

The Farmer's Advocate and Home Magazine

PERSEVERE
AND
SUCCEED

ESTABLISHED
1866

REGISTERED IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE COPYRIGHT ACT OF 1875

VOL. L.

LONDON, ONTARIO, APRIL 15, 1915.

No. 1177

EDITORIAL.

A seeding better than usual is what the farmer wants.

If a regular rotation has never been followed start now.

Farm a little better this year than ever before. It is necessary.

Watch the drill that it may be kept sowing the required amount of seed.

The currycomb and brush will aid greatly in keeping the horses in condition during the Spring work.

Remember the bad places in the roads when "road-work" time comes and repair them properly.

Cattle rambling over the meadows at this season will not improve the chances for a good hay crop.

Some Ottawa investigations have revealed the fact that it sometimes pays better to be a middleman than a manufacturer.

Many thinking readers still believe that if marketing difficulties were solved production would increase by leaps and bounds.

Clover is high, but try sowing a little more of it to the acre this year than usual. On most land ten or twelve pounds will not be too much.

With yearling lambs selling at \$12 per cwt., and all sheep products advanced, sheep breeding should receive the attention of more stock farmers.

Try a regular pay-day with your hired man this season. It will meet with his approval and will mean better relations between employer and employee.

We hope those who predict an early end of the war in Europe are right. The world will rejoice to see the great nightmare over and permanent peace established.

Success with live stock depends greatly upon the watchful eye of the herdsman. The man who cannot see the little changes and how they affect the stock is not a stockman.

What percentage of your corn will germinate and send up strong, vigorous shoots? If you don't know you should and the method of ascertaining is simple and within the reach of all.

Clean the cultivator teeth, the disk harrow, the plow mold-board and the teeth of the drag harrow when unhitching at night that they may the better clean themselves the next morning.

The man who "pushes" his work is always ahead while his neighbor who allows his work to push him is invariably behind. This applies to financial condition as well as to actual labor.

Agriculture's Opportunity.

In discussing with a leader in agricultural thought a few days ago, some of the big questions confronting Canadian agriculture, he made a statement to this effect.—This is agriculture's grand opportunity to get just recognition—and we believe it is, but it must have the support of real leaders, and its representatives in parliament must not forget that their first duty is to look after the interests of the people forming the constituency which elects them. We can rest assured that the representatives of cities and towns will be men untiring in their efforts to promote the welfare of those cities and towns and the people living in them. A city never elects a farmer to parliament; no more should a rural constituency elect a city man. A few days ago a writer objected to a statement made by a correspondent advising that farmers be sent to parliament holding that a parliament of farmers would be a fizzle. Quite true, but let the cities send their representatives and the rural districts rural men, ready to stand by their interests regardless of party politics and then look for good government.

This is agriculture's opportunity. The farming industry should be represented by men who are farmers or who at least know something of farming conditions and who are not afraid to speak out or act in parliament according to their convictions. Let the cities elect the doctors, lawyers, and men of finance, transportation and commerce and let the country districts elect the man who knows by experience the ills of agriculture, and from that experience should be in a position to suggest remedies. Big men are needed—men who can see through the cigar smoke in the lobby the aims of the smooth-tongued politician who seeks to rob them of their real worth to their constituency and country,—men who will not even twitch a muscle at the crack of the party whip,—men who will stand, fight and vote for the interests of agriculture which they represent. Because a man is a farmer when he is elected to parliament, because he is a back-bencher when he makes his first appearance on the floor of the house, because he is not so fluent as his professional colleagues is no reason why he should sit out session after session and never be heard from more than to rush to the chamber when lashed into line by the party whip to cast his vote with his party. We have heard it said before now that all most farmers were good for when elected to parliament was to smoke cigars and vote when a division occurred. We think this is a reflection on farmer members; all are not like that, far from it. But in the past, too many have been politicians first and representatives of the farming constituency which elected them last or just before an election when votes were needed for re-election. Every rural constituency should have and has in it several men, farmers, who if they would throw off party politics and enter the fight as independent liberals or independent conservatives, and would carry the fight to the floor of parliament and stick to their guns regardless of caucus, lobbying or party whip would make good members for this country and would raise the status of agriculture in the eyes of all the people including agriculturists themselves.

The war has served to turn all eyes toward the farmer. The products of the farm are even more necessary than arms or ammunition, and yet it took a world catastrophe to make the people see how the very life of the country depends upon the

farmer. The farmer is asked to do his utmost; he is lauded as the real strength of the country; he is pleaded with to produce; he is patted on the back as the backbone of the country. Opportunity knocks at his door. Unless he grasps it the end of the war may see it gone for years, perhaps forever. This is not a selfish proposal to take advantage of conditions to reap individual gains. Not at all. But it is a proposal to make agriculture as a whole benefit after the war is over. People know now that they depend for their very existence on the farmer. They must not be allowed to forget this. To make the most of the situation there must be a unity of purpose on the part of Canadian agriculturists; they must be represented by men big enough to impress their case upon parliament as well as upon the business world at large; they must do things. People the country over are looking with expectant eyes to agriculture to pull Canada out of the present depression. Is it not a good time to grasp the opportunity, to be watchful that our leaders do not stony, to put agriculture where it belongs in a country which boasts of farm products first, last and all the time?

Can Fat Be Fed Into Milk?

At several of the creamery meetings held throughout Western Ontario during the past winter the old question of feeding fat into milk came up again and again. This question has cropped up for years, and some practical feeders of dairy cattle are generally found putting faith in the belief that it is possible by feeding richer feed to increase the percentage of fat in the milk, while those connected with the educational and business phases of dairying stick firmly to the belief that it is not generally possible to appreciably affect the percentage of fat in any cow's milk by changing her feed. We once talked with a man who was sure that when he fed a large proportion of corn and peas in his ration his cow gave a richer milk. Of one thing he was certain, the cow gave more milk, which, set in shallow pans, seemed to give a thicker cream. Because the cream was thicker he at once concluded that the milk was richer in fat, whereas the thickness of the cream may not have had anything to do with the richness of the milk.

Experimental work has definitely settled the fact that, generally speaking, it is not possible to materially change the percentage of fat in a cow's milk by making changes in her diet and keeping her under normal conditions. We recently made a study of a table showing the amounts of milk and of fat given by four cows, two of which were placed on a good ration for a month, while the other two were placed on a poor ration the first month, and the rations were shifted from each pair of cows to the other. While it was a fact that the amount of milk and the amount of fat given in the time was, in each case, very appreciably greater when the cows were on the good feed, it was also a fact that the percentage fat in the milk did not vary to any marked extent and the fat percentage was even a trifle higher with two of the cows when on the poorer ration, while the others showed a slight advantage in this particular when on the good feed. The average showed no change, and it is a well-known fact that slight variations in tests are often noticed between night and morning milk, due, it is said, to the fact that when cows lie still there is a larger percentage of water and a corresponding smaller percentage of solids