

The Farmer's Advocate

and Home Magazine

"Persevere and Succeed."

Established
1866.

REGISTERED IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE COPYRIGHT ACT OF 1875.

Vol. XI, III.

LONDON, ONTARIO, DECEMBER 24, 1908.

No. 848.

EDITORIAL.

Housing the Winter Fair.

The question of suitable building accommodation for the Ontario Winter Fair crops up regularly as the event annually materializes, and the universal cry is for more room. The promises of the past year, that enlarged accommodation would be provided, having failed of fruition, and another show having been held under unsatisfactory conditions, the need of more room is emphasized, and the agitation again raised for the removal of the Fair to a more ambitious and more central location, although it is gratifying to note that public opinion has united almost unanimously on the position which "The Farmer's Advocate" has steadily contended for, that Guelph, for many good reasons, is the most suitable place for the holding of an exhibition such as this, with its accompanying educative features. And if that city, and the County of Wellington, which is equally interested in keeping the show where it is, will do their part towards supplying the necessary funds for enlargement of the Exhibition Building, we are satisfied that public sentiment is in favor of the fair remaining where it is. Its contiguity to the Agricultural College and Macdonald Institute, where a large contingent of farmers' sons and daughters are in attendance at this season, where the annual meetings of the Provincial Experimental Union and Women's Institute assemble at the same time, and the benefit to students of the College of seeing together and handling high-class specimens of the many classes of farm stock, alive and as dressed carcasses, are all strong arguments in favor of keeping the Fair at Guelph. But the fact remains that lack of room for display of the exhibits and for the comfort of visitors, robs the show of one-half its interest and usefulness. There is poor satisfaction to persons coming long distances, on expense, to see cattle covered with blankets, where the seating capacity around the judging-ring is so limited that only a fortunate few can see the animals uncovered; while the pigs occupy the passages for the most of the two days devoted to judging them. The fact is, there is no room for farmers' wives and daughters to see the show in comfort, and only comparatively few men witness it satisfactorily. The demand for a more suitable setting for the event is urgent, and must be met if it is to remain at Guelph. The Provincial Government and the City, it must be acknowledged, have been fairly liberal in their grants for enlargement of the Fair Building. The Legislature voted \$20,000 towards the purpose, and the city declared in favor of a by-law to raise \$10,000, and grant a site for extension on the market-square, adjoining the present building. Unfortunately, the lowest contract in conformance with the architect's plans was over \$40,000, which left \$10,000 to be raised, as the city council did not see its way clear to accede to such alteration of the plans as would be necessary to bring the cost of the work within \$30,000. It was decided, then, to appeal to the county council and the local township councils, though so far without very satisfactory result. If the council of the County of Wellington, which is quite as intimately interested as the city, fails to do its share in supplying the needed funds, the responsibility will rest upon them very largely should the Fair be removed from Guelph. Wellington County farmers are and will be advantaged by the show in many ways over others, advantaged in the matter of travel and freight expenses, and of having, save for one week in the year, the use of the largest and best covered market building in the Province.

besides drawing a much larger share of the prize-money than they would be likely to do were the show held elsewhere. The Winter Fair has greatly benefited the County of Wellington by advertising it as a live-stock center, and has brought their buyers from widely-distant points, and the county will do itself grave injury if, from being parsimonious in the matter of providing the means necessary for proper housing, the show finds a home elsewhere.

Is Substance Lacking in Clydesdales?

Frequent contributions and expressions of opinion found in these columns urge farmers to raise horses more extensively. Almost invariably the draft horse is advocated as the most desirable for the average farmer. Recently, a prominent and experienced horseman, and one who supports the heavy draft as being the most suited to money-making, as well as to farm uses, asked the following questions: "Are not Clydesdale breeders of to-day going too much to action and quality, at the sacrifice of quantity? Are not a great many so-called draft horses simply medium-sized agricultural animals?"

In many districts both these questions would have to receive an affirmative answer. The lack of sufficient weight in heavy horses is only too evident at agricultural fairs. The cause of the deficiency was laid by our friend to the fact that in the Old Country, animals of quality and action, but lacking in substance, could be procured at much less money. Heavy horses in this country that were of sufficient size, he claimed, frequently were defective in one or more particulars. Some were decidedly rough, some had small middles, and others were below the standard in various points.

