

to men in other businesses, he has a pretty small allowance for his own and his family's year's work?

Would the average business man, with a similar amount invested, working short hours, be satisfied with the same returns, and would that same business man be willing to skimp himself and his family as the farmer does, and do without the conveniences that he enjoys in his city home.

It takes just as much ability to run a hundred acre farm as it does to run the average business, and I say, Mr. Editor, that, in the face of the bright pictures you paint, that there is something radically wrong, and that the farmer's life and remuneration is far from what it should be in comparison to that of his brother in the city.

Hastings Co., Ont.

ROBERT FRASER.

[Note.—Just such questions as those asked we are seeking to answer at "Weldwood," but it will take the average outcome of a few years' work to arrive at reasonably satisfactory replies, although results, as annually reported, should be helpful so far as they go. Meantime, we must ask our friend not to attribute to us statements that we do not make. We do not recall having stated that, with feed at present prices, the average hired man could make for his employer profit feeding hogs at \$5.75 per cwt., though we do believe that if one arranges to market his pork at some other period than October, November or December, he has a fair chance of coming out all right on the sum total of the year's operations. Of course, the average farmer works for a smaller wage than the average business man, and, of course, he has grounds for demanding economic justice; but, all the same, farming to-day, while promising but moderate profits, offers the sanest, most satisfying occupation and about the surest livelihood of any business we know. This is about all we have claimed.—Editor.]

On Cottonseed and Linseed Meal.

Editor "The Farmer's Advocate":

In your issue of Dec. 21st, in reply to A. E. R., you give an excellent answer, on the whole, in regard to the query, "Cottonseed vs. Oil Meal for Dairy Cows," but in one particular rather misleading. I refer to what you said about "cotton seed making more milk, but no more butter-fat than oil meal." This finding is contrary to all the experiment stations on both sides of the Atlantic, I believe, and it would have been interesting if you could have given us the details of the experiment in question. If it were possible to feed fat into milk, I think that some of the Dairy School bulletins would have put it on record, either by feeding oil meal or anything else. If you know of any, would you kindly give a record of the same in your next issue.

I think that, provided a man has silage or roots, there is a great advantage in using cottonseed over oil meal, at present market prices. Our local price for oil meal is \$43 per ton, and for cottonseed \$33 per ton—that is for choice No. 1, going 41 to 44 per cent. of protein. In the O. A. C. Bulletin 143 we find it stated that there is in oil meal 28.2 pounds of protein; in cottonseed, 37.2 pounds of protein. Here is a saving of 9 pounds of digestible protein in each cwt., or 180 pounds more in each ton.

So much for the feeding value. Now for the manurial value, after the cow is finished with it, and here is where cottonseed wins easily; indeed, it is a case of cottonseed first, and the rest nowhere. In one ton of cottonseed meal there are 135 pounds nitrogen, 61 pounds phosphoric acid, 36 pounds potash—a total of 232 pounds, worth \$25.95. In one ton of linseed meal there are 115 pounds nitrogen, 36 pounds phosphoric acid, 38 pounds potash—a total of 189 pounds, worth \$21.65. I reckon nitrogen at 20 cents per pound, phosphoric acid at 6 cents, and potash at 5 cents, and have deducted one-fifth for maintenance (desh, milk, etc.). One gets 180 pounds more protein in cottonseed, worth, at 75 cents per pound (that is the cost in oil meal) \$13.50; extra manure value, \$4.30; cost is \$10 less per ton—a total of \$27.80 saving in favor of cottonseed meal.

I was careful to say at "present market prices," and if fed with "silage or roots."

York Co., Ont.

CHAS. W. GANE.

