

THE PROGRESSIVE FARMER

Vol. XXXI No. 46.

SATURDAY, NOVEMBER 11, 1916.

\$1 a Year, 5c. a Copy

Timely Farm Suggestions

By TAIT BUTLER

ACCORDING to the United States Department of Agriculture, the population of the United States has increased by 24,000,000 people in the last 15 years, and the number of beef animals has decreased 6,000,000, and sheep 10,000,000, while hogs have increased 11,000,000.

The National Dairy Show

THOSE who joined the "party" made up by the Southern Railroad agricultural officials and attended the National Dairy Show at Springfield, Mass., as well as all others who attended from the South, must have been well pleased with their trip.

It was the greatest dairy show ever held in this country. In point of attendance, facilities for housing exhibits and the quality and numbers of exhibits, the show was the best ever held, but in point of management, transportation and in the housing of the people, the most charitable statement that can be made is, that these were not satisfactory. Springfield is too small a town for such a gathering and such a show. Hotel accommodations are entirely inadequate and the attempt to house the visitors in private houses could not have been handled much worse, notwithstanding the boasted efficiency of the "wise men of the East."

The transportation to and from the Fair Grounds was entirely inadequate and woefully slow. And at the grounds, although the buildings were large and splendidly arranged, the management of the crowds was so inefficient and crude that not only was it impossible for those seated in the coliseum to see the cattle in the rings, but the judge was unable to get room from the crowds that closed in on him, to properly sift and line up the winners for careful inspection.

It is a pity that such a splendid institution as the National Dairy Show cannot obtain adequate permanent quarters in some central city which can furnish accommodations commensurate with its magnitude and importance. No progressive dairyman interested in learning more of dairy cattle and dairy equipment and methods can afford to miss this great annual dairy show.

The South has given an invitation to the managers of the dairy show to bring it South. The show is getting larger and better every year, and before it is brought South we should be certain that we have facilities for properly handling it. Atlanta is probably best equipped of any of our Southern cities for handling this show, but it will be well for those interested to consider carefully if there is any place in the South better equipped than was Springfield. Unless we can house and handle the crowds better than did Springfield, Mass., we had better not try to bring the show South.

Farm Conditions Affecting the Use of Agricultural Implements

ONE obstacle to the use of more, larger and better farm implements in the South has been the lack of horse power on the farms—not only is the number on farms too small in proportion to rural population, but the weight or power per animal is also deficient. In the South Central states there is only .46 horse or mule on the farms per capita of rural population, while in the North Central states there is .82 of a horse or mule per capita. In other words, in the South Central states there are 2.17 rural population to a farm horse or mule, while

in the North Central states there is only 1.22 rural population to each farm horse or mule.

Consequently, the farm worker of the South uses more light one-horse and less efficient implements than the farm worker of the North Central states. The result is that the average Southern farm worker cultivates less acres than his Northern competitor. In fact, there are in the North Central states 18.5 acres of improved farm land per capita of rural population, while in the South Central states there are only 7.5 acres of improved land per capita of rural population. It may also be of interest to note that while the agricultural worker of the North Central states must cultivate 22.5 acres of improved land per horse or mule, and the farm worker of the South Central states only has to cultivate 16.1 acres per horse or mule, and that while the Northern worker cultivates nearly 2.5 times as much land on an average, he is able to do so because of a larger use of farm implements and machinery. In the South Central states there is used \$14.26 worth of farm implements per capita of rural population, while in the North Central states they use \$38.78 worth of farm implements and machinery per capita of rural population. But, if we state the investment in implements in terms of value per acre, the difference is slight, because of the small number of acres cultivated per worker in the South. The value of the implements and machinery per acre of improved farm lands in the South Central states is \$1.90, while in the North Central states it is \$2.09 per acre.

But the value of the products from an acre in the South Central states is greater than the value of the products from an acre in the North Central states, and hence our returns per acre cultivated are high, but there are not enough acres cultivated per capita of rural population—more farm power—horses, mules and tractors—and more and larger implements are essential to the solution of farm economic problems in the South.

