has been administered. The process keeps the owner near the patient to monitor the patency of the system. Cows that are recumbent or cows in stanchions usually are not a problem for maintaining the system. This system does not, however, provide for free movement of the patient in a box stall.

(5) When the process is finished, the owner replaces the PRN cap in the catheter and flushes the catheter with a heparinized saline solution. The catheter is left in place and taped over for protection so that it may be used for repeat treatment if required.

I have been impressed by cases where the cow is recumbent, with the eyes deeply sunken, and general severe depression, where after administration of 10 to 15 gallons of fluids, often accompanied by Banamine, we have seen the patient get up a few hours later and start eating and drinking.

We have used this same system for diarrhea calves that are recumbent and/or comatose. In a field situation, I find it most convenient to make a table of square hay or straw bales and to restrain the calf by tying to the bale strings. The period of fluid administration allows time to cover the calf with blankets and to warm the calf with hot water bottles or heat lamps. Fluids warmed higher than body temperature may be indicated. Severe dehydration in calves makes it extremely difficult to place a catheter. Many times a “cut down” is required.

Previously we mentioned cost effectiveness of this procedure. The costs are approximately as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Distilled water and jug</td>
<td>$0.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disposable IV set</td>
<td>$1.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deseret Catheter</td>
<td>$5.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nephrosol Concentrate</td>
<td>$0.15/gallon of IV solution</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRN adapter</td>
<td>$0.30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Summary

A method is described for field or hospital administration of large volumes of intravenous fluids in the bovine, using materials easily transported in a practice vehicle. Cases targeted are toxemias such as toxic coliform mastitis, and calves with neonatal diarrhea. The administration system described is reasonable in cost, is disposable, and after the original set-up, can be left in the care of the owner to supervise the remaining administration. The procedure hinges on the availability of an electrolyte concentrate which can be carried in a practitioner’s vehicle, and on using a diluent usually available on the farm. The system is practical for use either in the adult or neonatal bovine.

Sharing the Profits

A.G. Wesselius, DVM
1210 South Gold
Centralia, WA 98531

As veterinarians we have a unique and highly important role in determining the future of the dairy industry. Beyond our many professional responsibilities we are in a position to interpret the many factors which are impacting the livestock industry today. In our capacity as herd health consultants we are often asked to advise, educate and guide dairymen on the many factors that have a direct input on the profitability of the dairy enterprise. One of the most challenging aspects of consultation is that of employee/employer salary relationships.

The traditional family labor force on the dairy is being replaced by employees, who no longer consider the goals of management as their primary objective for employment. "The almighty dollar" has become the motivating force in job performance by today’s farm employees. Successful dairyman are seeking to compensate employees for their contribution towards the farm’s profitability. There are several ways to maximize the return on invested capital and/or labor that can be utilized to help maintain profitability on the dairy farm. This short discussion is a brief overview of one solution to the problem that we may want to review with our clients when salaries and wages for employees are questioned.

Obviously employee profit sharing incentive programs have their limitations when dealing with dairy farms. Financial health varies greatly from farm to farm and today’s milk price fluctuations make it very difficult for most dairy farmers to have a good understanding of the financial shape they are in. Cash flow has four components that do not impact the employee’s compen-
sation for employment. All employees have some apprecia-
tion of farm income but have little understanding of
farm operating expenses. Purchases and sales of capital
assets have little bearing on an employee's compensation
for labor even if the purchase is a labor saving piece of
machinery. Non-farm income and expenses further
the misunderstanding of the employee's impression of
the farm's profitability. Finally, borrowing and debt
repayment impacts the dairyman's cash flow that is not
appreciated by employees. Therefore, dairymen have
had to explore other approaches to improve employee
confidence and enhance employee performance to maxi-
mize profits.

