

FARM AND DAIRY

AND RURAL HOME

Published by The Rural Publishing Company, Limited.



1. FARM AND DAIRY is published every Thursday. It is the official organ of the British Columbia, Eastern and Western Ontario, and Bedford Districts, Quebec, Dairyman's Associations, and of the Canadian Holstein Cattle Breeders' Association.

2. SUBSCRIPTION PRICE, \$10 a year. Advance payment required. For all countries, except Canada and Great Britain, add 50c for postage. Renewals of subscription of subscribers are sent to all subscribers, who then continue to receive the paper until they send notice of discontinuation. No subscription is continued for more than one year after date of expiration. A year's subscription free of charge for a club of two new subscribers.

3. REMITTANCES should be made by Postal Office or Money Order, or Registered Letter. Postage stamps accepted for amounts less than \$10. On all orders add 25 cents for exchange fee required at the bank.

4. CHANGE OF ADDRESS.—When a change of address is ordered, both the old and new addresses must be given.

5. ADVERTISING RATES are printed on application. Copy received up to the Friday preceding the following week's issue.

6. WE INVITE ADVERTISERS to write us on any agricultural topic. We are always pleased to receive practical articles.

CIRCULATION STATEMENT

The paid subscriptions to Farm and Dairy exceed 14,000. The actual circulation of each issue, including copies of the paper sent subscribers free of charge, in arrears, and sample copies sent from 15,000 to 17,000 copies. No subscriptions are accepted at less than the full subscription rate.

Seven detailed statements of the circulation of the paper, showing its distribution by counties and provinces, will be mailed free on request.

OUR PROTECTIVE POLICY

We want the readers of Farm and Dairy to feel that they can deal with our advertisers with the same confidence as they can with our verifiers' reliability. We try to add to our columns only the most reliable advertisements. Should any advertiser have cause to be dissatisfied with the treatment we will investigate any of our advertisers fully. Should we find reason to believe that any of our advertisers are unreliable, even in the slightest degree, we will discontinue immediately the publication of their advertisements under the circumstances warrant, we will expose them through the columns of the paper. Thus we will not only protect our readers, but our reputable advertisers as well. In order that the advertiser may be entitled to the benefits of our Protective Policy, your advertisement in Farm and Dairy must be made to Farm and Dairy within one week from the date of any unsatisfactory transaction, with proofs thereof, and within one month from the date that the advertisement appears. In order to take advantage of the guarantee, we do not undertake to adjust trifling differences between readers and responsible advertisers.

FARM AND DAIRY

PETERBORO, ONT.

MILKING AND LABOR

"How many cows do you milk?" is a question frequently asked by the prospective hired man. His desire to employ with us is very apt to be in the inverse ratio to the size of our dairy herd. The hired man's antipathy to milking may be due largely to the fact that on many farms the milking is considered a part of the chores and done after six o'clock at night. But many laboring men so dislike milking that they will not hire for those of us who have dairy herds even when we make a practice of having the milking finished before six o'clock at night. What are we going to do about it?

The hired man who so strenuously objects to milking cows by hand, might take pleasure in looking after a milking machine. In recent issues

of Farm and Dairy have been given experiences of dairy farmers in both Canada and the United States with mechanical milking; and without exception the milking machine has been a success.

Many of us have been inclined to view the milking machine as still in the experimental stage, a machine whose value is still to be demonstrated. The fact that the machine has worked so successfully with dairy farmers here in Canada and with hundreds of farmers in the United States, should be proof enough that this machine has already demonstrated its right to a place on the dairy farm. We are told that in Scotland, where labor is more abundant and cheaper than in Canada, practically all of the large herds are milked by these machines. In New Zealand dairymen consider milking machines as much a part of their equipment as we do a binder of ours.

Those of us to whom the labor problem is presenting ever increasing difficulties would do well to investigate the merits of mechanical milking. From what we have heard of it we believe that a milking machine would be a profitable investment for any dairyman with 30 or more cows, and we have heard of dairy farmers here in Canada who are using it successfully on smaller herds.

HOW THEY WOULD SQUEAL

All over Ontario, as well as in most of the provinces of Canada, there are water powers of great value, the rights to which were deeded away by the Government to private parties on most indefensible conditions before the public awoke to their value. In older Ontario there are few water powers that are not now in the hands of private parties who in many cases have made, or are making, fortunes from their use and at the public expense. Many others, however, are still lying idle, but are held at enormous figures, and thus the public is being defrauded from the benefit of their use. We have in mind one water power in Eastern Ontario the lease of which the Government granted to private parties for one hundred years at two dollars a year, or a total of two hundred dollars. This lease is now being held at a valuation of two hundred thousand dollars.

Last October considerable excitement was made when it was announced that private parties had acquired control of the Chats Water Power on the Ottawa River. The price paid for this water power was less than two thousand dollars. Later, the Ontario Government expropriated the lands and property comprised in this sale. Now Messrs. Hartley & O'Connor, its owners, have filed a claim against the Government for \$3,000,000 compensation. This, they claim, is the value of the 50,000 horse-power that they state can be developed at this falls.

It is in such simple ways as this that many millionaires have been created in the past. They have gained control of natural resources which properly belonged to the people and

thus have been enabled to become wealthy at the expense of the public, either by reselling their rights at enormous profits or by charging the public excessive prices for their use.

