

PERCENTAGE OF TUBERCULOUS ANIMALS EXAGGERATED.

What percentage of reactions have we had in the tests on tuberculosis, or are there many cases of tuberculosis in our country? A statement was made by Dr. Moore that 25 per cent. of the cows of the State of New York reacted.

Dr. Rutherford.—I cannot say offhand, but Dr. Moore made a very grave mistake, I think—a mistake made one time in Canada in preparing calculations on that very same subject. A considerable number of herds are tested here in Canada. We supply tuberculin to any owner of cattle who desires to have his cattle tested by any veterinary qualified to do the work; we supply it free, providing that the veterinary will report to us the result of the test. In the case of reacting, we send an officer to mark the animals. If the veterinary neglects to send in his report, we do not send any more tuberculin where he is concerned. Of course, we do not send any tuberculin to any person where he is afraid his cattle have tuberculosis, and that means that the only tests made in this country are where herds are believed to be diseased, and, of course, you get a larger percentage of those to react than if you were making a test of all the cattle. I was lying in bed when I read that report of Dr. Moore's, and I had to laugh—and perhaps it did me good—for it was clear that he had taken as a basis of his calculation those reacting out of only the suspected animals, which would give a very high percentage. There is no such an extent of tuberculosis in New York State as Dr. Moore reports, nor as much in Canada, as we are only dealing with animals suspected of being diseased.

THE SPECIAL DAIRY COW VS. THE SHORTHORN.

Editor "The Farmer's Advocate":

In your issue of April 9th, Mr. Campbell strikes the nail squarely on the head in his closing paragraph, when he says there is plenty of room in Ontario for the men who fancy growing beef, or tugging at teats to secure milk for the cheese factory, but there must be, in order for each to win success, a clear-cut separation in the make-up of the herds. This is contradictory to his first argument, but has been my contention all along, and is what I have advised numerous inquirers who asked me what breed I would advise them to go into. My answer invariably has been, "If you want to produce beef alone, the Shorthorn is the breed par excellence; but if you want to follow dairying, then choose one of the special dairy breeds, the one to which your fancy is most inclined." I believe that a man will not make a success of anything unless his taste and inclination are in that line, and that is likely why the Hon. Mr. Monteith changed from dairying to beef-growing; or, what is more likely, because he milked your much-admired dual-purpose Shorthorn cow. Had Mr. Campbell not made the misleading statement that dairying does not pay, I certainly would not have found any objection to his letter. It has been demonstrated by our agricultural colleges that it requires as much feed to produce a pound of beef as it does to produce a pound of butter, so you can draw your own conclusions when beef retails at 12½ cents and butter at 30 cents per pound. In the one instance your bullock is gone; in the other, after milking 300 days, the cow is still at the old stand, ready for another year's business, and ready to feed a couple of hogs, besides her product of butter and cheese. In regard to prices quoted, as obtained at the different sales, Mr. Campbell forgot to mention the Government sales, as at Guelph, or Mr. Peat's sale here in our county; a dispersion sale (like Mr. Patten's), where the highest price obtained was \$90, and the lowest \$25, and these were well-bred and fairly good cattle. If he wants to compare the selections from the best Shorthorn herds in the country, which composed the sales he quoted, I will just call his attention to the fact that I, within the last two years, sold a two-year-old heifer for \$600, mature cows for \$800 and \$1,000, and received \$1,200 for a three-year-old from the Grand Trunk Railway Co., which they unfortunately killed for me. This I consider a test case of value, as this great corporation hardly ever pays more than one-half value. Then, Mr. Rettie sold a cow for \$1,600, and two others, bred directly from my stock, for \$1,500 each. But, taking it for granted that Shorthorns are in such demand, and command such remunerative prices, I do not see why Mr. Campbell should object when the Government tries to help the unprofitable (as he intimates) dairy industry to its feet, for the Government seems to feel that dairying is and always will be the backbone of this great country of ours. However, it seems to me there must be a nigger behind the fence somewhere, for, when beef production is remunerative and booming we never hear anything about the dual-purpose cow. I have even heard a very prominent (and honest) Shorthorn breeder say, "There is no such thing as a

milking Shorthorn in this country; they are bred for beef, and not for milk." Now, if Shorthorn men can undo in a year or two what it has taken them generations to accomplish, it will be more than a world's wonder, and would be considered folly by most people. Better go on improving the quality for which they are and have been destined, as there is room for both, as Mr. Campbell truly says, and we already have the dairy breed in our great black-and-white Holsteins, as is conclusively shown by their many wonderful records, also by the cow-testing associations. I will call Mr. Campbell's attention to Bulletin No. 21, of report for 1907, in which the yield of the best and the poorest cow of an Oxford County dairy herd is given as 9,660 pounds milk, 327 pounds pure fat; and 7,273 pounds milk, 211 pounds fat, in eight months, respectively. These were grade Holsteins, of course. How does that compare for profit with the 3,000 to 4,000 pounds a year dual-purpose Shorthorn cow?

