

FARM.

The People's Verdict.

S. D. Crandall says: "I found it easy work to obtain a new subscriber, when you give so much value for the money. I would not part with your valuable paper were it \$2.00 a year. It is the farmer's friend."

Alfred Deller, Oxford, Ont., says: "I would not like to farm without the 'Farmer's Advocate.' I shall like it better than ever as a weekly, and had I a little more time at my disposal, should canvass for it."

J. Brimmacombe, Durham Co., Ont., says: "I like the 'Farmer's Advocate and Home Magazine,' and believe it is the best paper that comes to our office."

Thomas Williamson, Grey Co., Ont., says: "I have been taking the 'Farmer's Advocate' for a number of years, and I think it is the best farmer's paper that can be got."

Peter Gilchrist, Ontario Co., Ont., writes: "I think every farmer should have your paper, as we find it very helpful."

George Graham, Huron Co., writes as follows: "The 'Advocate' is one of the best papers in the province. I would not be without it."

Thomas Hislop, Oxford Co., Ont., writes: "I do not see how you can do so much for the money; the Christmas number, alone, was well worth it. You are taking a large undertaking to issue a weekly. I wish you every success."

G. D. Ledlow, Cadell, Ont., says: "I am well pleased with the 'Farmer's Advocate.' I think there is no other farm paper equal to it."

Enos C. Shantz, Berlin, Ont., writes: "I have been a reader of the 'Advocate' for many years, and like it well. There are more valuable things in it than I can make use of, but there are always some things that a man can keep and do."

Wm. A. Hill says: "Enclosed please find my renewal, and one new subscriber's name for your valuable paper, the 'Farmer's Advocate,' which we have taken for over twenty years. We dropped it a time or two to try other agricultural papers, but none fill the bill like the 'Advocate.' It is truly the farmer's advocate, and every farmer should be its advocate."

Enos S. Hunsberger, Waterloo Co., says: "May your worthy paper keep on prospering as heretofore. We think it a high-class paper all round. It is clean and elevating from cover to cover. Hoping it will not sacrifice anything in quality for quantity in future."

H. M. Hicks, Victoria Co., Ont., writes: "I am an old subscriber. The 'Advocate' has always been a welcome and profitable visitor, and I am pleased to know that it will continue to be as good in the future, and twice as frequent. You deserve the best support of the farmers of Canada."

John Fyfe, Huron Co., Ont., says: "I received the Christmas number, and am more than pleased with it. You must have a large subscription list, or you could not print the 'Advocate' weekly for \$1.50 per year, but I hope that you may double your list this year."

The Wheels of Wagons.

With the object of throwing some light on the question of the influence of the width of tire and height of wheels on the draft of farm wagons, the Missouri Experiment Station conducted some practical tests, a summary of which is here given. The series of trials was made on macadam, gravel and dirt roads in all conditions, and on meadows, pastures, cultivated fields, stubble land, etc. With a net load of 2,000 pounds in all cases, three sets of wheels were tested, as follows: "Standard—front wheels, 44 inches; rear wheels, 55 inches. Medium—front wheels, 36 inches; rear wheels, 40 inches. Low—front wheels, 24 inches; rear wheels, 28 inches." The results obtained and conclusions reached were, in brief, as follows:

For the same load, wagons with wheels of standard height drew lighter than those with lower wheels. The difference in favor of the standard wheels was greater on road surfaces in bad condition than on good road surfaces. Low wheels cut deeper ruts than those of standard height. The vibration of the tongue is greater in wagons with low wheels. For most purposes wagons with low wheels are more convenient than those of standard height.

Wagons with broad tires and wheels of standard height are cumbersome, and require much room in turning. Diminishing the height of wheel to from 30 to 36 inches in front, and 40 to 44 inches in the rear, did not increase the draft in as great proportion as it increased the convenience of loading and unloading the ordinary farm freight. Diminishing the height of wheels below 30 inches front and 40 inches rear increased the draft in greater proportion than it gained in convenience. On good roads, increasing the length of rear axle, so that the front and rear wheels will run in different tracks to avoid cutting ruts, did not increase the draft.

