

his worth, simply because of some of the senseless reasons enumerated in the preceding lines. We trust that breeders, first of all, will get away from the folly of buying untried sires, when they may easily, and usually at an equal expenditure of money, procure a sire that has been tried and has proven his worth. The breeder should proceed in all forward movements in live stock affairs, and certainly this is one of the most needed reforms in breeding policies."

The Outlook for City Milk.

The middlemen—those who manufacture, as well as those who retail milk—are studying the outlook for milk in many States. As their observation is all from the city end of the milk line, it is inevitable that their views are clouded. They do not know what the farmers are doing, or at what cost the milk is produced. In a general way, they hold the opinion that there is an abundant supply of milk produced in the territory, and that advanced prices will draw it out.

From the country end of the line, the outlook presents some clear features. The producers of milk have been reducing their herds by cutting off aged cows. They have put on as many heifers and young cows as they have been able to buy at what they consider "reasonable prices." In all probability there was never a time in the past when there was in this territory so large a percentage of young milkers as now. This feature means that for a year or two the total production of milk will be somewhat below the average in these States, while the maturing and development of the cows ought to increase the production considerably in 1908 and 1909.

Another feature to consider is the effect of the movement in all the cities for better milk. This movement means that less adulterated and extended milk will be sold, and, therefore, that the middlemen will have to call on the producers for more whole milk. The extra call will probably wipe out the surplus in most of the city markets and produce a shortage in some of them.

A third feature is the growth of the city markets. Each year sees more consumers in each city.

A fourth feature is the growing demand of the cheese and butter factories and condensaries for milk. Cheese and butter promise to rule high, and to be in short supply indefinitely. The liquid markets will have to compete with the factories in prices, and the producers should profit by competition.

A fifth feature of the situation is the reduction in the milk supply of the towns, that inevitably will result from rigid city inspection and the rejection of whatever milk does not come up to the standard set by the cities.

The milk output of the territory is limited, even if it cannot be actually measured. There are just so many cows. They produce just so much milk.

Their production constitutes the supply of milk in the territory, and against it must be set the total demand, present and prospective. Information gathered by this journal indicates that in the territory from Maine to Montana the milk supply is short to-day, and that it will be short for several years to come. Furthermore, there is little or no reason to believe that the supply will be, or can be, made to increase as rapidly as the demand is increasing.

The city retail prices for milk are to be advanced. The city officials and middlemen see and say that an advance is necessary. The 4-cent and 5-cent milk sold to the "city poor" has been largely adulterated, skimmed, robbed, watered and doctored milk, and the new city regulations forbid the sale of such milk. Producers are going to receive better prices for their milk.

To-day the situation puts before the milk producers the opportunity of their lives to take and to hold the absolute control of their business. Organization is their need now. Co-operation is their weapon for the future. They are going to put more cost into milk, and it will be their own fault if they do not take more money out of it—enough more to make their business profitable.—[N. Y. Farmer.

Winter Dairy Exhibition Prize List.

The prize-list for the Winter Dairy Exhibition has just been issued by the Dairymen's Association of Western Ontario. In addition to the usual prizes, it makes announcement of several special prizes offered by companies which deal in dairy supplies, also of two medals donated by Ryrie Bros., Toronto, for the patrons of the cheese factories of Western Ontario. As usual, the Cheese Buyers' Trophy Challenge Cup will be a feature of the competition. The date of the Exhibition has been set for January 16th, 17th and 18th, 1907, and those who purpose entering it will do well to secure a copy of the prize-list as soon as possible. Write for it, also for blank entry forms, to Mr. Geo. H. Barr, London, Ont.

POULTRY.

The Hen Bird.

Behold
The hen bird.
The modest mistress of the barnyard,
The great talker,
The gabbler, gossipier,
And producer of fruit.
The renowned originator of the prehistoric Omelet.
The creator of the "sunny side up,"
The purveyor of the rare delicacy
Which accompanies
"Ham and"—
The celebrated inventor of the lump of Indigestion known as
"Hard-boiled,"
I salute you.
Take off my hat to you.
I have met your cold-storage children,
Ancient and modern,
Many times.
Fresh from the Stork, they are
Delicious.
But lying forgotten and in disuse
Many days, they are beyond—
Peradventure.
May your days be enlightened,
May you walk in the ways of the inspired,
And some day you may learn
That the mission of true henhood
Will be fulfilled
When you can lay a
Poached egg
On buttered toast
Fresh
Every
Morning.
—[John Quill, in Technical World Magazine.

Fatten Chickens Before Marketing.

The marketmen are constantly complaining of the poor condition of the farmers' chickens which come to the market, they being in what is termed "lean" condition, not properly (or even decently) fattened for killing. Mr. Charles A. Cyphers, in the communication quoted in the story of the Model Poultry Farm, in August number, states that ninety per cent. of the poultry put upon the market is second quality, or worse. We believe he would have been within the bounds of truth if he had said ninety-five per cent., so small is the amount of really good poultry that reaches the great markets—small in proportion to the carloads of "poor, poorer, poorest" which we see there.

