

grant, and a wise and beneficent scheme fell through. That, or something like it, might now be revived.

Prof. James urges that an agricultural coloring be incidentally given the teaching of composition, history, drawing, reading and arithmetic. The suggestion is practical. The wonder is that it needs repetition. Even though the teaching of agriculture was not thought of, the live teacher would, so far as he is able, draw on the children's interests, occupations and experiences for the groundwork of his illustration and instruction. The problems based on yesterday's market reports have a stimulating freshness compared with those copied from a five or ten-year-old arithmetic. Dr. McLellan used to tell a good story about a boy who had gone through the arithmetic, but failed to solve a problem involving the profit on a sale of turkeys. "I can't do it," said he, "there are no turkey sums in the arithmetic I ciphered in."

The reader of the Bulletin will not need to be told that the author attaches little or no value to the mere memorizing of terms, formulæ and technicalities from a text-book. The teaching, to be worthy of the name, must be by the scientific method. He does well to quote with approbation these two paragraphs, from Professor Huxley's address to an agricultural club. They are well worth repetition and careful study:—

"There are some general principles which apply to all technical training. The first of these, I think, is that practice is to be learned only by practice. The farmer must be made by thorough farm work. I think I might be able to give you a fair account of a bean plant, and of the manner and condition of its growth; but if I were to try to raise a crop of beans your club would probably laugh consumedly at the result. Nevertheless, I believe that practical people would be all the better for the scientific knowledge which does not enable me to grow beans. It would keep you from attempting hopeless experiments, and would enable you to take advantage of the innumerable hints which Dame Nature gives to the people who live in direct contact with things."

"And this leads me to the general principle which I think applies to all technical training of school boys and school girls, and that is that they should be led from the observation of the commonest facts to general scientific truths. If I were called upon to frame a course of elementary instruction preparatory to agriculture, I am not sure that I would attempt chemistry, or botany, or physiology or geology as such. It is a method fraught with the danger of spending too much time and attention on abstraction and theories, on words and notions, instead of things. The history of a bean, of a grain of wheat, of a turnip, of a sheep, of a pig, or of a cow, properly treated—with the introduction of the elements of chemistry, physiology and so on, as they come in—would give all the elementary science which is needed for the comprehension of the processes of agriculture, in a form easily assimilated by the youthful mind, which loaths anything in the shape of long words and abstract notions, and small blame to it."

We heartily endorse the aim as well as the method of teaching agriculture briefly set forth by Professor James. Not the "how"—the technique, but the "why"—the science of the subject, aiming in the process to create a sentiment in favor of farm work and love for rural life, and to arouse ambition to become an intelligent, industrious, successful farmer, and, consequently, highly worthy of the respect and honor of every member of the community.

#### Report of the Ontario Commission on the Dehorning of Cattle.

The practice of dehorning cattle appears from the evidence to have been introduced into this province in the year 1888, by Messrs. Kinney and Johnson, South Norwich, Oxford Co. It was not adopted by farmers to any extent till February, 1890, when Mr. Smith, a farmer's son, of Dereham, Oxford Co., returned from a visit to the State of Illinois, where the practice of dehorning cattle had obtained to a considerable extent. This gentleman dehorned his father's herd. This example was followed by several of his neighbors. The practice raised considerable controversy in the district as to the cruelty and pain involved in the operation. In February, 1891, Mr. W. V. Nigh, of Avon, Middlesex Co., was prosecuted at London before two Justices of the Peace on a charge of cruelty to animals by dehorning them. The case was dismissed, on the evidence of ten witnesses that the suffering was of short duration and the results were beneficial.

The practice continued to extend in the district, Messrs. Smith and W. A. Elliott being the chief operators, and within a year they had dehorned about 650 head of cattle, chiefly in the counties of Oxford, Norfolk and Elgin. These operations became the subject of general conversation in the community, and opinions were very much divided on the subject. Those who had adopted the practice justified it as being beneficial and advantageous to the comfort and safety of the animals. Those who opposed the practice held the view that it was cruel and inhuman, and no corresponding benefit derived. The controversy increased, and in many cases became very sharp between the two contending parties. This led to "The Dehorning Case" being brought before the courts.