On soft, cultivated ground, and bad roads, wagons with the rear axle longer than the front one drew heavier than one having both axles of

the same length. Wagons with the rear axle longer than the front one require wider gateways and more careful drivers, and are, on the whole, very inconvenient and not to be recommended for farm use. The best form of farm wagon is one with axles of equal length, broad tires, and wheels 30 to 36 inches high in front, and 40 to 44 inches behind.

The Daughter's Portion.

Sir,—A writer in a Scottish paper recently called attention to a malady which, it seems, is as prevalent in the British Islands as in Canada, and which, like the hobgoblins of our childhood days, has the rather peculiar attribute of existing, for the most part, unnoticed, most of all, by the very persons upon whom it fastens itself most firmly. This malady is a somewhat difficult one to diagnose. Were it not that it exists among the most affectionate and "feeling" of people, one would be inclined to think that its chief symptom is insensibility; and were it not that it is to be found in those who have never yet even been obliged to wear "spectacles," one might think its presence due to an alarming degree of short-sightedness at least, if not partial blindness. In short, the malady to which we refer is the almost wicked neglect of which many of even the best people are guilty in failing to make any provision whatever for their daughters.

The daughters come into the world helplessly, utterly irresponsible, so far as their existence or choice of sex is concerned. They find themselves in it, and that is all there is to be said about it. While growing up they are, in all probability, used well, clothed, fed and petted, happy as birds in June, free as the winds that blow, with no thought of the struggle for food and clothing and shelter which engrosses the great mass of mankind, and should be a matter of disregard to none. There are brothers in the family, too, and all are happy and prosperous.

But to too many of these girls there is all too likely to come a day of rude awakening. Possibly the father dies, and the old home passes into the hands of the eldest brother. This brother soon finds someone more necessary to his happiness than the bevy of sisters, who now become to him, though he may be ashamed to own it, somewhat in the way. The "upshot" of it all is that, one day, he brings home his bride, and from that hour the sisters realize that, much as they have loved the old place, hard as they have worked in it and for it, for them it is now no longer "home." At last they know what it is to say, "I have no home." . . . This is no fanciful case. We have in mind one which, we have no hesitation in saying, is duplicated—no, multiplied—many times over each year in every township in the land. A "comfortable" Canadian farmer had a large family of boys and girls. All worked at home, the girls doing as much, in proportion to their strength, as the boys, and the family was an exceptionally happy one. Some of the girls married, but there were still three who did not. At last came a year in which both parents died. The entire property fell into the hands of the boys, five or six hundred dollars only being left to the girls. In a short time the boys all married, a neighboring girl coming on the old homestead. There was no disturbance. The sisters did not expect their brothers to remain "single" on their account. Nevertheless, at more than thirty years of age, they found themselves practically turned adrift on the world, without any experience in breadwinning, with neither training nor knowledge of any market value, and with a pride (albeit a false and foolish one) which made the idea of going out to domestic service as gall and wormwood to them. Bitterest of all was the thought of leaving the old home which their hands had helped to make beautiful, and which was invested with the sanctity with which "home" can only be enshrined to a woman.

Yet, girls left in such a predicament as this must live. They cannot remain where they are not wanted; hence, before them are two alternatives—they must either marry somebody at once, or turn out and earn their own living. Possibly there is a chance for a happy marriage. Then the problem is solved in the easiest way. On the contrary, an opportunity of any kind of a marriage may not present itself, or one may come which is repugnant to every inclination of the girl's nature. Rather than face the Charybdis of the future, filled with the horrible things with which her imagination, all untrained in the experiences of the world, is likely to people it, many a girl, more willing to put up with evils whose name she knows than to risk encountering unknown ills in knocking about the world alone, lets herself drift with the current, and marries the man she does not care for, simply for the sake of the home he can offer. Only when it is too late does she realize the mistake she has made.