Why is it that the farmers' chickens sent to market are in such poor condition, so "lean" and unfatted? It is a very short-sighted policy to sell such; it cuts both ways, since it lowers the price the chickens sell for, consequently shrinks the farmers' profits; and it shrinks (reduces) the consumptive demand; people turn to some other kind of meat food when they do not find the good quality of chickens they want. An excellent illustration of the benefit there is in improving the quality of chickens marketed was given by Prof. W. R. Graham, at the Poultry Field Meeting, at Storrs, Connecticut, and it is worth quoting in this connection. He told that, "When they began this work (of bettering the product), six years ago, the best price for chickens in the Canadian markets was ten cents a pound; the price had now advanced to 14 to 15 cents a pound, and the exporting of chickens had practically ceased. The increase in price and greatly increased home consumption had been brought about by bettering the product. Produce better chickens, and the people will eat more chickens."

It is noteworthy that they did not begin the work of improvement with any idea of increasing the home consumption, but for the purpose of supplying the British market. Improving the product, however, has developed so great a home demand, at prices forty to fifty per cent. higher, "the exporting of chickens has practically ceased." That means that the farmers are getting forty to fifty per cent. higher prices for their chickens, solely because they are making a better article of chickens. Isn't that an object lesson of great value?

Nor is the fattening of chickens a difficult or complicated task. Much has been talked and written about putting the birds up in crates, etc., but it has been shown that it is not necessary to do that, if one does not wish to do it. Many of the great poultry-growers do not crate-fatten their chicks. The "South Shore Soft Roasters," which bring so great a price on Boston market, and the "Philadelphia chickens," which are noted as the standard for quality, are not put up in crates at

all, being confined in yards and small houses and fed a fattening ration. Indeed, the South Shore soft roasters are not even yarded; they are allowed as much liberty as they desire, but are so well fed and contented they have no disposition to wander far. As the male birds are castrated, they are naturally quiet and little disposed to wander, and they set the fashion for all to stay around the quarters.

In the short account of this soft-roaster growing, the ration is described as cracked corn and beef scraps, kept constantly by the birds, so they eat as much as they like and when they like, and abundance of green food. With a ration so rich in fats, the green food would be very essential.

The question of crate-fattening, or fattening with partial liberty—that is, being confined to houses (or coops) and yards—was tested at the Maine Experiment Station very carefully in 1900 and 1901, with the result that, while some lots of crate-fattened birds did better than those having houses and yards, more of them did better in houses and yards, so that it is right to say that it is not at all essential to go to the trouble to build crates and take the extra pains required; in other words, good results can be obtained with birds simply confined to houses (or coops) and small yards. The report of the work at the Maine Station, given in Bulletin No. 70 of that Station, is most interesting. It says:

"This station has made six group trials of close confinement, against partial liberty, in fattening chickens. These have comprised the use of 35 separate coops and six houses. Three hundred and twenty-one chickens, of different ages, have been fed in these 41 lots, in periods of 21, 28 or 35 days each, and the occupants of all coops have had weekly weighings.

"In 11 of the coops, containing four birds each, the gains have been greater than in the houses and yards containing from 20 to 68 birds, with which they were matched. In the 24 other coops the gains were less than in the houses and yards with which they were similarly matched. In five of the six groups the gains had been greater in the houses and yards, and in one of the six groups the gain had been greater in the coops.

"These results show that close cooping is not necessary in order to secure the greatest gains in chicken-fattening, and that the chickens made greater gains when given a little liberty than when kept in close confinement.

"The labor involved in caring for birds in small numbers in coops is greater than an equal number in a house and yard. The results are so pronounced that we regard them as conclusive."

It certainly is significant that more than twice as many birds did better in the house-and-yard fattening as in the crate fattening. If we can get substantially as good results with the less work, it is well to know it.

The important point is that we realize that not only are the birds of better quality, hence sell for a better price and pay the grower a better profit, but there is a substantial increase in quantity of edible meat. The grower who fattens his birds before selling them to market, not only gets the better price, but he has more pounds upon which to get the better price. In this same Maine Station test it was found that 40 chickens confined in coops (crates) gained an average of 2.23 pounds each in the 35 days, and the 20 others of like age and condition, fed in comparison with them, but allowed the partial liberty of house and yard, made the gain of 2.47 pounds each. In other words, chickens which weighed about three pounds apiece when put in the crates (or houses and yards) to fatten, increased between two and two and a half pounds apiece during the feeding period. Here were five to five and a half pounds of very choice chicken meat where there were but three pounds five weeks previous, and the five to five and a half pounds was worth about fifty per cent. more per pound than the lean chickens were.

The fattening ration was made up of 100 lbs. of corn meal, 100 lbs. of wheat middlings, and 40 lbs. of animal meal, mixed up with cold water. Skim milk would be better to mix the food with, as was shown in another test. In this test the feeding was carried but 28 days, and 33 lbs. of meat meal was used instead of the 40 lbs. of the other; the protein in 2 lbs. of skim milk balancing that in one pound of meat meal, so that the less quantity of meat meal, plus the skim milk, made an equal ration. The average gain of the milk-ration chicks was 1.68 pounds each; that of the ration mixed with water was 1.43 pounds each. Here was an average gain of about a pound and a half each in four weeks, which would make a three-pound chicken weigh about four and a half pounds (an increase of about fifty per cent.), and the better quality of meat would give an increase in value of about fifty per cent. on each pound. Truly, it pays to fatten the chickens before marketing them.—[A. F. Hunter, in American Poultry Advocate.

Education should not spoil any person for work; it does not spoil the sensible person.