[Note.—It was not intended that the answer referred to should convey any misleading ideas. The percentage butter-fat is generally understood to remain the same, regardless of feed, though small differences in fat content may occur following a change of feed. These differences are not permanent. The experiment referred to was carried on by Waters and Hess at the Pennsylvania Experiment Station, and is recorded in Henry's "Feeds and Feeding." Nine cows were used, and when fed linseed meal, 15.1 pounds of milk containing .78 pounds fat was produced daily per cow. These same cows, with cottonseed taking the place of the linseed, produced 16.2 pounds of milk containing .77 pounds of fat per cow daily. One experiment does not prove anything, but this was cited as one bit of evidence in favor of

the linseed meal, and not to show that the percentage of butter-fat may be increased or decreased in milk. There is at the present time a wider difference than usual in the price of the two meals, due largely to the demand for linseed meal, which proves that it stands in favor as a safe and wholesome feed when moderately used for almost any class of stock. In figuring the values for food and manure, our correspondent has reckoned the extra 180 pounds protein contained in cottonseed meal twice. This would make some difference, but, on the whole, for feeding over a length of time, considering wholesomeness, digestibility, etc., the linseed would likely prove preferable.—Editor.]

January Short Courses in Seed and Stock Judging.

The Institute Branch of the Ontario Department of Agriculture conducted ten Short Courses in seed and stock-judging during December, and arrangements have been completed for courses to be held in January as follows:

Fenelon Falls	January 3 and 4
Omenee	" 4 " 5
Newmarket	" 4 " 5
Essex	" 3, 4, 5
Kent Bridge	" 3, 4, 5
Orono	" 8 and 9
Wooler	" 9 " 10
Walkerton	" 11 " 12
Woodville	" 11 " 12
Grand Valley	" 15 " 16
Thornton	" 16 " 17
New Lowell	" 17 " 18
Chatsworth	" 17 " 18
Brigden	" 19 " 20
Lakefield	" 22 " 23
Lansdowne	" 23 " 24
Bolton	" 23 " 24
Hagersville	" 25 " 26
Uxbridge	" 24 " 25
Norwood	" 25 " 26
Metcalfe	" 30 " 31

Arrangements will soon be made for a number to be held in the month of February.

At those places where a suitable building cannot be secured, the Department furnishes tents 30 x 50 feet, or 40 x 60 feet, to be used as judging arenas. A representative of the Department arranges with leading stockmen in the locality to furnish representative classes of three or four kinds of stock. These are used by specially qualified judges sent out by the Department in instructing those in attendance, as to the desirable characteristics of the classes under consideration. The farmers and their sons are given an opportunity of placing the animals in accordance with their judgment, then the lecturer in charge gives his reasons for the placing which he makes. In this manner the farmers of the Province are being instructed in the judging of live stock in a way which cannot but result in greater uniformity and excellence of quality in our live stock. No line of work undertaken by this Department in recent years has appealed more favorably to the "hard-headed, practical farmers" of Ontario.

Among the instructors engaged for this work are such well-known men as John Bright, of Myrtle; J. E. Brethour, of Burford; John Gardhouse, of Highfield; Col. McEwen, of Byron; C. M. MacRae and T. G. Raynor, of the Dominion Department of Agriculture; R. Stevens, of Lancaster; C. F. Bailey, of the Provincial Department of Agriculture.

GEO. A. PUTNAM.

Plank Frame on Low Wall.

Editor "The Farmer's Advocate":

In "The Farmer's Advocate" of December 21st I see "W. M. W." inquiring about a plank-frame barn. I might say that, having been burned out in April last, and having no timber handy, I decided to build plank-frame. It is 36 x 80 feet, built on as low a wall as possible; it is about 6 inches high at the south end, and about 2 feet at the north, owing to the unevenness of the ground. In regard to doors, there are double doors at the south end, where the cow stable is, and a pair at each side 30 feet from the south end, and a pair going out of horse stable in on barn floor. There is one going out of alley in front of horses on to barn floor. The barn doors are on rollers, and work well. The doors mentioned above are all on hinges.

I would like to know what the carpenters meant when they said they were not satisfactory without basement, on account of doors. S. A. Dundas Co., Ont.