The late Charles Hutchinson, Crown Attorney of Middlesex County, acting on behalf of the opponents

of the practice, instituted proceedings in January, 1892, against Messrs. Wm. York, sr., W. A. Elliott and Edward York, charging them with cruelty to animals by cutting off the horns of Mr. Wm. York's cattle. The case was called at the Interim Sessions, London, Ont., on 6th January, before Messrs. Smythe and Lacey, Justices of the Peace for the County of Middlesex. Mr. C. Hutchinson conducted the prosecution. Messrs. E. R. Cameron and R. M. C. Tooth conducted the defence. Ten witnesses were examined for the prosecution—two veterinary surgeons, one medical doctor, two butchers and five farmers. None of these witnesses had ever seen the operation performed, but believed from the structure of the horn the pain would be very great.

Seven witnesses were examined for the defence—four veterinary surgeons and three farmers—all of whom had either seen or performed the operation, and were convinced the benefits were great and the suffering of short duration. The case rested for a time at this stage, the defendants withdrew their defence, and they, with a number of others, waited upon the Ontario Government at Toronto on February 2nd, 1892. The deputation, which consisted of Messrs. E. B. Brown, J. A. Brown, B. Hopkins, of Brownsville, and seven other representative farmers of the district, with Mr. E. R. Cameron, solicitor, London, was introduced by Dr. McKay, M. P. P. South Oxford.

They were received by Sir Oliver Mowat, Attorney-General, Hon. John Dryden, Minister of Agriculture, and Hon. Messrs. A. S. Hardy, G. W. Ross, J. M. Gibson and Richard Harcourt. Mr. E. R. Cameron was speaker for the deputation. He begged the government to interfere and save the defendants from further costs, and asked that a commission be appointed to investigate the whole question of dehorning cattle. As there was no precedent to govern the courts in this matter, it was unfair to place the whole cost of defending a prosecution upon two or three men, besides branding them as criminals in the event of conviction, which seemed probable in this case.

The Attorney-General, in reply, pointed out they were making a most unusual request in asking the Executive to interfere in the administration of justice. He added, however, that he and his colleagues were much impressed with the arguments in favor of an official enquiry, and if, after this matter was concluded, they thought fit to make a like application it would be favorably considered, but the Executive did not feel justified in taking any action at present.

On February 3rd the case was resumed at London, and adjourned for judgment until February 8th, when judgment was given as follows:—

1. The horns referred to were cut off by W. A. Elliott, assisted by E. York, and ordered by Wm. York, the owner.
  2. Thus cruelly torturing the cows, and no precautions were taken to lessen the pain, nor to protect the cows afterwards from cruel treatment.
  3. It does not appear to us there was any necessity to cut off the horns of these cows.
  4. Neither does it appear that doing so was any advantage, but the whole evidence leads to the conclusion that it was a decided disadvantage to each cow.
  5. There being no advantage to the cows to compensate for the torture and suffering endured by them, there should be adequate advantage to the public generally; in our opinions it does not appear that such is the case.
  6. On the contrary, cutting off the horns of milch cows and other cattle may be the means whereby fraud may be perpetrated on the public, by removing that which is the best means of knowing the age of a cow, and of judging of its breed and other qualities.
- The decision is, that each of the defendants be fined \$50 and costs forthwith, and in default of payment, one month in the county jail.

Notice was given that the judgment would be appealed against at the next General Session of the Peace.

This case caused a widespread newspaper controversy, which aroused public attention to such an extent that on the 9th of March a commission was issued by the Ontario Government to the Hon. Charles Drury, R. Gibson, D. M. McPherson, A. Smith, H. Glendinning and J. J. Kelso, authorizing them "to obtain the fullest information in reference to the practice of dehorning cattle, and to make full enquiry into and report with all reasonable speed the reasons for and against the practice, and to collect all the accessible evidence of experts and others in connection with any trials which have taken place in England, Scotland and Ireland, or any other useful information from any quarter ob-

tainable." The Hon. Chas. Drury was appointed chairman; J. J. Kelso, secretary.

