

Mr. Business Man says the farmer is getting well off and is riding in his automobile. I wonder who has a better right to an automobile than the farmer. He is the mainstay of the country as well as the town; if you don't believe it drop into a business office about July 1 and see how anxious they are as to the crop prospects. The business man is all right, but I will not submit to such a rub when it is dealers and not farmers who boost prices. I wish that all farmers would consult their own interests and organize, forget party politics, and work with one aim, a national government which would be in the interest of all.

Leeds Co., Ont.

D. F. ARMSTRONG.

Why a Duty on Seed Beans?

EDITOR, "THE FARMER'S ADVOCATE":

During the past year there has been quite an agitation for farmers to be patriotic by trying to produce more. Now all this agitation for us to do more work, or for our wives and daughters to do more in assisting us in the work on the farm is all right to relieve the minds of the agitators, but it is almost useless for any other purpose, as human strength and human endurance, in most cases, will not permit it. The only way for us to produce more, is to manage by some way to get better returns without increasing our work. One method (and I believe a good one) is to sow better seed. Last spring, our seed merchants were able to supply some of us with seed beans, imported from Michigan, and owing to our home-grown beans being of a very poor quality, there was quite a lively demand

for the imported beans, and as there is a duty on seed beans coming from the United States, our seed merchants were very cautious about getting any more than they knew they required, with a consequence that quite a number who wished to get better seed were deprived of doing so.

As to the results of the imported seed from Michigan, I was one of the fortunate few and got some of this seed. I was able to sell 410 bushels and 15 lbs., besides having 10 bushels kept for seed (providing I can't get better). This was the crop from 18 acres, while our neighbor, practically just across the fence, who had just as good land and bought about as good home-grown seed as he could get, and planted on the same day as we did received a return of about 75 bushels from 7½ acres, and were also of a more inferior quality.

This difference was not an exception in our neighborhood. I am well within the limits in saying, that to the few, who were fortunate enough to procure the Michigan seed, it increased the production at least 100 per cent. Not wishing to create any false impressions I might say, I would not expect as much difference every year, as the American Wonder proved to be at least 10 or 12 days earlier than our home-grown pea bean. Consequently when our first heavy frost came, they were matured, and ready to harvest, while the others were just nicely started to develop pods. From the fact that they are earlier, and give a much better opportunity to get wheat sown earlier, and from the way they have proved themselves this year, there is sure to be quite a strong demand for the Michigan seed again this spring.

The question naturally arises "why a duty on seed

beans?" As it is hard enough under the most favorable conditions, for us to get as good a quality of seed as we ought to sow, then why leave a stumbling block in our way?

Another point in regard to our seed is, we have been battling with that disease known as anthracnose. On account of the dry bean season, it did not develop very strong last year, yet to anyone who knew it in its earlier stages it was not hard to find in most places on the pods. As one of our main weapons, in combating this disease, is to sow seed free from it, surely it is time that our Minister of Agriculture considered a removal of the duties on seed beans from Michigan. It would be a blessing which would be appreciated by a large number of the bean growers in this bean-growing district, and would also prove a blessing to the consumer, as the high price of the article is a sure indication of the scarcity. If we can raise more beans with the same amount of work, the consumer is sure to get his share of the benefit. This question was discussed last spring in this district, but we did not go far enough to reap any benefit. It is surely time for our authorities to assist us when it is possible to assist us as producers, and also benefit the consumers at the same time. I am sure it will be of more benefit to us in producing than it would be to do nothing but talk about the high cost of living.

Kent Co., Ont.

J. SPICER.

[Note.—According to the Canadian Almanac the Canadian tariff on beans from the United States is 25 cents per bushel. Seed from the United Kingdom enters Canada duty free.—Editor.]

Canada's Young Farmers and Future Leaders.

A Lennox County Farm Returns.

EDITOR "THE FARMER'S ADVOCATE":

You ask for articles on the "Gross Returns of your farm." As I have kept as concise and accurate account as possible for the past three years, I will submit my figures and deductions to the readers of "The Farmer's Advocate." Accounts for the year 1916: Investment in stock, feeds, and machinery on hand January 1, 1916. (As nearly as possible the actual market value prevailing at the time has been used):

Feeds, \$804.20; 6 horses, \$835.00; 16 cattle, \$658.00; 11 hogs, \$165.00; 62 poultry, \$38.00; implements, \$597.85; miscellaneous, \$105.50; total, \$3,203.55.