Few Writers Discuss Their Mistakes.

A Canadian newspaper recently quoted a Canadian humorist who has marketed his literary product abroad as saying that we have not yet learned to laugh at our own foibles—we take ourselves too seriously, in other words. Corroboration of this charge is to hand in the somewhat meagre response in our recent essay competition, "My Most Profitable Mistake." It is evident that we still have few readers willing to dilate cheerfully upon their own errors, although, as one competitor confessed, he could write freely enough of his neighbors'. But this would not do. The neighbors would not like it, and the essayist would reap no salutary effect of the exercise. It is a fine thing to reach that point of candor where one can laugh at himself freely and impersonally. It denotes a sanity of mind. Touchiness is really a form of insanity. A sense of humor is closely akin to, if not an essential part of common sense. As time goes on, we trust Canadians will come to laugh at themselves, and more, and more freely.

Of the contestants in this competition, only one or two really got down to "profitable mistakes"; that is, mistakes through which valuable lessons were learned, which enabled them to improve on past practice and win where they had failed before. Some told of things they did which turned out better than they seemed likely at one stage to do, but this was hardly the thing. Some told of experiences from which they drew half a dozen inferences, but which failed to enforce strongly any one point. One competitor pointed a moral lesson in respect to prompt action, but the mistake made was hardly a profitable one in the sense in which "profitable" was intended to be understood.

The prizewinners are: 1, Jas. McKenzie, Bruce Co.; 2, Geo. V. Anderson, Norfolk Co.; 3, Thos. Kerr, Prescott Co.

MY MOST PROFITABLE MISTAKE.

First-prize Essay.

In the autumn of the year nineteen hundred and seven, I had some twenty-five pigs feeding to finish. My sow was not pregnant at this time, and I was short of hog feed, so I came to the conclusion that I would not keep her; although she was a good type of sow for bacon purposes. One of my neighbors, who is something of a dealer, asked me to buy three calves he had raised that summer. I told him that I had a sow to sell, so he thought for a while, then said, my brother wants to get a sow of that kind, so I will just trade with you, and sell him the sow.

I went back to the edge of his bush where the calves were. They were very small and thin, but he said they were from extra good cows, and that they were very young; besides they had such poor pasture. Well, I thought they don't look much like our own; but I had got the notion of selling my sow; and starved though the calves looked, I decided to take them home and be rid of the sow, as she would eat considerable grain by spring, and I had several cattle fattening. I thought I would trade even deal. I took the calves home; they got a run on good grass before going into the stable, but they seemed to keep by themselves, and in some far corner where there was very little for them to eat and drink. Stabbing time came, but I could see no improvement in them. They showed the wedge shape from almost every point you would view them. My stable that winter was well filled, and being ashamed of them standing beside my own, I decided to put them in a barn on an adjoining farm, where I kept nothing but sheep. This place was warm, having a stone wall on three sides, and the front well boarded. Here I fed and attended to them very regularly, but the feed seemed to have no value to them. I began to see my mistake. These calves had been starved when young; they had no constitution, and more than ordinary feeding was necessary, but I decided to give them a fair chance, and if they died I would say nothing.

The long days in March came, when the sun is so bright, and two of them wilted beneath its beautiful rays. I had one left; he lived to go out on the grass, but was as poor as wood. I left him in the bush till fall, then stabled him a while, and sold him for twenty-eight dollars. In the spring of that year, sows such as I had traded, if in pig, sold for thirty-five dollars. If I had kept the sow and bought a little feed, I could have had her spring litter marketed in the fall, and the sow and her fall litter to the good. In this case, suppose I had bought feed, I would have been one hundred dollars ahead. This fall, pigs were selling very cheap, but I did not try dealing them off. I am feeding them all, and I believe it pays me. This is my own experience, and I hope it will help someone else who may read it. Bruce Co., Ont.

JAMES MacKENZIE.