It is true that, occasionally, the girl who

"marries for a home" seems to come out all right. He may prove better than she thought, or she may be endowed with the stolid, easy-going sort of a nature that is easily satisfied, with food and clothes, and money to spend. But to the highly-strung, intellectual, finely-constituted girl the experience is a different one. She cannot attune her sensibilities and longings for the highest and best of things to the lower level of one who is, in every way, perhaps, coarser and less noble than she. She feels that her promise to "love" has been a lie, and that she is living far below the standard of the ideal wife she has thought of. She feels that her whole life is a living lie, and little wonder is it if she becomes warped and soured—the very opposite of the woman she would be. Such a career as this is truly "death in life." . . . And yet, to how many parents the only thing seems to be to get their daughters married off to the first "respectable," well-to-do fellows who offer themselves. It is worth remembering that there are respectable people and respectable people, and that the matter of temperament is quite as important as that of respectability.

On the other hand, suppose the girl has enough strength of will to form the decision of making her own way in the world, unless endowed with especial talent or ability, her path is not likely to be strewn with rose leaves. Perhaps she is willing to encounter a few thorns, but she has a right to a reasonable amount of happiness, and a rather continuous thorn is likely to be the trouble of finding a desirable situation. Constitutionally, she has not the strength to turn her hand to "any old thing," as a man can, and with neither training nor experience, she is likely to encounter a good many closed doors.

So the question arises, "How may the girls be provided for?" The Hindus of earlier times solved this question very easily by dumping the superfluous daughters into the Ganges, but, since our civilized government might interfere with such a proceeding as that, it would seem that something else must be done by the parents who profess to hold their daughters dear.

In answer, we shall quote from our Scottish writer, who, in seeking for a solution to the problem, seems to have hit upon more sense than nonsense. "There are some things," he says, "that the French manage better than we, and one is their systematic attempt to make a provision for their daughters. When a baby girl is born, the father—if he have any respectability or thrift—begins to lay past a yearly sum for her dowry. . . . Let the infant have a bank-book from her birth, and the father add to the account every year according to his means. When she reaches woman's estate, this sum may form her marriage portion, or it may put her through a business training involving more expense than the father's income could stand. It may stock a poultry farm, or start a market garden, or it may lie untouched, accumulating till the day when she will be left homeless. The surest provision of all is to put her in the way of earning her own livelihood. Farmers' daughters are so fortunately situated that many of them can stay at home and have a business of their own at the same time. Let one make a practical study of poultry, or cheese, or horticulture, grasping at all means open to her of perfecting herself in her own branch. Not only will she be worthy of a wage at home, but in case of need she will have a good chance of finding a situation elsewhere."

We believe in our Scottish writer's advice, that it hurts no girl to have an independent means of earning her own living. Whether the choice be dairying, or gardening, or poultry-raising, or teaching, or sewing, or cooking, or journalism, or typewriting, or bookkeeping—whatever it may be—her training in it should be as thorough as possible. There is little room in the world to-day for unskilled workmen. Moreover, the work should be congenial. It is not enough to say: "Mary must sew," or "Mary must teach." Mary's taste and ability should be consulted. She will probably have hard work to do, no matter what line she enters upon, but that work may be a happiness or a misery to her, according as it is the thing she is adapted to, or the contrary. By all means, let Mary feel that she has strength within her right hand, and that the fear is forever removed from her. In one way or another, provide for the girls. One question in closing: Setting entirely aside what custom may prescribe in the Old Land, when the Canadian farmer makes his will (which every prudent man should do in good health), why should not the daughters receive a fair share of the property which her toil has helped to create?

THE TOILER.

Dakota Giving up Flax.

Owing to the heavy demands which flax makes upon the plant food in the soil, North Dakota farmers are reported as giving it up. It is said they are not only selling their crop, but the seed also, as their lands are becoming flax sick. Barley is expected to take its place, as it has already become quite a popular crop.