Swine.

THE SWINEHERD.

Feeding for Pork.

Striking results were obtained by the Utah exp sta during the winter of 1893-94 in feeding wheat, peas, corn and barley for pork. Four sets of Berkshire hogs were fed, one with wheat and bran in equal proportions by weight, one with peas and bran, another corn and bran and a fourth barley and bran. In other respects the conditions were equal. The experiment extended from Dec. 5, '93, to May 15, '94. During this time the pigs in the set which were fed peas made a gain of 1.09 lbs p pig p day. Those fed wheat gained .69 lbs p day; those fed corn .63; those fed barley 56; or during the whole period, the three pigs fed peas gained 528 lbs and those fed on wheat 333 lbs. Wheat ranked next to peas in making growth

It will be noticed that a bushel of wheat in this case produced about 90c. worth of pork. Those interested in feeding wheat to hogs will be able to figure out from this experiment just about how much they can make out of their wheat by so doing. It is summarized as follows:

Peas mixed with bran, half and half by weight, proved to be far superior to either wheat, corn, or barley mixed and fed in the same manner, both as to rapid gain and to the amount required for one pound of gain. The wheat mixture comes second, with corn and barley following in the order named. The pea mixture gave a gain of nearly 200 lbs more than the wheat mixture; 225 lbs more than the corn mixture; and 255 lbs more than the barley mixture.

While the pigs averaged the same weight, it required .89 lb more of the weight mixture, 1.41 more of the corn, and 1.53 lbs more of the barley mixture to produce 1 lb of gain than of the pea mixture Peas and wheat proved to be excellent feed, fed mixed with bran in the manner described. Reckoning pork at 4c. p. lb, after deducting the cost of the bran at $10 p. ton, wheat fed in this experiment brought 89.4c p bu or $1.49 p cwt; peas $1.70, corn $1.26, and barley $1.23 On the above basis peas should be worth 13 % more than wheat, while corn should be worth 15 % less and barley 17 % less.

POTATO CULLS FOR PIGS.

Farm and Home does well in recommending the feeding of small potatoes to pigs. In potato growing sections there are thousands of bushels of potatoes that are to small to put upon the market in the cities and even when the best "seconds" are saved for seed, there is a large amount of culls. They are good food for all kinds of stock and when fed to pigs should be boiled until thoroughly done and then removed to a slop barrel in which bran, meal, house slops and milk are mixed with them.

Fall pigs can be put upon the market in the spring more cheaply in this way than any other of which I know The slop barrel should be buried in the earth, or better yet, packet in sawdust to prevent freezing. I have also fed large quantities of cooked turnips to fall pigs and got good results. Turnips are not more than half as valuable as potatoes for food, but when well cooked make a cheap and good addition to the slop. I have found it a good plan to use some corn cob ashes in the slop. Such soft food as a potato or turnip slop with bran is much better than whole corn and when the culls would otherwise be wasted, it is a far cheaper one. When one does not wish to bother with the cooking of potato culls they can be profitably fed raw to cattle and horses and sheep, a small quantity each day aiding digestion.—[Alva Agee, Gallia Co., O.

VALUE OF SKIM MILK.

The Chairman—In our factory we once went to the expense of determining the value of skim milk; we bought, I think it was thirty-six shoats, weighing an average of 100 pounds each. We wanted to convince the farmers of two things; first, the value of skim milk as a food, and second, the value of feeding it rightly to young animals. So we fed these shoats for fifty-six days on nothing but skim milk, just as many farmers would feed it; we did not feed it intelligently with something else, because, if we did he would say, "Oh, that ain't the way to do it." Now, if we had fed it intelligently we would have bought middlings and corn meal and mixed with it, but we didn't. We fed those pigs fifty-six days. We bought them at $4 50 a hundred, we sold them again at $4.50 a hundred, and kept track of all the skim milk and fed them nothing but skim milk, and the skim milk netted us 2½ cents a hundred. Then we wanted to show the farmers that if we had fed this intelligently, with corn meal and shorts and bran, mixed with it, it would bring more, so we did that. We did prove that at the same price for pork we could pay for the corn meal and shorts and have the skim milk stand us in at 27 cents a hundred. Those are some figures that we made. They cost us some little money and time, but we wanted to get the farmers around there to understand it. We wanted to prove that skim milk to be made profitable must be fed to young pigs in the young and growing stage. You take a 250 pounds hog and you might pretty nearly as well fatten a mill by running oats through it. Then we proved that it helps the grain very much to mix with skim milk. It has got so now that an intelligent feeder never feeds a pig over 6 to 8 months, months, but I remember when the farmers in Wisconsin almost universally fed hogs to eighteen months old, wintered the hogs and fed them the second year

Mr. Goodrich—I tried an experiment. I wanted to determine the value of skim milk to feed hogs. I bought a lot of shoats about five mounths old, weighing about 125 pounds. I divided them in three lots, one lot I fed nothing but skim milk; one lot I fed nothing but corn and gave them water to drink, and one lot I fed corn and skim milk together. Those that I fed skim milk made five lbs. gain for every hundred pounds of skim milk. Those I fed nothing but corn and had water to drink, made ten pounds gain for every bushel of corn, so that being fed separately 100 pounds of skim milk was worth as much as half a bushel of corn. The other lot were fed both, that is, one feed of milk and one of corn, a ration of half a bushel of corn to 100 pounds of skim milk. Now, you see where they were fed separately a bushel of corn and a hundred pounds of skim milk made fifteen pounds of live weight gain. Where they were fed together, it made eighteen pounds gain. Now, if I had nothing but corn every 100 pounds of skim milk would have paid me eight pounds gain so I could have afforded to buy it and pay a good price. If I had nothing but milk every bushel of corn would have made thirteen pounds gain. So that with the live weight of hogs, at four cents a pound, fed separately, the skim milk was worth twenty cents, and the corn forty cents a bushel; fed together, both were higher.—*Hoard.*

The Dairy.