Thus we see there was an actual investment of \$3,203.55 in chattels and feed to begin the year.

The gross returns were \$2,304.67, derived from the following departments:

Cheese, \$700.53; butter, \$73.30; calves, hides and cattle sold, \$304.10; horses, \$140.00; hogs, \$691.44; poultry, \$126.64; miscellaneous produce, \$268.65; total \$2,304.67.

The actual operating expense during the same period, exclusive of household expenses, labor and interest on total investment in land, buildings and actual worth of stock, feed and implements, was \$810. An additional investment of \$251.75 was made in tile and expenses to traction ditcher; also \$40 in repairs on buildings.

Interest on actual investment in land, buildings and chattels, as enumerated above, at 5½ per cent., which is approximate average mortgage earning \$478.71. It will be seen that this \$478.71 would have been obtainable without any physical effort on our part, had it been invested otherwise and we had become the mortgagee instead of the operator of the land. Thus it will be seen that \$1,580.46 is the total operating expense.

Total income.....	\$2,304.67
Total expense.....	1,580.46
Balance.....	\$ 724.21

Therefore \$724.21 represents the actual balance, earned by the efforts of two men upon a farm of 100 acres, from which to provide the expenses of a household.

As to which department is most profitable, I am unable to give authentic figures. Each is in some way dependent and interlaps on the other and it is very difficult to arrive at individual costs. Then, too, conditions, crops, markets, place one ahead and sometimes the other. I have been convinced that poultry, considering the cost of equipment and money invested, together with labor required, was much ahead. With present high cost of all grains this is a doubtful conclusion for 1917.

The abundance of clover hay and its cheapness, silage and the ability of the dairy cow to utilize these roughage feeds, together with the remarkably high price obtainable for her products, coupled with the need of soil fertility, maintenance and restoration, place this department in the lead to-day in my estimation.

Hogs I would place third, for although unusually high, the price of feed they require has followed in close margins. As I write, pork is \$13 per cwt. and middlings \$42 per ton.

Horses are as essential and useful as ever as motive power, but to produce for sale above the requirements of the farm, I believe they represent very slow returns and narrow margins.

The 1917 inventory shows a decrease of \$250 worth of feed on hand, as compared with 1916. All other lines of stock maintained with two head of cattle and

forty hens in advance. All machinery in repair, and, on account of advance in steel, worth as much or more than last year.

Lennox Co., Ont.

READER.

Gross Returns From a Haldimand County Farm.

EDITOR "THE FARMER'S ADVOCATE":

Our farm consists of one hundred acres, ninety acres of it being under cultivation. Although our system of bookkeeping is not complete, it will give you some idea of what we do in a year.

From November, 1915, to November, 1916, our income from the various sources was:

Number of hogs sold 13, \$240.25; number of cattle sold 7, \$272.25; number of poultry sold, 160, \$106.57; eggs, \$110.00; cream sold from 8 cows, \$523.97; grain hay, etc., \$215.47; total income, \$1,468.51.

We keep no account of milk, eggs, and garden produce used by family. Expenses: To improvements on implements, \$300.00; various church causes, \$55.96; patriotic fund, \$26.00; flour used by family, \$47.00; pork used by family, \$40.00; butter used by family, \$48.00; mill feed and sundries, \$1108.00; total \$1,624.96.

Hay last season was an abundant crop, but corn with us was scarce. We did not have enough to put any in the silo.

I find that poultry raising gives about the best returns for labor expended. While there is also a profit derived from dairying, and stock raising, it necessitates more labor but seems necessary to keep up the fertility of the farm. The present cry of the country is "Produce." Farm help is scarce. The majority of farmers have to buy grain to winter their stock. We feel that we need the highest market price for our produce.

Haldimand Co., Ont.

AGRICOLA.

[Note.—We scarcely understand these figures. They show a distinct loss.—Editor.]

A Wellington County Farm Returns.