This is a question that could be discussed to advantage by farmers and horsemen. Canadians want the type of heavy horse that is best adapted to this country, and the kind that will attract buyers from all parts of the world. The sooner a proper start is made, the easier it is to reach the desired goal. Canadians have acted wisely in demanding quality in preference to quantity, but if quality and scale can be combined to a high degree, so much more to the credit of our horsemen. Is it not true, also, that, in cases where sires meet the requirements in most regards, the offspring fails to come up to the mark because of lack of care and feeding until the colt has reached its second summer?

What Makes the Difference?

The detailed annual statements of cheese factories afford some striking contrasts that should set men thinking and doing. Here is a case in point, noted by an Eastern Ontario correspondent: One patron received the past season for the milk of six cows sent to the adjacent factory, after taking out the home supply for two families, \$300.35. One of the half-dozen cows was a two-year-old heifer, and another a three-year-old. Scanty pastures were supplemented with supplies of corn and peas and oats. Another patron, with the same number of cows, received for the season's milk, sent to the same factory, just \$107.29. Why this difference in returns? The cows composing one herd may have been better to begin with than the other, but good cows do not come by accident, and, even allowing for variation in natural capacity, so wide a variation—nearly three to one—must surely, in large measure, have been due to the general care, feeding and water supply requisite to the making of milk, which is not a magic product, called forth like water from some rod-smitten rock.

Education of Future Mothers.

Our good friend Mr. Bollert, of Oxford County, Ont., strikes the nail on the head in a contribution, which we have entitled, "Train the Home-makers." Reviewing and endorsing the ideas which have been editorially advanced by "The Farmer's Advocate," on the subject of keeping the boys on the farm, he concludes by urging that the greatest influence will not be exerted in this direction until the mothers have been trained to be good home-makers, and imbued with a love for the farm and country life. The greatest influence is the home-interest, and the mother moulds it to a very large extent.

There is no doubt of the truth of this. In order that our boys and girls may truly appraise farm life and occupation, both school and home influence must be rational; but the school influence is important not only for the effect it has on the inclination and efficiency of the present generation, but also for its influence on the fathers and mothers of the next generation. The school children of to-day are the farmers and home-makers of to-morrow; thus, any school influence, wholesome or otherwise, is bound to have a cumulative effect. One great reason the home influence to-day is not as well balanced and rational as it should be, is found in the irrational educational influence to which the present fathers and mothers were subjected in their time, and so of grandparents and great-grandparents. The effect of schooling extends on into future generations, because it acts upon and helps to shape the home influence. The trend and character of our schooling is, therefore, a matter of the very greatest importance to the State, and, as Mr. Bollert rightly contends, the education of the country girl is probably more important and far-reaching in its effects than the education of her brother. Not only should she receive some elementary instruction and practice in the principles of household science, but school-gardening, nature study and, probably, manual training should be for her also, while both boys and girls should receive in the country school a kind of general education that will not divorce them from but rather draw them towards agriculture and rural life. To this end, of course, the first and fundamental requisite is proper training of rural-school teachers, for a teacher who is blind to the beauties of nature and the attractions of farm life will inevitably tend to wean her pupils from the land, no matter how well the school curriculum is shaped.

Must Have More Milk.

Factorymen are viewing with apprehension the waning milk supply and lessened cheese output. A leading maker advises us that his expenses during the past year, owing to the increased cost of boxes, labor, milk-hauling, etc., amounted to over \$1,000 above what they were a couple of years ago, while the make was 27,000 pounds of cheese less. He made the cheese, supplied everything, hauled the milk, sold and delivered the cheese, at \$2 per cwt., but, unless he received a vastly-increased supply of milk, he would be facing an unprofitable proposition, reduction of the cost of running the factory not being in sight. With the high prices prevailing for cheese, and the splendid returns derived from the better class of herds, properly supplied with food, surely there is room for increasing the milk supply of factories in 1909.

To show that an abuse is prevalent is no defence of it. To show that it is of long standing is only to point the necessity of energetic action to end its existence.