There is a simple way in which the eye teeth of monopolies of this character can be pulled and the rights of the public be protected. At present these water powers are either not taxed at all or the land around them is being taxed at farm land values. If the Government needs to do is to impose a tax on the value of water powers and at the same time require the owners to set their own valuations on them with the understanding that the Government shall have the right to purchase the water powers at the valuation set. On this basis the Chats water power would be taxed on a valuation of \$3,000,000. By the imposition of such a tax the Government could readily break the monopolies now enjoyed by the owners of these water powers and the public rights would be protected.

OUR RENTING SYSTEM

"No, sir, I didn't sow a bit of clover last spring. Think of the price of it. I'm not working for the owner of this farm, I'm working for myself." In these words we heard a tenant on an Oxford county farm express himself at a farmers' picnic not long ago. On further conversation we began to think that perhaps the tenant was equally worthy of sympathy. This tenant was renting his 100 acres on a lease that could be cancelled at any time. He would rather have taken his farm for a period of five or six years, but the landlord was not willing to rent on that basis.

The short lease is the weak point in the system of renting farms that is most commonly practiced here in Canada. If a tenant fertilizes and tills his land as he should, he should be given an opportunity to reap the rewards of his industry. This he cannot be sure of doing on a yearly lease. Hence, the run-down condition of many of the farms in the hands of tenants. In England, Scotland, and the countries of central Europe, we find whole countries in which practically every farm has been in the hands of tenants for the last 100 years. And yet the fertility of these farms is not only kept up, but is being continually increased. And here is the secret. Leases there are made out in some cases for periods of 50 years or more. No farms are leased on the yearly basis. Both owners and tenants recognize this latter system as bad.

Those of us who have farms for lease should not bind our tenants down too closely as to their farm practice, but we should make some agreement with them as to the length and kind of rotation to be followed. We should ourselves supply the alfalfa and clover seed; and commercial fertilizers if they are to be used. And then with a long time lease and a fair play between tenant and owner we would not need to be so frightened to rent our farms. But

above all things we must have longer leases, or dissatisfied tenants such as the Oxford county man to whom we referred will be common.

NOT GOOD ENOUGH

In the big factory of the National Cash Register Company is the following motto hung in a place where all workmen will see it every day: "Good enough, is an enemy of the best." We farmers might well hang a print of this motto in the stable, in the living-room of the house, in the hired man's bedroom, and in our own.

We find that the cattle have got into the grain because the fence was fixed "good enough." We find that crop yields have been unsatisfactory because we bought seed that we considered "good enough," although we knew it was not the best. How many of us have neglected to renew our subscription to our agricultural paper, or to attend the Institute meeting, where the best farmer in many counties was to speak, because we thought that we could farm "good enough?"

We follow the "good enough" proposition in our duties as citizens, too. We have known elections to be run on the cry, "Let well enough alone." And many of us have been foolishly tempted to vote for the "good enough" ticket without ever inquiring as to the possibilities of having something better.

A contented state of mind is a fine thing. But a little discontent that will lead us to strive for better things to make our ideal "the best there is" is a finer thing. And remember—"Good enough, is an enemy of the best."

EXERCISE THE BULL

"One cannot improve on Nature." This is an old saying, but not strictly correct. In a few instances we farmers have gone Nature one better. Our dairy cows that yield such abundant returns, in a state of nature would be merely producing enough milk to feed a calf. The difference in production is due to the interference of man who by scientific breeding, weeding, and better feeding, has vastly improved the money making powers of the cow. But we can carry artificial conditions altogether too far in our dealings with the live stock on the farm.

One place where many of us are most decidedly stretching the point is in the care of the herd bull. The following instance that came under the notice of one of our editors recently could be duplicated in almost every section in Ontario where dairy cattle are reared. We were looking over the stables of a farmer in the Eastern Ontario dairy section, and in a dark corner, in a small box stall, we found the herd bull, a two-year-old. "He has never been outside of the stall except for use," said the owner. We then stepped outside ourselves. To us the pure air and the sunlight were a relief after the dark, close stable. That bull would have enjoyed the air and sunlight quite as much as we, and would be a much more healthy and vigorous outside

Who re-
advertising
is it you
the salesm
the custom
that pays f
Every
plows, o
then has b
his bes
his wares
sible and
hands with
to himself.
expense in
that pays h
is instant

A certain
years ago o
of \$3,000,
selling the
per cent.
business in
cost of selli
ing expendi
to 5 per cent
earning, mu
the advertis
to do it, bec
missions ar
are made e
trebled in v

Dead stock
sell is the c
amongst ret
vertising is
surance that
On every
pay for thr
material, the
cost of selli
you can say
the machine
shoves cost
you 20 years
you "pay"
which enable
to increase l
better value

If you choo
the manufact
advertising,
dends bydimi
of selling his
usually less
as measured
"You don't
on your cloth
because he ge
would be va
The manufact
side as an a
machine which
in three years
It costs mo
The most cost
is to store the
chusers to co
pensive way
about them by
The Curtis
it nicely when
advertising is
body and by
body, because
share in earni
which business
by nobody, be
a labor-saving
goods.

"A Paper Far