EDITOR "THE FARMER'S ADVOCATE":

I am carrying on operations on a hundred-acre farm of clay loam soil, situated about the centre of Wellington County. The fertility, physical condition of the farm, is not much above or below the average of this locality. The distance from shipping station, shops and stores is about three miles, which is also an average condition. Further, there are no large towns to which farmers of this part may conveniently cater in any special farm product. The following figures give a fairly accurate idea of the gross returns for the past year, and also of the expenditures:

Receipts for year 1916: Jan., pigs, \$84.50; Jan., cattle, \$212; March, filly (3 years), \$120; May, cattle, \$168; May, pigs, \$190; May, pigs, \$19.50; Aug., pigs, \$100; Dec., pigs, \$88; Dec., pigs, \$131. Produce during year: Old hens, \$36; ducks, \$8; dressed fowl, \$120; eggs, \$92; butter, \$150. Total, \$1,419.

Expenditures for year 1916: March, cow, \$115; March, grain (farmers' feed), \$188; March, millfeeds, \$145; March, seed grain and seeds, \$50; April, fertilizer (artificial), \$100; June, insurance (life), \$40; July, tile (clay), \$60; Aug., wages, \$45; Aug., wages, \$5; Sept., to Dec., millfeeds, \$115; threshing, \$12; twine, \$7; taxes, \$66; insurance, \$5; ditching machine, \$120; tile (cement), \$28; cementing pens, \$30. Total, \$1,131. Balance, \$288.

The figures given above indicate that the expendi-

tures are almost equal to the receipts. The difference of \$288 paid, no doubt, many expenses incidental to the running of a farm as well as for numerous small purchases of provisions, etc., also the personal expenses of two persons. Any "blood money" about that? Rather not, I would say. Yet conditions, including weather, have been such during the past two seasons that I believe many are not making much more than enough to carry on their business—much less "getting rich out of the war." Of course, some are more fortunately situated as regards their markets, products and the ability of their farms to produce substantial crops under unfavorable conditions.

To increase the returns from the farm I purpose draining the whole farm as quickly as I can. This means as soon as I can finance the operation and do the necessary work in connection. This means the buying and hauling of tile and the filling in of drains. One man, who is alone on a hundred-acre farm, cannot do this in an afternoon or many afternoons.

I also intend to use artificial fertilizer on the greater part of the grain and root crops. This, I find, gives enough immediate returns to pay for the fertilizer, and also produces more straw, which I may return to the land to supply humus, after it has passed through the stables.

Another means of increasing our crops will be by cultivation. Much of our clay and loam soil is at the present time in a pretty thoroughly set or hardened condition. It is almost impossible that it could be otherwise after the past two years. Therefore, it is up to us to loosen it up by some means, in order that plants may grow and thrive therein. So we, those who are left, had better go about it.

The above remarks pertaining to farming as I find it, may not be very inspiring, but are set down for what they are worth, and I hope they will be read that way.

Wellington Co., Ont.

AGRI.

The Value of By-Products on the Farm.

EDITOR "THE FARMER'S ADVOCATE":

I do not know the comparative values of skim-milk, whey and buttermilk as a feed for pigs, but I think that buttermilk or skim-milk can be fed, with a little oat chop or shorts, to young pigs just after they are weaned with better results than whey. Pigs will do well on whey with chop after three or four months old. Some reckon whey to be worth 20 cents a hundredweight when fed with a small quantity of chop. I think they are not going beyond its worth as a feed for pigs, as these have been grown and fattened on whey alone and a very good, sweet quality of pork it makes, but better returns may be obtained by feeding a small quantity of chop with the whey. I never made a test of weighing the grain and milk or whey and noting the gains made, but would be interested in hearing from someone who had. Have never fed many root tops in field or stable. I have fed mangels with tops on in the fall to cows to keep up the flow of milk. I always thought the tops of roots were worth more as a fertilizer to the land than as a feed for stock. I have fed potatoes to hogs some years when they were a large crop and a small price. The potatoes boiled and mashed and chop mixed with them made very appetizing feed and produced good results. I considered the potatoes used in this way were at least worth 60 cents per bag, when hogs and feed were much cheaper than they are now. The value of raw potatoes as a hog feed is very small.

Any farm product that has any value should not be wasted, but, as far as my experience goes, I never saw much good result from feeding apples to live stock. I