective silo builder can determine for himself what size of silo will meet with his requirements. The factors to be taken into consideration are the number of days feeding and the number of cattle to be fed. An average cow will eat about 35 lbs. of ensilage per day, and it is well to figure on a feeding standard of 200 days with whatever ensilage may be needed for supplementing pasture in addition. For instance, a herd of 10 cows fed for 200 days would consume 35 tons of ensilage. Allow five tons for spoilage and waste and a silo 10 x 27 feet would be required to hold sufficient ensilage. This is the weight of ensilage held when settled. From six to 10 feet additional weight would be required to boards could be stood up around the outside of the silo to increase its capacity at filling time. A reliable table is as follows:

CAPACITY OF ROUND SILOS IN TONS.

Height in feet.	Inside Diameter of Silo in Feet.													
	8 ft.	10 ft.	11 ft.	12 ft.	13 ft.	14 ft.	15 ft.	16 ft.	17 ft.	18 ft.	19 ft.	20 ft.	22 ft.	
20	17	26	30	38	44	51	59	67						
22	18	28	33	41	47	55	63	72						
24	19	30	35	43	50	59	67	77						
26	20	32	39	46	54	63	72	81	92	103				
28	22	34	41	49	57	67	76	86	96	107	119	122		
30	23	36	43	52	61	71	81	91	102	112	123	135	152	
32	24	38	46	55	64	75	85	95	105	116	127	140	156	166
34	25	40	49	58	68	79	89	100	110	121	132	145	162	179
36	26	42	51	61	71	82	93	104	115	126	138	152	170	190
38	27	44	54	64	75	86	97	108	119	130	142	157	176	197
40	28	46	56	67	78	89	100	111	122	134	146	161	181	203
42	29	48	59	70	81	92	103	114	125	137	149	164	184	206
44	30	50	61	72	83	94	105	116	127	139	151	166	186	210
46	31	52	63	74	85	96	107	118	129	141	153	168	188	214
48	32	54	65	76	87	98	109	120	131	143	155	170	190	218
50	33	56	67	78	89	100	111	122	133	145	157	172	192	222
52	34	58	69	80	91	102	113	124	135	147	159	174	194	226
54	35	60	71	82	93	104	115	126	137	149	161	176	196	230
56	36	62	73	84	95	106	117	128	139	151	163	178	198	234
58	37	64	75	86	97	108	119	130	141	153	165	180	200	238
60	38	66	77	88	99	110	121	132	143	155	167	182	202	242
62	39	68	79	90	101	112	123	134	145	157	169	184	204	246
64	40	70	81	92	103	114	125	136	147	159	171	186	206	250
66	41	72	83	94	105	116	127	138	149	161	173	188	208	254
68	42	74	85	96	107	118	129	140	151	163	175	190	210	258
70	43	76	87	98	109	120	131	142	153	165	177	192	212	262
72	44	78	89	100	111	122	133	144	155	167	179	194	214	266
74	45	80	91	102	113	124	135	146	157	169	181	196	216	270
76	46	82	93	104	115	126	137	148	159	171	183	198	218	274
78	47	84	95	106	117	128	139	150	161	173	185	200	220	278
80	48	86	97	108	119	130	141	152	163	175	187	202	222	282
82	49	88	99	110	121	132	143	154	165	177	189	204	224	286
84	50	90	101	112	123	134	145	156	167	179	191	206	226	290
86	51	92	103	114	125	136	147	158	169	181	193	208	228	294
88	52	94	105	116	127	138	149	160	171	183	195	210	230	298
90	53	96	107	118	129	140	151	162	173	185	197	212	232	302
92	54	98	109	120	131	142	153	164	175	187	199	214	234	306
94	55	100	111	122	133	144	155	166	177	189	201	216	236	310
96	56	102	113	124	135	146	157	168	179	191	203	218	238	314
98	57	104	115	126	137	148	159	170	181	193	205	220	240	318
100	58	106	117	128	139	150	161	172	183	195	207	222	242	322
102	59	108	119	130	141	152	163	174	185	197	209	224	244	326
104	60	110	121	132	143	154	165	176	187	199	211	226	246	330
106	61	112	123	134	145	156	167	178	189	201	213	228	248	334
108	62	114	125	136	147	158	169	180	191	203	215	230	250	338
110	63	116	127	138	149	160	171	182	193	205	217	232	252	342
112	64	118	129	140	151	162	173	184	195	207	219	234	254	346
114	65	120	131	142	153	164	175	186	197	209	221	236	256	350
116	66	122	133	144	155	166	177	188	199	211	223	238	258	354
118	67	124	135	146	157	168	179	190	201	213	225	240	260	358
120	68	126	137	148	159	170	181	192	203	215	227	242	262	362

*New men have studied agricultural conditions more carefully than Eugene Davenport, Dean of the University of Illinois and a member of the United States Department of Agriculture, in this article, which is a reprint of an address given at the Wisconsin Live Stock Breeders' Association, Deas Riverport, Wis., July 10, 1918. Deas interests of the United States. All the profits made have a 100 per cent application to Canada as well.