

but not enough to make any difference with stacking the grain, and unless the season be very dry will make a rapid growth after the grain is cut, and by the time stacking is done will be one solid mass of green, the finest sheep pasture in the world. My friends, your sheep will feed upon this in preference to the earlier sown rape, but will attack that later in the season. With this pasture you need have no fear of stunting your lambs, but they will swell and grow, and your heart will be glad at sight of them.

"In first turning in the sheep in the rape you will need to be careful, but there is not so much danger of bloat as is generally supposed. Before turning in I would fill them on some kind of food they will relish. They must not be turned in when they are hungry. I would leave them in the rape an hour or an hour and a half the first day. I would follow the same course the second and third days, only the third day I would let down the bars, and I would not put them up again the entire fall. I would give them free access to the rape field all day and all night, too, for that matter. I have not lost but one sheep by bloat since following this plan.

Those Stock-feeding Figures.

I think it only in the cause of humanity, that someone should come in and shield the much-criticised agricultural lecturers. Prof. Grisdale has unwittingly, by simply looking at things from a business standpoint, a method which very few farmers pursue, aroused the righteous indignation of Mr. Fawcett, of N. B. They are both good men, of sound judgment and successful in their work, but it strikes me very forcibly that the latter gentleman has allowed his zeal to swallow his reasoning power in this matter. This is a matter in which I have had some experience, for I cannot yet see the time when I shall come under the yoke of the extreme dairy cow. Like Mr. Fawcett, I believe the dual-purpose cow exists to the satisfaction and prosperity of her owner, but she has her drawbacks. Her steers DO NOT MAKE BEEF AT A PROFIT, when seen from a business point of view. I am learning in the costly school of experience something at least about making beef, and my experience has taught me that Prof. Grisdale is nearer right than Mr. F. would have him appear. The first pair of steers I ever fattened sold at three years of age for \$75. Estimating the cost at market prices, of all the food consumed by those steers during the three years, I found they had eaten about \$170 worth. Now this is hard fact, and I can prove it by figures kept. Though I am reducing that debit balance every year, I have not yet sold a fat steer which, actually on the basis quoted above, i.e., charging up market prices against them, has given an absolute profit, and still the live stock part of the farm is paying its way. As Mr. Fawcett very truly says, hundreds of farmers have been doing this for years, and still have enjoyed prosperity in a considerable degree. He cannot seem to explain the matter, except by the impression that Mr. Grisdale is wrong in his figures. How is it then that Canadian farmers are selling for 8c. per pound what cost them 17c., and still making money? Prof. Grisdale in his findings has charged to the steers, and rightly too, everything they consume at prices which the foods cost to produce, and not in any case as high prices as we pay for them here in the Maritime Provinces. Why, we would consider the conditions almost millennial if bran could be bought for \$16 or \$17 per ton; clover, \$6 to \$7, etc. Now, our brother farmers, in very few cases, keep any account of what their feed costs to produce, consequently, when they sell a beef for \$50 you could not persuade them that it may have cost them \$65. Most of our stock farmers would not credit the statement that from three-fourths to four-fifths of the year is spent in working one way or another to produce that beef. The time spent in feeding them is a mere bagatelle compared with the days and weeks spent in raising and harvesting the roots, making and storing the hay, fencing, milking, driving to and from pasture, etc. Why, the average farmer and his whole family are slaves to the stock barn the year round. Is this time worth nothing? Don't you think, Mr. Fawcett, that the same amount of muscular and brain energy which every farmer spends during the year, the planning, the long hours, etc., if put into almost any other vocation under the sun, would yield a much more handsome return than it does from beef-raising; or, in fact, from any branch of farming? The same principles pertain to dairying in too many cases. In summing up the profits of the year, the average farmer never stops to reckon in his own and his family's wages, the interest on capital invested, etc.

I think if Mr. F., or any other farmer, will look at the matter as above, he will find that he has turned off very few fat steers that have given him an absolute profit over the cost of production.

Annapolis Co., N.S.

R. J. MESSENGER.

Spare the Calf.

To the Editor "Farmer's Advocate":

Sir,—Could you (or would you) write an article about the practice of buying up calves a day or two or more old, and sending them away to be made into "canned chicken"? And don't spare the farmer, for he really holds this thing in his own hands in a way. If he would not sell the calves, no canned chickens could be made of them. I think all the leading papers should

take this question up, and cry the dirty business out of our country.

FARMER'S DAUGHTER AND "FARMER'S ADVOCATE" READER.

Pulp in a Cave.

I liked sugar-beet pulp all right from the start. I found it to be the handiest and best root feed I have ever used. I fattened two head of cattle, and fed five others on pulp and cut straw mixed. They always ate it up clean, and are looking well. Of course the ones I fattened were fed on cut oats mixed with the pulp and a little meal. They did remarkably well. I also fed two brood sows on it; about three pails per day mixed with one-half gallon of barley meal. One of them farrowed this month; the pigs are strong, and doing well. I continued feeding her on it, two pails per day, mixed with two gallons of corn meal. Both the sow and her pigs, nine in number, are doing well. I kept part of it in a cave, which was not too warm; the pulp froze a little on top, and the rest of it I kept in a mow of a frame barn, covered with cut straw. I found the cave to be the best place to keep it for feeding to pigs.