Oxford Co., Ont.

H. BOLLERT.

THE FARM.

CONTRASTED CORN FIELDS.

Editor "The Farmer's Advocate":

Corn is one of the most important crops now produced in Ontario. In travelling through the country, I have noticed closely the indifferent meth-



A CONTRAST.—Look on this—



And then on that.

ods of its cultivation in many places, and I have been interested in getting the accompanying two photos, which were taken at the same time, of cornfields on adjoining farms, the one showing the results of proper cultivation, good underdraining and careful selection of seed, the other being the exact reverse. They were sown same time, May 20th. The one showing strong foliage was on my own farm, and the other on an adjoining farm. From mine, we had twenty tons of corn per acre for the silo, the other yielding about three tons. My field, before being underdrained, was so wet in the spring that corn could not be grown with any success. Last spring was wet and cold, causing very many fields that I saw in different parts of the country to make no better showing than the second illustration. In this neighborhood, where we grow corn largely for the silo, we have no lack of food for our stock this spring.

Oxford Co., Ont.

JOHN C. SHAW.

SEEDING AND HAY CULTURE IN EASTERN NEW BRUNSWICK.

Editor "The Farmer's Advocate":

In answer to your inquiry about seeding in New Brunswick, it might be well to state that practices and conditions are quite different to those of Ontario and the West. Institute speakers who have come to us from Ontario tell that fact, while a number of us have personally noted the different ways of doing things in the several Provinces.

Sad to say, the most of the eloquence handed down to us by Ontario Institute speakers is falling upon stony ground. Some have told us we are a peculiar people, doing things in a peculiar manner. That may be true, but not always. The conditions of climate and soil are so different that what is meat to some soil in Ontario is often poison in the Maritime Provinces. Usually, the virgin soil of Ontario produces the best crops. In many portions of N. B. the opposite is the case; although in some of the counties the soil is very like that of Ontario, and will crop for a generation without much fertilizer. Very seldom is it possible, in this county, to get ten acres of land where plows, seeders and binders can be operated by driving all around the square. The land is often hilly, with black-mud swamps connecting, through which have to be cut large ditches for drainage.

We find it quite impossible to follow a rotation of crops such as is almost always advised by

outside speakers. A few years ago the idea was to grow corn for ensilage. While that makes a very cheap fodder, and is raised with excellent results in Quebec and Ontario, the efforts here have been practically lost. Wheat is sometimes a good crop, but cannot always be depended on; neither can it be grown on a large scale. To get a good yield, it is necessary to put it where potatoes or turnips were raised the year before, as that is generally the richest land on the farm, consequently the acreage is small, as a farmer who grows five or six acres of roots is a big one. Oats can be depended on every year, if the soil is at all fertile. We see by reports that other Provinces sow from 2 to 2½ bushels to the acre, while we sow 4, and do not find it any too thick. Barley is only a fair yielder, while buckwheat, with fair conditions, is a bumper crop. Turnips and potatoes yield very heavily, but barnyard manure and commercial fertilizers have to be applied very heavily to produce 1,000 bushels to the acre. Mangels are not popular in this section. They have been tried for years,

but are so uncertain about coming up that they have been practically abandoned. Turnips come along without coaxing, and grow so fast that the weeds are left in the rear. Mangels grow so slowly that, if they do show themselves at all, it requires the patience of Job to separate them from the weeds.

We are safe enough in raising 800 bushels of turnips to the acre, and we are likely to continue at it. Some tell us a turnip contains 90 per cent. of water. Perhaps it does. One thing we have found out, and that is our cows fall off very suddenly in milk when we cease feeding them, although they drink all the water required.

Our peculiar position of being beside the Tan-tramar marshes makes our conditions different from any in North America. We can grow hay, thousands and thousands of tons, and it will continue to grow till the millennium, without fertilizing more than once in 150 years. This being