The Commissioners, on the invitation of Dr. Smith, visited the Ontario Veterinary College on the 20th April and examined the anatomy of the horn, and the same day at the Parliament Buildings received evidence from the following gentlemen:—Ex-Ald. G. Frankland, cattle exporter; A. J. Thompson, cattle exporter; W. W. Hodson, lessee Toronto cattle market.

On May 10th the Commissioners met at Tilsonburg, and received evidence from seven farmers and one V. S., L. A. Brown, Aylmer.

May 11th the Commissioners, accompanied by the Hon. J. Dryden, Minister of Agriculture, visited several farms in the district where dehorning had been practised, and the owners expressed themselves satisfied with the results. On the same day they visited the farm of Edward York, Brownsville, and witnessed the operation of dehorning performed on six animals by W. A. Elliott, assisted by E. York and a farm hand. The operation was done with a fine tenon saw, eleven teeth to the inch, well sharpened and oiled; each horn was cut off in about an average of six seconds. After the operation, the cattle were turned into a yard, in order that the Commissioners might see the result of the operation. They say, no doubt that during the operation there is considerable pain, but after the operation is over the cattle did not seem to show any symptoms of severe pain. The same afternoon the Commissioners received evidence from six farmers.

May 12th Commission received evidence at Town Hall, Tilsonburg, from fourteen farmers and one V. S., Wm. Brady, Tilsonburg.

The Commission met at Harrietsville and received evidence from sixteen witnesses.

June 1st the Commission met at London and received evidence from seven witnesses.

June 2nd, at London, received evidence from ten witnesses, one M. D., and one V. S.

June 3rd, Mr. Chas. Hutchinson, Crown Attorney, was examined, and a deputation was received from the London Humane Society, who gave their views to the Commissioners.

On June 14, 15 and 16 the Commission examined twenty witnesses in Toronto, all connected in some way with the cattle trade, except two Drs. and two V. S's.

June 17th the Commissioners visited the Toronto cattle market to see for themselves the extent of the injuries which the cattle had received in transit. There were some injured and some had broken horns.

July 7th the Commissioners visited the Experimental Farm at Ottawa. Fourteen steers that had been dehorned in the spring and previous fall were seen, and evidence taken from Prof. Robertson and the herdsman. In the afternoon a meeting was held at Ottawa, and evidence given by W. C. Edwards, Esq., M. P., and Senator Read, of Belleville.

July 20th the Commissioners met at the Town Hall, Ingersoll, and received evidence from ten witnesses, all farmers in the district.

Whatever opinion people may have about the dehorning of cattle, only one opinion can be held about the work of the Commission. They have spared no labor in investigating the matter and collecting all available evidence that could be had.

We think the Commissioners are entitled to the respect and esteem of all parties connected with cattle raising and feeding for all purposes, for the very painstaking, careful and full investigation which they have made of the whole subject. They cite in their report a number of decisions given in the higher courts of England, Scotland and Ireland on the same subject, even these lords of session were not agreed and of one opinion as to the legality of the operation, and whether it comes within the scope of the Act against cruelty to animals or not. We also think the farmers generally will agree with the conclusions which the Commission have arrived at and their recommendations:—

1st. That the practice of dehorning be permitted where performed with reasonable skill, with proper appliances, and with due regard to the avoidance of unnecessary suffering, and that the Ontario Government should bring to the attention of the Dominion Government the desirability of amending the law relating to cruelty to animals, so as to give effect to this recommendation.

2nd. That the Ontario Government should direct the management of the Ontario Experimental Farm to experiment with chemicals on the horns of young calves, and also cutting out the embryo horn, with a view to ascertaining whether these methods are more desirable than sawing off the horns when they have obtained their full growth.

We hope the result of the work of the Commissioners will set at rest this question, and that we shall hear no more of farmers being prosecuted for practising dehorning of cattle, if they see fit to do so. A copy of the report may be obtained by applying to the Department of Agriculture, Toronto.