JOHNSON GRASS FOR HAY

The Plant Is an Excellent Hay Crop, but a Rather Dangerous Pest to Introduce Where It Is Not Already Growing

A READER wishes us to say something in defense of Johnson grass as a hay plant, and give the digestible nutrients in the different kinds of hays.

In the issue of The Progressive Farmer for November 20, 1915, we reported the results of an experiment made by Director Lloyd at the Mississippi Experiment Station, comparing the feeding values of Johnson grass, timothy, lespedeza, alfalfa and Bermuda grass hays for feeding mules. In this test they ranked as follows:

1. Alfalfa,
2. Lespedeza,
3. Johnson grass,
4. Timothy,
5. Bermuda.

The digestible nutrients in a given amount or weight of hay is not an entirely accurate index of its feeding value, although a pretty good indication. The quality of the hay, and hence the palatability, and the waste in feeding are important factors. Moreover, in giving the digestibility of hays we must, of course, give the average of all tests and the larger the number of these tests the more the differences between the different grades or quality are lessened. Be-

tween a good grade of Johnson grass and a poor grade of timothy there is a very considerable difference in value, whereas there is little difference in grades of the same quality or in the average of all grades. The same facts apply to a comparison of other hays; hence, the average of all tests of the different grass hays shows that there is not much difference in their value. The same is also true to a considerable extent with regard to the average quality of different legume hays.

DIGESTIBLE NUTRIENTS IN 100 POUNDS

Hays	Protein	Carbohydrates	Fat
Johnson grass	2.9 lbs.	45.0 lbs.	1.0 lbs.
Timothy	3.0 lbs.	42.8 lbs.	1.2 lbs.
Millet (common or Hungarian)	5.0 lbs.	46.0 lbs.	1.8 lbs.
Redtop	4.6 lbs.	45.9 lbs.	1.2 lbs.
Orchard grass	4.7 lbs.	41.1 lbs.	1.6 lbs.
Oat grass (tall meadow)	3.4 lbs.	38.4 lbs.	1.2 lbs.
Oat hay	4.5 lbs.	38.1 lbs.	1.7 lbs.
Corn stover	2.2 lbs.	47.8 lbs.	1.0 lbs.
Red clover	7.6 lbs.	39.3 lbs.	1.8 lbs.
Alsike clover	7.6 lbs.	36.9 lbs.	1.1 lbs.
Crimson clover	9.7 lbs.	36.8 lbs.	1.0 lbs.
Sweet clover (White Mellilotus)	10.9 lbs.	38.2 lbs.	0.7 lbs.
Alfalfa	10.9 lbs.	39.0 lbs.	0.9 lbs.
Soy bean	11.7 lbs.	39.3 lbs.	1.2 lbs.
Cowpea	13.1 lbs.	33.7 lbs.	1.0 lbs.
Lespedeza	8.6 lbs.	41.1 lbs.	1.1 lbs.
Peanut vines with nuts	9.6 lbs.	39.6 lbs.	3.3 lbs.
Peanut vines without nuts	6.6 lbs.	37.0 lbs.	3.0 lbs.

—From 15th Edition Henry's Feeds and Feeding.

On lands already seeded to Johnson grass, which are rich and moist enough to produce a good growth, the plant may be made a very profitable hay crop. Two and sometimes three cuttings are obtained or a crop of fall-sowed oats may be grown and one to two cuttings of Johnson grass hay obtained after the oat crop is harvested. Johnson grass also grows well with alfalfa without apparently injuring the growth of the alfalfa. The tonnage is increased, although the grade of alfalfa hay is lowered.

The quality of the hay, when the plants are cut before they become too large and coarse, is good and it is superior in feeding value and palatability to timothy.

But we cannot advise any man to sow Johnson grass on a farm where it is desired to continue the cultivation of corn, cotton or other row crops. Good crops of corn and cotton can be made on Johnson grass lands, but it costs too much for cultivation to keep the Johnson grass in subjection. If mowed and grazed for a few years and none of the plants allowed to make and scatter seed, the land may then be cultivated in corn or cotton for one year at little extra cost, but the next year cultivation will cost more, and after the second year the land should be mowed and pastured again for another period of two or three years.

