

More Acres Not Needed

B. Clancy, Grey Co., Ont.

"LET us buy more land to grow more corn to feed more hogs to buy more land," and so forth ad infinitum.

This is supposed to have been the motto of the United States farmer. I know from observation that it has been the ruling passion of the majority of Canadian farmers as well. This constant buying of more land has its advantages. It keeps the farmer moving. No chance for him to sit back and take things easy and allow farm operations to get behind when there is interest on mortgage and part of the principal to pay off each year. I have even heard people say that they have never got on so well as when they have had a heavy mortgage hanging over their heads.

But has this craze for more land tended to the best development of the country? He who runs may see that it has not. In driving through my own county of Grey I can see the results of this craze for more land. Size of farms has been increased to the detriment of the home acres. Buildings have been neglected, fences have been neglected, and community life has languished. I prefer the method of increasing the farm business adopted by an old friend of mine who has been one of my best neighbors for many years.

It was away back when in his early twenties that this friend had to decide whether or not he would buy more land. He pondered the matter carefully and came to the conclusion that there were two ways of increasing the farm business. One was to produce on more acres and the other to make the acres he had produce more. He decided in favor of the latter course. Almost the first move he made was to set out an orchard and a limited acreage of small fruits such as he could find a market for in the district. From that he proceeded to improve his stock. The poultry department of the farm was increased. To-day he has one of the best producing farms in this section, and he has not one more acre than he started with.

After my neighbor had improved the producing end of the farm his attention veered around to what he is now pleased to call the most neglected department of all—the home. The old house that had been good enough for his mother he decided was not good enough for his wife. It was rebuilt, modernized in every particular, and made such a home as any man might be proud of and his wife satisfied with.

What would our rural communities be like if more men were like this young fellow? Certainly our rural population would be larger, less scattered, the rural church would flourish, rural schools would be up to the standard, and there would be a community life and a community spirit worth while.

Heavy Feeders Most Profitable

R. C. Culman, Elgin Co., Ont.

THE fallacy that "easy" feeding qualities are to be desired in dairy cows was common when I was a boy, but I thought that that old lie had been completely nailed long since. A couple of weeks ago, however, I heard it advanced again, and with as much assurance as might have been used by my grandfather. I was buying cows in a certain county—I will not mention the name for fear of prejudicing myself if I were ever to return—and the cows in several herds were recommended to me because they were "good rustlers" and "easy feeders." They looked it. They were slim-bodied, narrow-hipped brutes that did not have any particular weight to carry in rustling and not much body to support under stable feeding. They certainly were not troubled in their rustling by the size and weight of their udders.

My experience has shown me conclusively that it is not how much a cow eats that is important, but how fully she pays for what she does eat. The herd that I started with were good rustlers. The first year cheese prices were good, and yet my cows averaged me only \$30 each for the whole year; \$27 from the factory and \$3 for the butter. With that \$30 I had to feed the cows, house them, and wait on them. But then, they were good rustlers. Oh, yes.

An Eye-opener

My eyes were opened when I bought two heavy-feeding, big-uddered cows at a sale in an adjoining township. They were not recommended as rustlers, but the cheese factory cheques of their owner had given his herd a reputation. The feed that those two cows ate was a surprise to me, but the milk that they gave was a greater surprise; so I opened my heart and fed them liberally. One of the cows returned me \$76 the first year and the other \$82. Even had they eaten twice as much as the other cows in my herd, they were still more profitable, as the charges for stable room, labor, and so forth were the same for all. Gradually cows of this type, the heavy milking kind, replaced my good rustlers, and dairying began to appeal to me as a profitable proposition.



An Old Beginner, but Just as Game as the Youngest of Them

Mr. Henry Welsh, Weston, Ont., made his first appearance in a public dairy test when he entered his cow, Silver Calamity, at Guelph, last month. Mr. Welsh is 70 years old, didn't know much about feeding for a test when he arrived at Guelph, but he did know a lot more when he left. His cow was one of the 12 best cows, all breeds considered. "I am going to prepare for next year just as soon as I get home," announced Mr. Welsh with spirit, when the results became known. Evidently Mr. Welsh is old in years only. His determination to "come again," shows the spirit of youth.

—Photo by an editor of Farm and Dairy.

I still have the report of the 90-day test at the Columbus Exposition, and the results in that test bear out the conclusions to which I have come from my experience. These cows were arranged in eleven groups, irrespective of breed, according to the amount of total solids produced during the 90 days. It was then found that the cows yielding the largest amount of solids and fat consumed the most feed, but what is of more importance, they gave the largest net profits. The cows giving the smallest yield cost 30 per cent. less to feed, but the net profits from them were 60 per cent. less than from the heavy feeders. For instance, the best eight cows with an average yield of 104.11 pounds of fat, were fed at a cost of \$24.84, and yielded profits to the extent of \$57.41. The four cows of lowest production, 70.39 pounds of fat, cost \$19.50 to feed, and returned \$21.08 in profits. Even these cows, of course, were much ahead of the average.

The heaviest feeder is not necessarily the most profitable. I have had cows like that. The scales only will locate the most profitable cows in the herd, and they must be used at both ends of the cow. As a general rule, however, a heavy feeder is a more profitable cow than a "good rustler."

Consider the Pedigree

F. C. H., Oxford Co., Ont.

IN an experience as a breeder covering several years, I have sold quite a few hundred of pedigreed animals, including dairy cattle, horses and pigs. Nothing has impressed me more than the ignorance of the average buyer as to the value of a pedigree and his inability to really consider the merits of a pedigree that he may hold in his hand. I have a few suggestions that I would like to pass on to prospective breeders and buyers of pure-bred stock. It will be a good day for the honest breeder when all buyers are as intelligent as they should be.

One of the most common mistakes is to place altogether too much confidence in the fact that an animal has a pedigree. I have received letters from scores of buyers who state that they will be perfectly satisfied if they know that the animal I am offering them is registered. The poorest of scrubs may be sold to such men if along with them goes an authentic pedigree sheet. Such men are hard to sell good stock to. Being satisfied with anything that is registered, they always buy from the breeders who have the cheapest stock, and, therefore, the poorest stock.

Points in a Good Pedigree

No one is safe in buying a registered animal unless that animal comes of ancestry of known value. In buying dairy cattle, for instance, in considering the pedigree one should first acquaint himself with all of the producing strains of his particular breed. Don't be satisfied with the name of some great individual away back in the ancestry of any particular animal. The influence that that animal will exert after several generations of breeding is comparatively small. At Shorthorn sales I have seen scrubs highly recommended because they traced back to some of the great animals owned by the Cruickshanks or Bates. What we want are good ancestors in the first, second and third generations back of the animal we are going to buy.

Even then we should not be satisfied. We must have good stock on both sides of the pedigree. At a sale in Western Ontario a couple of years ago, I saw a son of the great Pontiac Kornydke sold for a few hundred dollars. Many were inclined to consider the purchaser fortunate. I did not. The mother of that bull calf was altogether lacking in constitution, and the calf had its mother's weakness in this regard. This is only one instance of an ill-balanced pedigree.

Neither should we be satisfied with good records on the part of the sire and dam only. They may both have been sports, as we call them in the breeding world; and sports are not able to pass on their good qualities. What I look for is uniform high quality rather than sensational records.

But then, pedigree is not all. We must consider individuality also. One of the finest Holstein bulls I have ever seen, a champion at many leading fairs, has never had any offspring able to win honors anywhere, either in the show ring or at the pall. That animal was a sport. Beware of sports as you would beware of any other fakir.