

few of these performances, as shown in the following table :-

Name of Cow.	Lbs. of Milk.	Lbs. of Butter.	Lbs. of Milk required for a pound of Butter.	Food consumed per day.
MARY ANNE OF ST. LAMBERT.				
Test No. 1. (Sept. 1883)	261	27 9½	9.10	14 lbs. oat meal, 14 lbs. pea meal, 7 lbs. oil meal, and pasture. Cost per day, 50 cents.
Test No. 2 (Sept. 1884)	245	36 12½	6.66	25 lbs. oat meal, 17 lbs. pea meal, 1 lb. bran, and pasture. Cost per day, 65 cents.
PRINCESS				
Test No. 1 (1884)	315	27 10	.4	25 lbs. clover hay, 48 lbs. bran, 12 lbs. oat meal, 6 lbs. corn meal, 6 lbs. linseed meal, and 50 carrots per day. Cost per day, 40 cents.
Test No. 2 (1885)	290½	46 12½	6.4	22 lbs. oat meal, 23 lbs. pea meal, 1 lb. bran, with hay, carrots and beets. Costing \$1.00 per day.

In each case the test lasted seven days. The complete quantity of food consumed is only given in one instance, viz., the first test of Princess II., and the quantity and cost of food per day is only approximate in the other tests. If great feeding capacity is to be lauded, then these cows and these booms cannot receive too much praise. In the test just mentioned, the 27 pounds of butter would have to bring 34 cents per pound in order to pay for the bare cost of the food consumed. But we shall not dwell on these figures, for the reader can make his own deductions. Pedigree worshippers must feel astonished that there can be so much difference in the product of thoroughbred cows. If there is so much difference in the maximum yields, there must be an immense gulf between the maximum and the minimum. Now it is well known that these figures are presented to the public for the purpose of booming up the Jersey cattle, and the fancy prices are based upon these tests. Granting that there have been a few phenomenal records, this does not prove that there are no monstrosities in other breeds, possibly, also, including the "scrub" kind.

We shall now make a few demands from these men of record notoriety, leaving our readers to judge if our demands are just :

1. We want to know the exact quantity and quality of the food consumed, or the exact cost of producing a pound of butter. We are well aware that no two feeders will agree as to the nature of the ration to be fed during the test; some will condemn foods which others applaud, proving that no satisfactory results can be obtained from this "practical" method of investigation. Nobody denies that the butter comes from the food as well as from the breed, which shows the necessity for a uniform method of feeding. If the feeding makes so much difference as it appears to do in the accompanying table of tests, then a Jersey herd can be manufactured out of any breed in a few months, and the less thoroughbred the cows are for this purpose the better.

2. We want to know if the cow increases or decreases in weight during the test. Some cows allow themselves to be milked almost to death for a short period of time, and then give out completely. They not only give milk for a short season, but also for a small number of seasons. Length of time in use is of greater importance in a cow than has been ascribed to it. The age of the cow, and the general system of management, are also matters of unquestionable importance.

3. We want to know something about the quality of the butter, its keeping qualities, the mode of manufacture. The quantity and quality of the food affects the churning very materially. It is well known that when succulent foods are fed, mostly all of the butter fats will be churned out of the milk (if churned whole), or the butter-milk; and it has been frequently observed that a greater weight of butter has been obtained than the weight of butter fats in the milk, while in dry food rations quite a large percentage of butter fats has been left in the skim-milk and the churn. We also want to know whether the cream has been raised on the ripening or souring principle, whether the milk has been set deep or shallow, and the temperature of the vessels, and the milk rooms. Inattention to this matter alone may make a difference of 12 to 15 per cent. in the butter yield. What are the keeping qualities of the butter? Is it really true that the quality is better than that of other breeds? It is known that the larger the fat globules the better the butter, which rather favors the Jersey brand; but otherwise, does not quality depend upon food and management? It is impossible that the best quality of butter can be obtained from phenomenal yields.

4. We want to know the quantity and value of the skim-milk. Butter is a pure luxury, all the nutritive value being in the skim-milk. This is a matter of great importance for those who want to raised much stock, and who have a worn out soil to be restored.

5. We want to know something about the health and constitution of the cow, and how she adapts herself to our climate and average system of management, as well as the impressive power of the breed upon our native herds.

6. We want to know the record of the whole herd, not a few individuals; and if we can get this, then we want the minimum records of the breed as well as the maximum.

And yet an answer to these questions will only decide the true order of the records; it will place many cows in the front rank which are now in the rear, and weed many out of the ranks altogether. It appears that the only object is to beat all previous records at any risk or expense. If these "practical" experts would honestly report to the farmer that the only practical lesson learned was the testing of the bursting pressure of these cows, they would at least receive credit for honesty. Even if these records could be turned to practical account, the farmer must still know similar records of all other competing breeds, including our natives, in order that he might be able to draw his own conclusions as to their respective merits. It is not the fault of the Jersey men that the champions of the other breeds do not push their business with equal zeal. A start must be made somewhere, no matter how false

the principles may be, and so long as the Jersey men honestly seek to improve their methods according to the best light they can obtain, they will win our sympathy and support, and we will boom up every record that we regard to be of practical utility for all it is worth. If they have not the appliances for ascertaining the truth, let them hand their testing over to those who have.

Ensilage in England.

The Ensilage Commission appointed for the purpose of inquiring into the methods of preserving green fodder crops by the ensilage system, recently held a convention in London, England. The evidence of many practical farmers who have been practicing the system is reported at length in the English agricultural papers; also the evidence of many noted agriculturists and other scientific authorities.

It appears that the promoters of the ensilage boom are manipulating the affair to their own advantage, at least as far as apparent consistency is concerned; for the practical feeders who have been examined are unanimously in favor of the system, those who have abandoned the feeding of "pickled grass" in disgust not having been examined. Of course the evidence of such an eminent authority as Sir. J. B. Lawes, the most pronounced opponent of the system, could not have been consistently evaded. Agricultural journals and writers on both sides of the ocean have also committed themselves to the boom, and hence they appear averse to any evidence which is at variance with their policy. The ADVOCATE is almost the only agricultural paper that has not been led astray by the crazy; but we expressed our readiness to befriend the system so soon as reasonable arguments could be advanced in its favor, supported by the scrutiny of actual tests; for we foresaw many advantages that would arise if June grass could actually be fed during the winter months.

IMPORTANCE OF THE COMMISSION.

In one respect we regard this commission as one of the most important agricultural assemblages that has ever been held. It is a struggle between science and practice; and, should the former prevail, a new era will be opened in the settlement of all agricultural questions. In short, it will form one of the most important precedents in agricultural history. The report of the commission will not be made public for some time, and it is yet premature to discuss the probable termination of the issue. The scientists still labor under a disadvantage inasmuch as the question has not yet been so thoroughly investigated as it might have been, while the practical men are the enthusiasts, and are very pronounced in their statements, although their evidences by no means harmonize. However, even should the report of the commissioners be averse to the practical investigators, the struggle between science and practice is only a question of time; for the science includes the practice—that is, the principles, verified by accurately conducted tests, are arrayed against the loose experience of those whose figures are always round numbers, and whose opinions are usually swayed by prejudice or self-interest.