

THE FARMER'S ADVOCATE AND HOME MAGAZINE.

THE LEADING AGRICULTURAL JOURNAL IN
THE DOMINION.

PUBLISHED BY
THE WILLIAM WELD COMPANY (LIMITED).
EASTERN OFFICE:
CARLING STREET, LONDON, ONT.
WESTERN OFFICE:
MCINTYRE BLOCK, MAIN STREET, WINNIPEG, MAN.

LONDON, ENGLAND, OFFICE:
W. W. CHAPMAN, Agent, Finsbury House,
Strand, London, W. C., England.

JOHN WELD, MANAGER.

1. THE FARMER'S ADVOCATE is published on the first and fifteenth of each month.
It is impartial and independent of all cliques or parties, handsomely illustrated with original engravings, and furnishes the most profitable, practical, and reliable information for farmers, dairymen, gardeners, and stockmen, of any publication in Canada.
2. TERMS OF SUBSCRIPTION—\$1.00 per year in advance; \$1.25 if in arrears; sample copy free. European subscriptions, £s. or \$1.50. New subscriptions can commence with any month. Contract rates furnished on application.
3. ADVERTISING RATES—Single insertion, 30 cents per line. Contract rates furnished on application.
4. DISCONTINUANCES—Remember that the publisher must be notified by letter or post-card when a subscriber wishes his paper stopped. All arrears must be paid. Returning your paper will not enable us to discontinue it, as we cannot find your name on our books unless your Post Office address is given.
5. THE ADVOCATE is sent to subscribers until an explicit order is received for its discontinuance. All payments of arrears must be made as required by law.
6. THE LAW IS, that all subscribers to newspapers are held responsible until all arrears are paid and their paper ordered to be discontinued.
7. REMITTANCES should be made direct to this office, either by Registered Letter or Money Order, which will be at our risk. When made otherwise we cannot be responsible.
8. ALWAYS GIVE THE NAME of the Post Office to which your paper is sent. Your name cannot be found on our books unless this is done.
9. THE DATE ON YOUR LABEL shows to what time your subscription is paid.
10. SUBSCRIBERS failing to receive their paper promptly and regularly will confer a favor by reporting the fact at once.
11. NO ANONYMOUS communications or enquiries will receive attention.
12. LETTERS intended for publication should be written on one side of the paper only.
13. WE INVITE FARMERS to write us on any agricultural topic. We are always pleased to receive practical articles. For such as we consider valuable we will pay ten cents per inch printed matter. Criticisms of Articles, Suggestions How to Improve the ADVOCATE, Descriptions of New Grains, Roots or Vegetables not generally known, Particulars of Experiments Tried, or Improved Methods of Cultivation, are each and all welcome. Contributions sent us must not be furnished other papers until after they have appeared in our columns. Rejected matter will be returned on receipt of postage.
14. ALL COMMUNICATIONS in reference to any matter connected with this paper should be addressed as below, and not to any individual connected with the paper.

Address—THE FARMER'S ADVOCATE, or
THE WILLIAM WELD CO.,
LONDON, CANADA.

A Forward Movement in Domestic Science.

As was recently pointed out in these columns, a movement for imparting systematic instruction in domestic science is on foot in Toronto, and in our issue for January 15th Mr. J. J. Ferguson very forcibly put forward the idea of starting a woman's department at the Ontario Agricultural College, as has been done on an extended scale in several kindred American institutions. We understand that Alma Ladies' College has a domestic department, where practical instruction in cooking is given to the students, thus fitting them more thoroughly for the vocation of home-makers. We were pleased to notice, also, that in Hamilton, Ont., recently a new Technical Institute and Normal School of Domestic Science was opened—an institution mainly due to the heroic and self-sacrificing efforts of Mrs. A. Hoodless and other ladies associated with her. Hon. Geo. W. Ross, the Premier of Ontario; Hon. Dr. Montague, and others, took part in the formal inauguration, pointing out the importance of the movement and congratulating Mrs. Hoodless upon what she had been able to accomplish. Hon. Mr. Ross mentioned the rather surprising fact that he had, while Minister of Education, found considerable resistance on the part of the public to the introduction of domestic science. We are of opinion that it would be very much better for the future of Canadians if, by raising the domestic life and its duties to a higher plane, a strong current would now take place in its favor, checking, if possible, the alarming drift of so many girls and young women to shops, factories, and offices. A vast amount of effort is being put forth, and large sums of money expended by Governments, both Federal and Provincial, for the improvement of the man's side of farming, but little or nothing for