It is critical for dairy producers to understand that
their objective is to maximize profits because their long-
term survival hinges on their ability to generate profits
over time. Employees must be made to realize that
producers accomplish profit maximization objectives by
first keeping costs at a minimum and secondly on how
successful the dairy maximizes total milk sales. This is
where the interaction between employee/employer can
be evaluated for the introduction of incentive programs
that justify financial rewards to the employee.

Today's profitable producer is constantly adjusting
his production level as milk prices and input prices vary.
This has contributed to variations in milking and feed-
ing times that employees are reluctant to accept unless
there is compensation for their added efforts. Every
dairy producer must assess their current operation and
determine the steps necessary to alleviate this discrep-
ancy in job responsibility.

A review of the job responsibilities by the employer
accomplishes several important objectives. For employ-
ees, a review of incentive financial rewards provides an
opportunity to let the employee know how his or her
work benefits the farm. It also allows the employee to
realize how well they are fulfilling expected job respon-
sibilities and identifies areas for improvement. By at-
taching a monetary compensation figure to improve-
ment the employee is more inclined to become part of the
farm profit making decisions.

Various systems have been devised to compensate
farm employees but one important feature should be to
strive to make formulation simple. Using base salaries
as a starting point, additional incentive formulation can
be worked out for various aspects of the farm's profitabil-
ity to determine final salary figures. It is advisable to use
reproducible base line figures for the formulation to
avoid discrepancies and misunderstandings by the em-
ployees. Milking cow numbers change constantly but
daily bulk tank milk weights are recorded production
base line figures that can be used in the formulation.
DHIA production summaries such as Average for Milk-
ing Cows and Herd Average are also useful for computa-
tions, but be aware that the former is a monthly tabula-
tion and the latter is a yearly average. Monthly Somatic
Cell Counts, either processor's or DHIA figures, are
applicable for incentive compensation formulation since
they are monitors of the herd's profitability. Other DHIA
herd total figures (Average Calving Interval, Days In
Milk At First Breeding, Days Open) can also be used if
the dairyman feels that improvement in these specific
areas are worthy of emphasis. Processor's milk quality
reports or quality milk bonuses are both sets of repro-
ducible information that can be included into determin-
ing employees' bonuses.

There are always some important "pitfalls" to be
avoided when a new system of compensation is being
contemplated. Compensation for detected heats is mean-
ingless unless payments are consistent with resultant
pregnancy determinations. Payment for reproductive
performances and/or mastitis rates must include the
"fail-safe" factor for culling rate figures, otherwise the
obvious becomes the modus operandi on the dairy. The
DHIA Reproductive Performance Index includes the
culling rate in its formulation, however, the interval of
change is rather small in the larger dairies and therefore
requires more weight for monetary compensation when
included in the formulation.

When setting up on a bonus compensation formula
always remember to make the intervals consistent with
the data for each category. It is also advisable to make
these intervals wide enough to reflect a change in the
compensation. Somatic Cell Count figures are a perfect
example for an illustration of this point. In most in-
stances the formulation pays out on a monetary amount
times the hundredweight of milk shipped for a monthly
period. This puts the emphasis on all aspects of produc-
tion and gives the bonus compensation system a team
work objective.

Most dairymen have included a "Tilt" factor into
their incentive compensation programs. An actual de-
grade or warnings there of because of milk antibiotic
residues, PMO-BTU violations or high bacteria milk
counts will nullify all additional bonus compensations
until these problems are rectified.

Every dairy is a special case of its own and there-
fore the exact monetary bonus compensation for each
category in the formulation must be worked out for a
farm's individual goals. The bonus must be significant
enough to inspire an incentive for the employees and yet
allow farm increases to be profitable. Producers must be
conscious of their production costs, but they should not
become so concerned about managing costs that they fail
to take advantage of market conditions which allow
them to incur higher costs and still earn even higher
profits.

Every dairy producer must assess their current
operation and determine the steps necessary not to sur-
vive, but to succeed in an increasingly competitive dairy
industry. The competitiveness in qualified farm labor will
only become more acute in tomorrow's job market.