

to any of the following directors: Messrs. John Hannah, Seaforth; George Browning, Ripley; J. T. Brill, Guelph; Aaron Wenger, Aytun; John Sprague, Ameliasburgh; L. E. Garnett, Bethany; F. Millar, Parkhill; R. J. Graham, Belleville; Peter Graham, M. P. P., Legislative Assembly, Toronto; D. Derbyshire Brockville; Mr. Johnson, care of Baillie & Co., produce merchants, Toronto; M. Moyer, Georgetown; Albert Hagar, Ex-M. P. P., Plantagenet; Valancey E. Fuller, Hamilton.

VALANCEY E. FULLER.

"Oaklands," Hamilton, Ont.,

April 2nd, 1887.

For the CANADIAN LIVE-STOCK JOURNAL.

### Butter Supplies and Values.

BY JAMES CHEESEMAN, TORONTO.

Our butter supplies and their values during the season of 1886-7 offer farmers some hard and uncomplimentary facts for consideration. Why should the great bulk of Canadian butter be so bad that it has always been impossible for oleomargarine or any other butter substitute to be placed on the market? Artificial butter competes with only high grades of dairy and creamery butter, because competition with low grades means accepting a low price; but so far as I can learn it has never attacked us, as our dairy products were of too low a character. Yet this position is so fully illustrated by the facts of the case that it is only necessary to quote them to secure appreciation.

#### IMPORTS OF BUTTER AND BUTTERINE INTO GREAT BRITAIN, 1885.

	Pounds.	Value.	Price.
Russia.....	1,656,816	\$ 196,059	12c.
Sweden .....	13,444,833	3,517,433	26½
Norway.....	2,430,054	453,281	22½
Denmark.....	42,289,642	10,305,675	24½
Germany.....	13,346,226	3,882,440	23
Holland.....	121,061,248	21,632,667	18
Belgium.....	6,908,372	1,308,167	20
France.....	50,500,183	12,545,234	25
Italy.....	196,585	45,998	23½
United States.....	8,207,002	1,544,768	18
Other European Countries.....	1,008	170	17
Channel Islands.....	80,416	18,563	22
Brit. E. Indies.....	113,668	19,372	17
Australia.....	165,185	29,379	18
Canada.....	4,040,876	707,723	18
Other British Possessions.....	112	24	21
Total.....	268,953,876	\$6,256,466	20½ c. a lb.

Ontario makes about 32,000,000 pounds of butter a year, and, according to the returns made to the Bureau of Statistics, this output averaged only 12½ cents per pound, or \$3,900,000. The whole of our creamery butter is little more than 1,250,000 lbs., if so much; but the average price paid for it is about 20c. per lb., or just 7½c. more per lb. than that made by thousands of pairs of hands in I don't know how many different churns, washed and unwashed, colored and uncolored, colored too much or not enough, worked or unworked, and packed away in layers, each one a different shade to the other, and no two of them having the same flavor or keeping qualities. A recent daily paper, the accuracy of whose commercial reports is unquestioned, quotes the following figures for present supplies of butter made in Ontario:

Low grades	14	to 15 cents.
Western	15½	to 17
Morrisburg	16	to 21 "
Brockville	16	to 20 "
Creamery	22	to 25 "

How long shall we continue to allow such a difference as 11c. per pound to exist between the best and poorest quality of butter? We have only thirty-five creameries in Ontario at present, and these make less than four per cent. of the provincial product, but they earn over eight per cent. of the butter revenue.

We have to make up our minds to extend the working season for creameries, so as to include the winter months. It has been found necessary in the United States where the same climatic conditions prevail. Creameries operate the year round, and feed the market just as fast as it can absorb the weekly make, and no faster. The effect of creamery butter on the public taste is improving, and wherever it finds its way it makes consumers less content to use inferior goods.

Roundly stated, it may be said that Ontario alone loses \$2,500,000 every year on its present output. The loss on the undeveloped dairy interest is fully an equal

amount, so that we have the enormous sum of five millions a year passing us by. This sum would much more than pay all the provincial subsidies on a basis of one dollar per capita instead of eighty cents; or, it would give to Ontario the equivalent of \$2.50 per annum on every head of population.

Before closing, let me say the increasing rivalry among those who supply the English market will make it impossible to obtain any great increase of price. We must begin where the Danes did, and where the English and Scotch have. Instead of raising about 3000 lbs. of milk per cow, and using three acres for the purpose, we must double the animal's capacity and treble the yield of the acre. This has been worked out already by many men in all parts of Canada, in cheese and butter districts. We want to increase the per acre yield, and to get a more economical animal than the cow we have now. Unless we can have a minimum of 5000 lbs. of milk, containing at least 200 lbs. of butter per cow, and acres able to raise at the very least one-half this amount, the sooner we quit the business the better. Who will help the manufacture of good butter? Who needs it? Why not the farmer? Let them plank down their dollar and come into the Creamery Association. Commission men are interested; won't they join our Association? We want ten thousand members at one dollar each. One cent on every ten thousand pounds of butter made in Ontario would be but \$3,200 a year. One mill on the dollar realized by the sales would be less than \$4,000. We want to educate all Ontario to produce higher quality, greater uniformity, as great a reputation in butter as we have now in cheese, to double the capacity of the stock, and to permanently improve the agriculture of Ontario. Every dairyman must work to help this result.

