

The Dairymen's Association of B.C. held their annual meetings last month in Victoria, and in addition to the ordinary routine business and discussions, the members had the advantage of hearing some very excellent addresses delivered by Professor Shutt, of Ottawa; Mr. Spillman, of Washington; and Mr. Marker, Dominion Dairy Commissioner. Mr. Marker, in fact, has done something more than speak. He is endeavoring to further a project, which, if only it can be universally introduced, will mean much for the dairy herds throughout the province. He wishes to see established in each dairying centre an association for the systematic testing of the individual cows in each herd. In many herds there are three classes of cows to be found. First, those which barely pay for their keep. Second, those which are an absolute loss. Third, those which show a profit. Now the object of a scheme of individual testing is to enable the farmer to determine exactly to which class each of his cows belongs, making it thus an easy matter to weed out the poor milkers, and breed exclusively from the best stock. Any farmer can, and in fact, should, do this for himself, but by forming an association, keeping records of the results, and publishing them from time to time, it is then proved beyond a doubt where the best stock is located, the intelligent farmer gets his reputation built up in the district, people know where to buy good calves, and there is an all-round benefit. The idea comes from Denmark. The Danes started this system in 1895 with two societies, comprising forty-seven members and 834 cows. By 1898 the scheme had extended until it embraced fifty-nine societies with 1,139 members and 25,130 cows, these societies being assisted in their work by a government grant. Now the method is as follows: The members pledge themselves to have samples of milk of each of their cows tested once every two weeks. A man is specially employed to effect these tests, and note the results. He also keeps a record of the length of time each cow has been milking and the amount of feed consumed. In reckoning the feed a very ingenious method is employed—a system of units—the unit in this case being one pound of grain or oil-cake. Now it has been found by careful experiment that one pound of grain is equal to ten pounds of mangolds. Thus ten pounds of mangolds can be put down in the food scale as one. Other units, each equalling one pound of grain, are, 10 pounds of carrots, or 12½ pounds of turnips, or 2½ pounds of hay, or five pounds straw, or three pounds vetches, or 10 pounds green feed, or 1/12 part of a day spent upon a good pasture, each unit being valued at 1¼c.

I cannot say that an association has been started here exactly upon these lines, but at any rate, the first step has been taken. We are going to do without the peregrinating milk tester for the present, keep the records ourselves, and make them public at the end of six months.

Creamery butter has gone up to 40c., and stays there, and this with a fairly mild and open winter. Fresh eggs are still at 30c. These quotations must not lead Eastern farmers to think that this is an agricultural Klondike. It must be borne in mind that there are 250 feet high and 4½-feet thick Douglas firs to be cleared away before we can raise 40c. butter.

Plenty of Space for Poultry

One of the greatest mistakes of poultry-raisers is to suppose that chickens do not require much space. A dairyman only keeps enough cows on his farm that the land is able to support. If one acre will support a cow, it is not crowding them to have as many on the farm as there are acres, but if you put five hundred hens on one acre the matter would be quite different. Land is generally cheap enough for poultrymen to have ample room for their poultry, but as a rule they are always too cramped. Not more than fifty to seventy-five hens should be raised to the acre. A five hundred-chicken farm should contain at least eight to ten acres, exclusive of buildings. That is larger space for each bird than most people provide, but it is not too

liberal an arrangement, as any one will discover after a few years' experience. Farmers calculate their profits by the acre. If they can clear from \$20 to \$30 an acre they consider themselves fortunate, and they do not grumble at their hard conditions. \$50 an acre would supply them with substantial rewards for thinking themselves well blessed.

Now in the case of the chicken-raiser we find that everything is in his favor for comparison with any other class of farmer. Suppose fifty hens are raised to the acre; a profit of fifty cents a year on each bird would make fair farming. He would be clearing \$25 a year per acre, which would be more than many farmers can clear to-day in raising either wheat or corn. But fifty cents a year clear profit is small indeed for respectable poultry, and a dollar a year is not too much to place to the credit of the average well-bred fowl. Here we have \$50 an acre, and a ten or twenty-acre farm stocked to the capacity mentioned ought to yield a good living income to the owner.

One acre judiciously cultivated should raise enough food to keep fifty chickens a year, and that is about all we can expect from it. Let us go to work and cultivate the soil for chicken food as systematically as the farmer cultivates his land for corn and wheat, and then we will realize larger profits and a sure income. The birds will no longer be crowded, and fewer diseases will attack them. Both our pocket books and poultry will be richer and better for expanding the chicken farm in this way.—*American Cultivator*.

CORRESPONDENCE

The Dog Nuisance

To the Sheep Farmers of Ontario:

At the last session of the Ontario Legislature we were promised that at the next session the dog and sheep law would be brought up for amendment. As the promised time is now at hand, I should like to hear, through the papers and otherwise, from all interested in the matter, with a view to assisting the Assembly to amend the law. All who have read the papers during the past year have noticed that the destruction of sheep by dogs has been very great. The present law is unjust to breeders of sheep and owners of dogs; but if we wish the conditions improved we must look after it, and have the necessary changes made.

Lynndale Stock Farm,
Simcoe, Norfolk Co., Ont.

J. H. WOOLLEY.

Bonussing Beet Root Sugar

To the Editor of FARMING:

I notice in a recent issue of FARMING that a large and influential deputation of men interested in the beet sugar industry waited upon the Ontario Government and asked for a bounty upon a sliding scale for a few years in order to establish the industry in Canada. Now, sir, I am, probably, just as much interested in the establishment of the beet sugar industry for Ontario as anyone else, because I can see that it means another industry that will not only benefit the country generally, but also the farmers in particular, whose interests I have always to heart, having been one myself. I see no reason, however, why this industry must be bonussed in order to make it a success. I have been in communication with O'd Country capitalists who are ready to furnish the money for establishing a factory, if only a sufficient number of farmers will guarantee to raise enough beets to keep the factory running at a profit. From enquiries they have made they are convinced that there will be good returns both for themselves and for those who will produce the beets. Our climate is most favorable; there is plenty of suitable soil, and, altogether, there is nothing to hinder the carrying out of the project,