

give up the idea of breeding of sexes at will by that method. I believe it is generally conceded that there are nearly an equal number of the two sexes usually born of the different varieties of animals as bred on the farm, so that no great preponderance of either sex in a series of years is usually observable. This being the fact, it would seem that an all-wise Creator had established certain immutable laws that could not be changed, and therefore the sexes would continue to sustain the same relations to each other in the future as in the past.

If Mr. Stuyvesant's theory proves true when tried by breeders at large, it would seem that there was provision made by the Creator for equalizing the sexes, so that by careful observation the different sexes could be produced at will in those animals that usually bring forth only a single young at a birth. If the writer fully understands Mr. Stuyvesant's theory, it is that by serving at the first heat in a female the produce will be a male, the second under like circumstances will produce a female, and so on alternately.

Mr. Stuyvesant's statement was wholly new to me, doubtless it was to most other breeders of farm stock, and whether it will prove in practice what he claims for it, time and the practices of a few breeders only must determine, as it is not to be supposed that it will be generally tested at present by the mass of farmers and breeders. Since the publication of Mr. Stuyvesant's theory, the writer has taken some pains to look over his past records, and was surprised to find so much in them to corroborate Mr. Stuyvesant in this. I have found only a single instance in twenty-five cows that did not corroborate that theory. I will give a few examples from my service record, and your readers may draw their own conclusions.

The cow Lady Oxford 2nd had calved late in the season of 1875; her first turn of being in heat was Dec. 8th; she was served, and according to Mr. Stuyvesant's theory should have produced a bull calf. The 28th of December she came again in heat, and was then served by the same bull; this service should have produced a heifer calf, and she dropped one, Oct. 4th, 1876. The cow Duchess had calved the same day as Lady Oxford 2nd; she came in heat the first time Dec. 18th, and was served. She came in heat again Jan. 7th, 1876; was then served, and dropped a heifer calf Oct. 15th. The cow Lady Constance calved Oct. 8th, 1875; came in heat and was served Dec. 7th; was in heat and served again Dec. 29th (heifer); was served again Jan. 18th, 1876 (bull); served again Feb. 7th (heifer); served again March 28th (bull); again April 18th (heifer); again July

3rd, and dropped, April 13th, 1877, a bull calf. Lady Constance 4th calved May 30th, 1875; she came in heat July 7th, was served, and dropped a bull calf April 21st, 1877. Lady Constance 5th produced a bull calf March 25th, 1876; she came in heat April 19th (heifer); she came in heat again June 3rd, was served, and dropped a bull calf March 20th, 1877. Lady Oxford 7th had a bull calf March 6th, 1876; she came in heat the first time May 31st and was served (bull); she came in heat again July 29th, was served, and produced a heifer calf April 12th, 1877. Lady Oxford 12th calved Nov. 16th, 1876; first came in heat Jan. 18th, 1877, and was served; she dropped a bull calf Nov. 3rd, 1877. Duchess, mentioned as having dropped a heifer calf Oct. 15th, 1876, came in heat for the first time Feb. 16th, 1877; was then served (bull); again in heat March 9th, was served, and dropped a heifer calf Dec. 16th, 1877.

We had six calves this fall, and in every instance they had been in sex according to Mr. Stuyvesant's theory. When the cows were served we knew nothing of the theory; consequently there was no attempt made to prove or disprove its correctness. Since the publication of Mr. Stuyvesant's communication, we have been making some experiments, the result of which will be communicated to the *Country Gentleman* when known another year. I hope this theory will be tested by breeders, and if it should prove correct, or nearly so, the thanks of breeders will be due to Mr. Stuyvesant. JONATHAN TALCOTT.

Rome, N. Y.

—In *Country Gentleman*.

SHORT-HORNS, THEIR GENERAL UTILITY FOR ALL PURPOSES.

THE following lecture read by Mr. Fawcett, of Childwick Hall, before the North-East Somerset Farmers' Club, excited much interest and elicited much comment among the English farmers. We have not been able till now to find room for it in the *JOURNAL*:—

Mr. Fawcett said he was not there to suggest, or for a moment to suppose, that he could teach them their business, or advise them to place any kind of stock upon any of their farms, without taking very carefully into consideration the character of the soil, the character of the herbage, the character of the water, and various other circumstances, the difficulties of which they had to contend with. He was not there to attempt for a moment to advocate any particular breed of cattle, or to say that Shorthorns were right here, there, or everywhere, for it was very important to stock a farm correctly; it was

perhaps the very act that must lead either to their success or to their failure, whether they stocked it rightly or wrongly, and no one could so well judge of the character of the stock suitable to a particular farm as the persons who resided in the immediate neighbourhood, and who knew the climate and the various circumstances that had to be contended with. They must not, therefore, suppose he was there for a moment to attempt to induce any to sell or part with the stock that he might happen to have upon any particular farm which he had carried on successfully, and say to him, "place Short-horns there instead," because he knew that the stock must be adapted to the place, or the farmer possibly could not be successful. Having said so much to them he would now tell them as briefly as he possibly could what little he knew of Short-horns, and in what he said he would endeavour to say nothing but what he believed to be strictly true, and so keep them from running after these animals with that degree of madness—for he might call it madness—which had lately been adopted. First of all, then, he would touch upon the origin of Short-horns. Their origin would be some hundreds of years before the Herd Book was compiled, therefore they would observe at once with him the folly of arguing simply upon the foundation of the Herd Book. For instance, the Stanwick Park herd was said to have existed at least 200 years before Messrs. Colling purchased the cow called Duchess, and Messrs. Colling's Herds were sold some ten or twelve years before the Herd Book was established. He mentioned that, to show them that no breeder ought to be guided solely by the pedigrees of the Herd Book. Messrs. Colling, who were probably the first parties who bred the Short-horns in and in, purchased from Messrs. Maynard and others, who had been breeders of Shorthorns long before the Messrs. Colling started. No pedigrees were then kept, the Herd Book only commenced in the year 1822 or about then, and therefore the early pedigrees as found entered in the Herd Book were necessarily to a very large extent made up from hearsay, or at best, from very questionable information. People referred to the Herd Book as though it related to the beginning of the breed of Shorthorns, although it was well known they had been known as the Teeswater or Dutch cattle, for hundreds of years before, but no exact account existed as to their origin or the process by which they were improved.

No doubt the Galloways and the West Highlanders were those which improved the quality of the flesh and the hair, reduced their size, shortened their legs, and increased the valuable proportions as well as the flavour of the flesh. The Durham