the betterment of the work carried on in the home—household management, cooking, etc. A very large proportion of the earnings of the farm, as well as of toilers in cities and towns, is absorbed in feeding and clothing the family, so that it becomes a serious economic question, apart from mere comfort and satisfaction, how all this work is conducted. We publish elsewhere a note from Mrs. Hoodless, dealing with the subject of women's institutes. We are satisfied that on very many farms, and in town homes as well, the success of the "head of house" is largely due to the superior and thrifty methods pursued by his "better half," and to make this general would certainly prove a consummation devoutly to be wished. Why not have a forward movement in the science of home-making?

Women's Farmers' Institutes.

BY MRS. HOODLESS.

I take this opportunity of drawing your attention to the need of trained instructors in butter-making, egg packing, poultry feeding and trussing, cooking, etc. It is all very well to raise the standard which will command high prices, but how are the isolated farmers' wives to learn how these things are done? When in England last summer I visited a Ladies' Agricultural College, where educated young women were taking these scientific courses, with a view (many of them) of going out as district teachers. What we want is Women's Farmers' Institutes established in every district in Ontario, with trained teachers to go out to the institutes and spend sufficient time to give thorough instruction in the questions mentioned and many others. I have gone into this question with great care, and know this is the only way to raise the general standard in rural districts. Get a training school established at Guelph, where every facility is provided. It is nonsense to think farm life will look up or produce improve until the women receive equal educational privileges in scientific agriculture. I trust you will use your influence in this direction, and assure you of my heartiest support in planning any movement along these lines, by voice or pen.

STOCK.

A Criticism re "Judging Dairy Cattle."

To the Editor FARMER'S ADVOCATE:

In your issue of January 15th is reported a paper on the above subject, read by Mr. J. C. Snell at the annual meeting of the Canadian Jersey Breeders' Association, in which paper he sets forth some ideas the soundness of which I desire to call in question. Every one has a right to his own opinion, and, after all, our opinions are only *our opinions* or estimation of the facts, and these are not changed one way or the other by all the opinions in the world. But it is in the highest interests of all that the public's estimation of the facts should be as nearly correct as possible; consequently, the fullest discussion and expression of thought must be beneficial to all concerned; and I do not believe that there was ever an address delivered, or an article printed, that did not have some influence, great or small, expected or unexpected, in moulding public opinion.

Now, as to the address itself: He says, in the first place, that there are certain characteristics in a dairy cow which are a reasonably sure index to dairy quality, but a little further on he says: "It is true that among the very best producing cows have been some that were very plain in appearance, but it is fair to conclude their usefulness was not necessarily owing to their ugliness, but was quite as likely in spite of it, and probably even the advocates of the theory of angular conformation, raw bones, and the convex pelvic arch, are not seeking to breed their cattle on those lines so as to perpetuate and intensify those peculiarities, however highly they may profess to esteem them." From this sentence two things are pretty clear: Firstly, Mr. Snell evidently considers that "angular conformation," "raw bones" and a "convex pelvic arch" are features of ugliness. I am not quite sure what he means by raw bones, but presume he means a general loose-jointedness and sparseness of flesh—indications of high-producing power and persistent milking qualities. And, secondly, he evidently considers these points aforementioned not to be indications of usefulness. Now, my observation, agricultural education, and reason, lead me to disagree with him. The first is mainly a matter of taste, and mine instinctively discounts in the dairy an animal with a straight back and blocky, beefy conformation. But coming to the second objection, I think there is less room for argument. The dairy cow is one more particularly the functions of maternity, and as these organs are situated in the rear part of a cow's body, the need for plenty of space here is obvious. This would naturally tend to give a sort of angular conformation, but right here lies a danger which it will be well to heed. This wedge of the fore part of the body, but by an especially full development of the rear part, else we are likely to discount constitution.