REGAIN THE LOST PRESTIGE.

The dairymen of Wisconsin have during the recent election had a good deal to say about the damage done to the state dairy interests by the Peck administration on account of its fostering the filled cheese industry. They asserted that in the last few years Wisconsin cheese has been almost entirely driven out of the English market by the Canadian product, and this loss has been ascribed to the adulteration practised in Wisconsin. We think that the following extract from The Toronto Mail fully bears out their assertion regarding the loss of the English market:

"It is no small thing for Canada that we are now sending more and better cheese to Great Britain than any other nation in the world. This year, our export of this article to the mother country was nearly double that of the United States, and it is generally admitted that Canadian cheese is synonymous for the best cheese."

The Canadians realise their gain, quite as much as Wisconsin dairymen do their loss. But the English market is not to be regarded as irretrievably lost. The greatest effort should now be concentrated on bringing Wisconsin cheese up to its former reputation. It is one of the most important industries of the state and will well repay the attention bestowed upon it. The coming Republican administration may be relied upon to spare no effort to counteract the injurious policy adopted by the Democrats (1) for four years past in regard to the dairy interests. It should be Wisconsin and not Canadian cheese that is generally admitted to be "synonymous for the best cheese."—*Milwaukee Sentinel.*

A COW WITH AN ENVIABLE RECORD. (2)

Sayda 3d is one of the most valuable cows living to-day. In the World's fair cheese test she led all but four of the great cheese-making Shorthorns, of the Guernseys but one and 13 of her younger, strong Jersey sisters. In the long 90 day test she again did better than 13 of her Jersey sisters, all but two of the Guernseys and every Shorthorn, even though fresh cows were added to all of the herds. In the 7 day, butter test, she was sick from infection, but did grand work throughout the test.

Sayda 3d entered these dairy tests in her twelfth year, was accepted upon one day's test of 50 lbs. of milk and 2 lbs. 4 oz. of butter. In the cheese test she made 56.82 lbs of cheese from 524 4 lbs, of milk, but made no gain in flesh. In the 90-day test from 3043 lbs. of her milk were made 170.1 lbs. of butter. In this test she put all of her feed into the pail and 21 lbs. from her own carcass. Her feet were disabled by stable soreness, but she improved toward the last and held her place in spite of fresh cows offered for the 30 days; in fact, she was chosen fourth when she had been milking 170 days. In the three tests she made 4111.1 lbs. of milk, 256.82 lbs. of cheese and 217.92 lbs. butter or 274.74 lbs. of cheese and butter.

Sayda 3d, the only cow presenting a daughter able to take her place, was supported in the supplemental herd by Sayda M., 46.195. She calved on the cars in transit, survived that shock and showed her great strength, after enduring all that the others suffered, by giving, still upon dry feed (Sept. 28 to Oct., 4), 201 lbs. 3½ oz. of milk, making 22 lbs. 11½ oz. of butter. Her bull calf dropped at Chicago, to Koffee's Noble, 14,631, was secured by H. A. Sibley, president of the A. J. C. C. She has been a constant breeder, always catching from first service and has produced 10 healthy calves, among them Sayda M., Sayda's Princess, Sayda's Prince, Koffee's Noble 2d and World's Fair at Chicago. She is with calf again, having caught at first service by Little Harry, while at hard work at the fair. Though crippled with lameness, handicapped with age, and her system drained by 10 years of constant milking and breeding, by the dairy rules, she leaves 13 of her Jersey sisters behind her, 20 of the Shorthorns and over 20 of the Guernseys. She was the oldest cow of the 74 in the trial of the three breeds.

(1) Those poor Democrats!—Ed.
(2) See portrait in the November No.—Ed.

THE SHORT-HORN AS A DAIRY COW.

Eds. Country Gentleman.—The advocates of special dairy cattle would have it believed that it is better to keep these cattle, than those commonly called, general purpose cattle. This class is typified by the noble breed known as the Short-Horns. The ancient proverb, that it is safe to have two strings to one's bow, has a bearing on this matter. One cannot question the wisdom of this adage, and thus being wise it certainly has some use in practice. Its wisdom, however, is proved by the tests made at the great exposition at Chicago. Profit is the great purpose of all industry. And the wise man will choose the best stock for this purpose. This exhibition seems to have had the foregone intention of booming the Jersey cows, doubtless worthy of it, but not at the expense of the other breeds competing with them.

The Jerseys were awarded the first place in the competition because they yielded the most butter. But this is not the true test. The dairyman's end in view, is the money he can make, and not the mere quantity of butter. And when the result of this notable competition are analyzed, it appears that the first was really last, by this ultimate test. For the Guernsey cows made the most butter for the cost expended, and the Short-Horns made the most profit, estimated by the butter and the increase in live weight. Thus it appears that taking the butter and beef of the Short-Horn cow, and of course of her calves which are unquestionably the best beef cattle existing, this breed is the most profitable even now, of the three competitors.

But when we go back to the history of this splendid race of cattle we find that at that time they were unsur-