

The Farmer's Advocate

and Home Magazine

"Persevere and Succeed."

Established
1866.

VOL. XLI.

REGISTERED IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE COPYRIGHT ACT OF 1875.

LONDON, ONT., JUNE 21, 1906.

No. 717

EDITORIAL.

Improve the Quality of Our Beef Cattle.

The quality of the dairy products of Canadian farms compares favorably with that of any other country in the world. Our cheese and butter have secured a solid standing in the estimation of the buyers and consumers of these commodities in Great Britain—the best market afforded for these products—and this trade has grown into grand proportions, netting many millions of dollars annually to the industrious and thrifty farmers of this country whose tastes and predilections run in that direction, or whose circumstances and environment have brought them into touch with a successful and prosperous dairy industry. This result, it is true, has been brought about largely by a prudent policy of Governmental aid, by supplying educative information, demonstrations and inspection, by securing improved shipping facilities, and by following the product to its market, to see that it is placed there in the most presentable and attractive form. That this policy has proved a pronounced success, there is now no question, and we are aware that there are among breeders and feeders of beef cattle those who contend that undue favor has been accorded by both the Dominion and Provincial Departments of Agriculture to the dairy industry, as compared with that of beef-raising, transportation and marketing. While there may be some foundation for this feeling, and while we do not, as a rule, approve of relying upon Government assistance, or spoon-feeding, for the prosecution of business, but would rather counsel and encourage the employment of vigorous and energetic private enterprise as the most independent business method, it must be admitted that dairying, being largely a manufacturing process, and more dependent upon scientific management and methods in the making and handling of the product, has stood more in need of educational support and assistance than does the production of beef, and the end has, therefore, justified the means employed in placing the industry on a firm footing.

But the great majority of the farmers of this country do not favor dairying as a specialty, preferring general farming, growing grain and raising stock for feeding to a finish, or selling to others to finish, while others depend upon buying stockers to stall feed or graze, with the object of lessening expenses by employing the least labor possible. And these classes of farmers generally pin their faith to the dual-purpose cow—the cow which will yield a profitable supply of milk for dairy purposes, and at the same time, on the by-product, the skim milk, raise a calf that, with little care, will grow into a fairly profitable feeder. While, with reasonably good management, this is quite within the bounds of practicable husbandry, it certainly is lamentably true that the bulk of the general-purpose cattle of this country come far short of meeting this requirement, and their failure to do so is due mainly to the parsimony, the "penny-wise and pound-foolish" policy of using mongrel-bred sires because the initial outlay is little, while the farmer fails to recognize that the profit from such a course is practically nil, whereas, by using a pure-bred sire of good type, the produce from grade cows, under similar care, would almost certainly be worth from five to ten dollars a head more at any time after they are a year old than the progeny of grade sires, and the herd will be steadily improving in character, instead of retrograding, as it inevitably must while a scrub bull is used.

If Canada is to secure and hold a good position in the British market for beef cattle, or for

dressed meat, in competition with other countries catering to that market, our people need to get a move on, and improve the quality of their product. Failing to do this, we shall be left in the lurch, playing second fiddle, where, by reasonably good management, we might well take first place. Since we have the most healthful climate for stock in the wide world, and can raise in profusion on our own land all the necessary fodder and feed to finish them in first-class condition, while maintaining the fertility of our farms without resorting to any artificial means. And there is no reasonable excuse for lagging in this matter. Good, useful, pure-bred bulls are available in plenty, at prices easily within the reach of the general farmer, prices little if anything above what they will fetch for beef at the end of their term of service, while they will repay first cost many times over in the improved value of their progeny. Enterprising capitalists and dealers, having faith in the future of the country and the meat trade, have invested largely in the establishment of stock-yards and abattoirs in our leading cities, providing markets for cattle, sheep and hogs, depending upon the farmers to supply the necessary stock to fill the requirements of the trade, and it is up to our farmers to see that stock of good quality and finish is supplied, in order that the good name of Canada for first-class food products may be maintained and the best prices secured. The best quality is always in demand, and brings a fair price when inferior stuff goes begging for buyers.

The Creamery's Buttermilk is the Patron's Skim Milk.