Mr. Snell also says that a specialty utilitarian is an unsafe man to have in a ring, because such a one will look at useful indications alone to the exclusion of beauty and constitution. As for "beauty," see-

ing this is a rather indefinite and uncertain quality in a cow, he would be foolish to be swayed by it. But no true utilitarian will disregard evidences of constitutional vigor and nervous energy, as evidenced by a good depth of chest, a large, well-sprung barrel, a strong, prominent backbone, and a good, wide, high forehead. A cow without a good constitution is like a barn built on a foundation of quicksand, and she cannot be permanently useful as a producer of milk and butter, or as a progenitor of stock with this capacity. We must have constitution first in any class of stock, and *after that* we want a pronounced tendency to some special line of work. We often find cows with good constitutions that are not extra performers at the pail or churn, but we never find permanent usefulness in any capacity without a fair degree of constitution. A judge who would give a preference to a cow with an ideal wither and a small chest over one with a good heart and lung space, but a little extra weight of shoulder, is not a utilitarian, he is a faddist. There is a wide distinction between the two, but Mr. Snell seems to have got them a little mixed. Utility is usefulness in its fullest sense, and its first requirement is constitution, but it does not require "beauty" of Mr. Snell's type. Faddism consists in giving undue importance to one particular point or to several such, either to a fancy point, such as a certain turn of the horn or gait in walking, or else to a slightly more excusable one, such as a minor indication of usefulness. "One swallow does not make a summer," to repeat his own quotation, and one point does not decide the superiority of a cow. We must take all the points together, and we must give constitution an important place, but we cannot afford to allow many points for such an inconsequential thing as cow beauty.

The subject of Mr. Snell's address is one affording wide room for discussion, but for fear of trespassing upon your space, I will leave the subject here to the pens of more experienced men.

Lincoln Co., Ont.

W. D. ALBRIGHT.

[REPLY.—There is really not so much difference between Mr. Albright's ideal type of a dairy cow and that advocated in the paper he criticises as would at first sight appear. It should be borne in mind that the subject of the article was the judging of dairy cattle in the showing by inspection with a view to establishing uniformity of breed type, and at the same time combining utility and handsome conformation. There is no greater stickler for constitution, first, last, and all the time, than the writer of the paper referred to, and a careful reading of the same will reveal that beauty in the dairy cow is only championed when combined with the indications of a high degree of constitutional vigor and also of usefulness as a producer of milk and butter, and that the idle or incompetent beauty is relegated to the butcher's block. Mr. Albright puts it well in the sentence in which he says "wedge-shape should be obtained not by reducing the size of the fore part of the body, but by an especially full development of the rear part." It is the short hind quarters and steep, drooping rump which spoils the beauty of the cow afflicted with it, of any breed, and does not enhance her usefulness, even if she be a good producer. She is that in spite of the hump on her rump, and the wasp waist which too often accompanies it. Intelligent breeders of all the breeds are seeing eye to eye on this subject, as indicated in the excellent articles on breeding dairy cattle published in this issue from the pens of such competent authorities as Mr. Peer and Mr. Clemons, which will well repay reading.—J. C. S.]

Dogs and Sheep.

To the Editor FARMER'S ADVOCATE:

In your issue of Jan. 15th I notice an article under the heading of "Sheep and Dogs," by W. J. W., of Victoria Co., Ont., and said article agrees with what was at one time practiced in the township in which I live, and I believe is still practiced in some places, but I must say that I do not approve of the system for the following reasons: By passing a by-law such as W. J. W. suggests, the municipal council would be insuring every sheep in the township against damage by dogs, by all owners of dogs paying an equal amount irrespective of the number of sheep that each man owned. Now, is it fair that a man owning say fifty sheep should have them insured for the same amount that a man owning five would have his insured? Then, again, there is only a small proportion of the dogs owned in a township that kill sheep. Now, why should I be taxed to pay for sheep worried by dogs, if my dog is innocent, any more than an honest man should be required to pay money into a fund to pay for losses caused by thieves? From what I have written I do not want anyone to infer that I am in favor of having dogs free from taxation. I am in favor of taxing them heavily, but put the money raised in that way into the general funds of the township, for we have to raise yearly a certain amount of money, and it is as well to raise a goodly share of it by dog tax as any other way, and it will likely help to decrease the number of useless—nay, more—injurious curs; and if sheep owners want to have their flocks insured against loss by dogs, let them have them insured in much the same way as mutual fire insurance companies are managed, namely, in case of loss let each insured party pay to make up the loss in proportion to the amount that each is insured. Thanking you for so much of your valuable space and expecting to be criticised,

Wellington Co., Ont.

ALEX. McCAGG.