J. J. MORAN.

Simcoe Co., Ont.

FARM.

A Chat with Neighbor Johnston.

Neighbor Johnston called in at the barn to-day while we were doing the chores. He was pleased with our turnips, and asked how we managed to have them keep so well. I replied, "I think the principal reason is that we pulled them by hand, the old-fashioned Scotch plan. They were nice and clean, no rootlets and no bruises or scratches, which would have been evident if they had been dragged out by the harrows. And then we keep the hatchways open, except in very severe weather. Perhaps it may be harder work to



"Mary had a little lamb,
Its fleece was white as snow."

pull turnips by hand, but there is a great deal in knowing how to do it."

We were discussing the fencing problem, and in reply to my neighbor's questions regarding the hedge fence, I said that quite a number of years ago I was on a deputation that went to a distant part of the county to inspect some portions of hedge fence that had been plashed and finished for a short time, and that I was so much pleased with the fence that I wrote it up very favorably for the local newspaper. I thought then that it appeared to be a good fence (it certainly looked well), and if adopted generally would tend very much to add to the beauty of our fine county. But there have been changes since those days. Farm help is high priced; in fact, costs more than it is really worth, and is hard to get, and so farmers who have hedge fences find it impossible to get them trimmed, and instead of growing up to be a thing of beauty and a joy forever, it is getting to be an unsightly nuisance, collecting snowdrifts on the road. Our Township Council have already paid one farmer to cut down his hedge fence, to get it out of the way, and others have applied for a bonus to cut theirs down also. A friend from a distant county was telling me that the hedge fence was also a source of trouble in his neighborhood; but he said the cutting down was only a temporary relief, as it would grow up again very fast. The best plan was to take a barrel and a sprinkler, in the fall of the year, when the grass was long and dry, and sprinkle it liberally with coal oil, after taking due precautions against the fire spreading. Set fire to the grass, and there would be enough heat generated to completely kill the hedge plants, if they were not quite burnt up. Besides all the drawbacks already men-

tioned, the mice are getting in their work, and I have seen long stretches of hedge fence where there was scarcely any bark left on the plants.

So far as we know at present, there is nothing better in the line of fencing than the smooth, coiled, woven wire fence. It is good to prevent drifts, and is practically safe. There are so many horses in the country disfigured for life by the cruel barbed wire, that we don't like to see it any more.

JONAS.

Claver Ha Lea.

Corn-testing Methods.

To the Editor "Farmer's Advocate":

Sir,—I have just noticed in your issue of April 6th a slight criticism by Mr. J. S. Pearce, on the system of testing seed corn which I had outlined in a recent issue. Mr. Pearce claims the system to be too "intricate and quite unnecessary," as it involves the testing of each individual ear. He goes on to say, and rightly so, that you cannot judge the vitality of the corn by the appearance of the ear, yet he advises the taking of but 15 or 20 average ears from the whole lot, shelling off the grain, and testing 100 kernels of the same. Having this spring tested large quantities of corn on the ear, and having seen the great difference in vitality that exists between the individual ears, I am forced to conclude that the best way, and the only way, to ensure a satisfactory stand of corn is to follow out such a system as I have already outlined. Were I to compromise to any extent, it would be where large quantities of corn were to be sown, that instead of testing every ear, the first one hundred ears might each be tested and taken as the basis upon which the vitality of the whole lot might be determined. Where these ears are found to possess good vitality, the whole sample may be sown with a very fair degree of safety. Were a number of good appearing ears to be shelled, however, as Mr. Pearce suggests, and a number of kernels chosen indiscriminately and tested, you might or you might not, as that gentleman admits, get a fair

test. I have such samples give very good germination tests, and yet, when the corn which they were supposed to represent was planted, a very poor stand was the result. In any case, it is only by chance that one can get a representative sample to test in this way, and, furthermore, what is of greater importance, you cannot trace back and discard those ears the kernels from which will not grow. I have talked with a great many of the larger corn-growers in the great corn states across the line, who have adopted this system, and who testify as to its utility. One grower in particular can I recall, who plants 8,000 acres of corn each year, and who has recently adopted this system; as a result, he claims his stand of corn to be at least one-third better. Can we accept any better evidence than that given by these bright, intelligent

who make their money out of this great cereal? In thinking this matter over, we must also keep in mind the following facts:

(1) That the grain from 100 ears of Dent corn, or 200 ears of Flint corn, sown in hills 8½ feet apart each way, with three kernels in a hill, will plant between five and six acres.

(2) That for every 20 ears of Dent or 40 ears of Flint corn that are discarded because they will not grow, approximately one acre of corn is saved, providing such ears are substituted with others of good vitality.

(3) According to a time test made at the Illinois Experiment Station, one man, in five hours' total time, can test every ear of seed corn required to plant 32½ acres.

With these facts before us, therefore, I am willing to let the system stand on its own merits. It is not my intention to urge anything unreasonable, and I am not doing so. It is certainly not unreasonable to assert that every corn-grower ought to know, without there being any doubt about it, just exactly what kind of corn he is planting, and the principle involved, as I have already said, is the only one that I know at the present time to be effective.

Our object should be to make agriculture an exact science. The testing of each ear of seed corn, whenever necessary, will certainly be a step in that direction.

LEONARD H. NEWMAN.

Seed Division, Dominion Department of Agriculture.