Creamery patrons will do well to read carefully the article by Mr. Barr in the Dairy Department of this issue. Apart from the usual admonition to be careful of the quality of milk and cream delivered, he touches a very important point where he discusses the advisability of sending only rich cream. Many patrons, by skimming too thin a cream, are sending off the farm with each day's lot 25, 50, and even 75 pounds of skim milk, which it would have been far better for all concerned if they had kept at home. It would be worth, at a low estimate, from 5 to 15 cents for feeding calves and pigs. In a week this would amount to from 35c. to \$1.00; in a month, from \$1.50 to \$4.50; and in a year, probably from \$10.00 to \$30.00. This is, in most cases, sheer loss.

The same amount of fat sent in the form of a rich cream would make a trifle more butter, partly because a more exhaustive churning can be obtained from rich cream, and partly because a rich cream enables the buttermaker to churn at a slightly lower temperature, and thus widen the difference between the churning temperature and the temperature of the washing water, thereby enabling him to incorporate more moisture in the butter, and consequently making more pounds of butter from a given weight of butter-fat. Of course, any benefit from this increased make is distributed among all the patrons, but if all would unite in sending rich cream, the returns to each one per pound of butter-fat, would, in many instances, be appreciably increased.

The main point that should appeal to the individual, however, is the direct gain in saving of skim milk. No patron has a cent to gain from sending thin cream. On the other hand, everyone stands to lose by the inferior quality and slightly decreased quantity of butter produced, while in every case there is the serious loss of valuable skim milk. Why anyone should desire to skim a thin cream, thereby sending the cream-

erymen a lot of fluid to be converted into butter-milk, and sold at his own profit (as is done in the majority of creameries), can be attributed only to lack of knowledge, and we trust that every patron will ponder the matter long enough to see clearly on which side his bread is buttered.

Sound Advice from Mr. Hill.

Three times in his address before the Canadian Club at Ottawa, did Mr. Jas. J. Hill, the Railway King of the Northwestern States, who desires the privilege of building a railway across Western Canada without a subsidy, lay down the proposition that the farming community was the great mainstay of the country.

The men who follow the plow, he said, were the men who built the nation and made it strong and vigorous. He jolted the lobbyists of the Capital by his declaration that he wanted to build the roads without bonuses, because it paid better—paid better to build according to business principles, to go where the traffic is to be got, and to overcome the law of gravitation, the first great problem in railway construction. He reminded his hearers that the man, was more important than the soil, and advised Canada not to hurry in settling the West, but to select its population. He warned Canada—and here he is in line with the position "The Farmer's Advocate" has taken—not to give away its great land heritage, but keep it for the man who is going to live on it. Do not allow a man to live on it by proxy, and then walk away with the title. The man with his roots in the soil was the one to encourage. The Northwest was now in a position to grow up strong and healthy without spoon-feeding. He warmly commended the Ontario Agricultural College, and counselled his hearers to preserve in Canada a high standard of business integrity, and keep the Old Flag flying to the last tatter.

The Georgian Bay Canal.

We have more than once called attention to the value of the proposed Georgian Bay Canal, in solving the transportation problem of Canada. It will make a short cut from the upper lakes to Montreal, via Lake Nipissing and the Ottawa River. Railway interests are likely "agin" the project, and the people are warned that it will cost \$50,000,000. One transportation key was lost when the Government allowed the Canada Atlantic Railway to Depot Harbor, on Georgian Bay, to slip into the hands of the G. T. R., instead of acquiring it as a link that would have made the Intercolonial a controlling factor in the commerce of North America. Is the great north waterway to go by default, also? In his address at Ottawa, James J. Hill put in a good word for this project. He reminded his hearers that the United States was spending from \$200,000,000 to \$250,000,000 on the Panama Canal. If the Georgian Bay Canal could be constructed for \$55,000,000, so as to be navigable for vessels drawing 21 feet of water, then Montreal would be fifteen miles nearer to Chicago and Duluth than Buffalo is, and 400,000-bushel vessels could carry grain at a profit for 3 cents per bushel. Trade followed the line of least resistance, and if the waterway could be brought into a condition under which a man could use it, then not only would wheat from the Canadian Northwest, but grain from all points in the United States north of Kansas City would come this way during the period of open navigation.