Toronto, April 2d, 1887.

### Poultry.

#### Poultry on a Large Scale.

(Continued from April Number.)

BY J. W. BARTLETT, LAMBETH, ONT.

Feeding stock is now considered a science, and that it is a difficult one to master, all who have ever studied it will admit. Certain it is, any person can throw a dish of grain to fowls or other stock, but to feed for best results is a different matter, and to the farmer who keeps a small flock of hens and gives them the run of the farm, or as much of it as they see fit to appropriate, it is a matter of minor importance, as the birds will provide for themselves to a great extent what he does not provide for them. But to the poultry farmer whose flocks are kept in limited quarters, it is a different matter, as he must supply all their wants, such as gravel to grind the food in the gizzard. This is the popular belief: but while we admit the necessity of it, we do not believe it is required for that purpose. He must give them lime in some form for the formation of shells, food suited for the formation of eggs, but not containing too great a percent age of fat, and last but not least, exercise must be made compulsory, as fowls, in common with all nature, find true life in action, and we do not think any other stock are rendered so useless by a little over feeding as fowls, especially laying hens. However, there is but one food we would exclude entirely from their diet, and that is corn: and we would not feed that to laying hens if provided free of charge, although it is excellent for growing chicks. A good ration is bran and shorts, equal parts, for morn'g: at noon, or a little before, if at all convenient, feed oats buried or thrown down on straw a foot deep; at night, wheat or buckwheat, just what they will eat up clean, and no more. In addition to this it is an excellent plan to cut turnips or mangolds in halves, drive nails in a piece of plank, allowing them to project about two inches or a little less, strike the round side of the turnip on the nail and it will remain there exposing the flesh side, which the hens are very fond of, and will

eat entirely down to the skin. They may be allowed all they want of turnips and mangolds, as they are not likely to put on much fat from them, and each season we are confirmed in the belief that a certain amount of green food is a positive necessity to egg production. We used to argue that fowls did not require green food any more than a horse, and that like him, they might be benefitted by it, but that it were not a real necessity; but we are now thoroughly convinced that the hens lay better and keep healthier for it, and are convinced they require green food of some kind more than any other kind of stock. Meat is also necessary; and we have heard poultrymen assert that rather than do without it they would buy steak at twelve cents per pound. However, this is not necessary, as refuse meat can be had for much less money that will answer every purpose. Bullock's liver is good, and in the vicinity of slaughter-houses can be had reasonable enough to afford it; cracklings are good also, and can be had from any pork-packer for about one dollar per hundred.

When the young chicks are about a week old take a sponge, dip it in coal oil, then squeeze dry and sponge the under part of the hen well, not allowing enough oil to remain in the sponge to blister the skin of the hen or hurt the eyes of the chick. This is the most effective method we know of getting rid of lice, and almost all chicks have them.

### Free Advertising.

EDITOR CANADIAN LIVE-STOCK AND FARM JOURNAL.

SIR,—If you will permit me to use a little space in your valuable paper I would like to state a few facts concerning some things, which to my mind hardly seem fair. As an advertising medium for breeders I believe that the JOURNAL is unexcelled in Canada, and when the advertisements are confined to the advertising columns there is no reason for any one to complain; but, sir, when your advertisers, under the cloak of "correspondents" and "contributors," seek to convert the space reserved for reading matter, of general interest to the countless readers of your paper, into free advertising columns, it is time some one called a halt.

I shall speak in this letter of one instance only, although there are others. The report which appeared in the February issue of the JOURNAL of the Western poultry show, held in London, is one which I cannot believe that you wrote. I feel sure that had you been there yourself, you would have dealt fairly, and squarely with all, and would not have favored any particular breeder in your report. Not so with the report which appeared in your paper. At the time your February number came to hand, I was looking for poultry. On looking in the JOURNAL I saw the report above referred to, and what did it tell me? Why, simply this, that there were one thousand exhibits of all the various breeds, and only one breeder's name was mentioned, that of "J. W. Bartlett, of Lambeth, Ont.," and the gentleman who competed with Mr. Bartlett was referred to as "a gentleman from Dundas, whose name we could not learn." It seems strange that your correspondent could not ascertain the name of this gentleman, especially as he knew he came from Dundas. Was his name not on the list of exhibitors? I think so. Will your correspondent please explain this mystery? Will Mr. Bartlett deny the authorship of that report? If he was the correspondent, and I feel certain that he was, he has acted in a very mean and despicable manner. He has abused the privilege he has of writing for the good of the farming community at large by using the space set apart for unbiased and unprejudiced reading to serve his own ends.

FAIR PLAY.

Milton, Ont.

"I like the JOURNAL better than ever. If I could afford it I would send it to every farmer in the country."—W. H. Davidson, Libbytown, Que.

"I think highly of the JOURNAL and say, go ahead: you are doing first rate so far. The articles written by practical men are a valuable feature. Stick to this."—J. T. Barclay, Morris, Man.