Johnson grass is an excellent hay plant, and where it now exists it should be fully utilized for hay and pasture. It is probably very much more profitable to use Johnson grass lands, that are rich and moist enough to produce a fair crop, for hay-making rather than to try to cultivate them in corn and cotton.

RICH LAND, FOOD AND FEED SHOULD BE FIRST

After We Have Looked to These Essentials, We Are Safe in Growing All the Cotton We Can

NO DOUBT many farmers who were advised to reduce their cotton acreage last spring feel that the advice was not good. With cotton selling at from 18 to 20 cents a pound and seed at from \$50 to \$60 per ton, it is not difficult for any man to convince himself that he cannot grow too much cotton. The writer has never been able to find, in his observation of actual practice, that it is a good plan to grow cotton to buy corn, hay, meat and mules to make cotton; but in theory it is not difficult to prove on paper that it is economy to do so in years like this. On the other hand, I have never been able to agree with those who say: "Grow your supplies

and then all the cotton you can." It is not difficult to prove that cotton is the best crop known to agriculture, a season like this, but cotton is only a good crop when the yield is sufficient per acre, one year with another and at average prices, to pay a profit over cost of production.

Recently I saw a field that back in 1878 or 1879, when the experiment started, produced over 70 bushels of corn per acre, that is now, after growing corn every year since, producing only 30 bushels per acre.

We believe that the facts as written in the records and experience of the last fifty years show plainly that the only correct practice for the cotton farmer is to produce all the cotton he can after he has taken care of his soil fertility and his needs in food and feed crops.

If we grow those crops necessary to economically maintain or build up soil fertility, in an intelligent cropping system, and produce the supplies for the farm, which can be economically grown on the farm, there is no danger of an over-production of cotton in the near future. But even the man who has advanced in intelligent farm management to the point that he is convinced it is wise to produce the corn, hay and meat for the farm, is likely to forget the matter of soil fertility in years such as this.

But it is just because of this fact, that we have ignored soil fertility, that some men are able to figure out on paper that it does not pay to grow corn to feed to mules. The reduced soils show this reduction more in the corn than in the cotton yields, hence the farther we go in our neglect of soil fertility the more excuse we find for planting less corn and more cotton, because cotton is a better poor land crop than corn. Any man who is now growing a given number of bales of cotton can in five years be growing the same number of bales on two-thirds the number of acres now used to produce that number of bales. He can do so without the loss of a single bale of cotton during the five years and the increased fertility will more than pay its cost in the other crops which may be grown on the acreage released from cotton.

If therefore, a man concludes, for instance, that he must have 40 bales of cotton each year for the next five years, if he will give intelligent thought to soil fertility he can produce those 40 bales on less acres than at present and produce his feeds on the acres released from cotton.

We have always allowed prices like the present to cause us to lose all thought of soil fertility, and consequently our yields are so small that in bad seasons we are so poor that we cannot afford even the seeds required to sow legume or soil improvement crops. It is simply another case of there being no need to patch the roof in fair weather and its being too disagreeable to do it when it is raining.

The wise farmer will, next season, as in all others, first provide for taking care of his soil fertility and his needs for feed and foodstuffs, and then grow all the cotton he can. If he reverses the order and grows all the cotton he can and lets the other fellow grow his feed crops, and forgets that his soil fertility is his stock in trade and his future safety, he will in the end find himself poor and with a poor soil. A poor man with a rich soil may himself get rich, but a poor man with a poor soil, never.

The heavy advertiser of a certain town entered the editorial offices of the daily paper, and in angry and disgusted tones delivered himself as follows: "What's the matter with this sheet, anyway? That was a fine mess you people made of my ad. yesterday." "What seems to be the trouble?" asked the editor, anxiously. "Read it and see," said the advertiser, and he thrust a copy of the paper into the editorial hands. The unhappy editor read, "If you want to have a n", wear Jinks' shoes."