

THE FARMER'S ADVOCATE AND HOME MAGAZINE.

THE LEADING AGRICULTURAL JOURNAL IN THE
DOMINION.

PUBLISHED WEEKLY BY
THE WILLIAM WELD COMPANY (LIMITED).

JOHN WELD, MANAGER.

AGENTS FOR THE FARMER'S ADVOCATE AND HOME JOURNAL,
WINNIPEG, MAN.

2. THE FARMER'S ADVOCATE AND HOME MAGAZINE
is published every Thursday.

It is impartial and independent of all cliques or parties, handsomely
illustrated with original engravings, and furnishes the most
practical, reliable and profitable information for farmers, dairy-
men, gardeners, stockmen and home-makers, of any publication
in Canada.

3. TERMS OF SUBSCRIPTION.—In Canada, England, Ireland
and Scotland, \$1.50 per year, in advance; \$2.00 per year when
not paid in advance. United States, \$2.50 per year; all other
countries 12s.; in advance.

4. ADVERTISING RATES.—Single insertion, 25 cents per line,
agata. Contract rates furnished on application.

5. THE FARMER'S ADVOCATE is sent to subscribers until an
explicit order is received for its discontinuance. All payments of
arrears must be made as required by law.

6. THE LAW IS, that all subscribers to newspapers are held responsible
until all arrears are paid and their paper ordered to be
discontinued.

7. REMITTANCES should be made direct to us, either by
Money Order or Registered Letter, which will be at our risk.
When made otherwise we will not be responsible.

8. THE DATE ON YOUR LABEL shows to what time your
subscription is paid.

9. ANONYMOUS communications will receive no attention. In
every case the FULL NAME AND POST-OFFICE ADDRESS MUST
BE GIVEN.

10. WHEN A REPLY BY MAIL IS REQUIRED to Urgent
Veterinary or Legal Enquiries, \$1 must be enclosed.

11. LETTERS intended for publication should be written on one
side of the paper only.

12. CHANGE OF ADDRESS.—Subscribers when ordering a change
of address should give the old as well as the new P. O. address.

13. WE INVITE FARMERS to write us on any agricultural topic.
We are always pleased to receive practical articles. For such as
we consider valuable we will pay ten cents per inch printed
matter. Criticisms of Articles, Suggestions How to Improve THE
FARMER'S ADVOCATE AND HOME MAGAZINE, Descriptions of
New Grains, Roots or Vegetables not generally known,
Particulars of Experiments Tried, or Improved Methods of
Cultivation, are each and all welcome. Contributions sent us
must not be furnished other papers until after they have
appeared in our columns. Rejected matter will be returned on
receipt of postage.

14. ALL COMMUNICATIONS in reference to any matter connected
with this paper should be addressed as below, and not to any
individual connected with the paper.

Address—THE FARMER'S ADVOCATE, or
THE WILLIAM WELD COMPANY (LIMITED),
LONDON, CANADA.

An Erroneous Deduction.

Figures will prove anything, is a familiar epigram, of which a fresh example has been furnished in a press bulletin on the subject of whey-butter experiments, issued by the Dairy Branch of the Ontario Department of Agriculture. Either that, or an error has been made in the calculations. Last week we published this article, which contained reference as follows to the feeding value of whey fat:

"From experiments carried on by Prof. Geo. E. Day, in Guelph, in 1907, it was found that 1,000 pounds of whey, as it comes fresh from the vats, is worth, when fed to hogs, about 12½ cents more than 1,000 pounds of whey from which the fat has been separated."

Inasmuch as Prof. Dean had previously computed the feeding value of skimmed and unskimmed whey (as indicated by Prof. Day's experiments) at 13.4 cents and 18.2 cents per cwt., making a difference of 4.8 cents per cwt., or 48 cents per thousand pounds of whey, we were astonished to find the figures placed at only 12½ cents in this official deliverance. Immediately, therefore, upon receipt of the article, we wrote the Director of Dairy Instruction, at Toronto, asking him whether it was not the 1908 experiments that were referred to, and inquiring how such a low value for whey fat had been deduced from them. We quote from our letter as follows:

"Taking as a basis the 1908 experiments, we find, according to data supplied by Prof. Dean, in his paper read before the Eastern Livestock and Poultry Show, and by Prof. Day in a letter to 'The Farmer's Advocate,' dated January 18th, 1909, that, to produce 100 pounds of gain with ordinary whey and meal, it took 269 pounds of meal and 747 pounds of whey. In the case of the separated whey group, it took 297 pounds of meal and 774 pounds of whey; while, in the check group it required 430 pounds of meal to produce 100 pounds of gain."

"Now, according to this, we figure that 1,000 pounds of ordinary whey saved 215.5 pounds of

meal, while 1,000 pounds of separated whey saved 171.8 pounds of meal, or a difference of 43.7 pounds. If meal is worth 1 cent a pound, this would mean a difference of 43.7 cents per 1,000 pounds in the value of skimmed versus unskimmed whey."

Copies of this letter were sent to Professors Day and Dean. At the date of this writing we have heard only from Professors Day and Dean. They both assure us that we were correct in assuming that the experiments were conducted last year, and also that our conclusions, printed above, are perfectly sound, as based upon this one experiment, though Prof. Day, whose letter appears elsewhere, points out, as "The Farmer's Advocate" did in a recent issue, that further experiments are called for to revise or establish the conclusions. While fairly well satisfied with the relative showing of skimmed versus unskimmed whey, he feels that, for some reason or other, too high a value was indicated for both classes of whey. We are disposed to agree with him in this; it is even possible that the press bulletin issued has not underestimated the feeding value of whey-fat, though we incline to think it has. Be that as it may, it is perfectly clear that if the 1908 experiments are to be accepted as the basis, the feeding value of the fat in 1,000 pounds of whey is nearer half a dollar than a York shilling.

Feeding Value of Patrons' Whey.

Incidentally, Prof. Day's article draws attention to the fact that the results of an experiment in which a perishable by-product like whey is fed in first-class condition, and regularly, in small quantities, should be accepted with qualification in their bearing upon commercial operations. There is a measure of force in this argument, though it seems to us overmuch is made of the wastage likely to be entailed in ordinary feeding practice. Whey is discussed as though it were purchased in bulk by a feeder, who had to incur the expense of hauling, etc. As a matter of fact, the whey in Canadian cheese factories is commonly returned to the patrons in reasonably regular quantities, and without any particular expense for hauling. True, it is usually sour and minus much of its fat, but these deficiencies are being overcome by pasteurization.

As for our claim that good sweet whey is worth at least 10 cents per cwt., we fail to see but that this is well within the mark. As between the value indicated by the O. A. C. experiments and the figure we named, there is quite a wide latitude for contingencies. We are strongly of the opinion that the feeding value of dairy by-products has been commonly underestimated, and consider that they should be appraised at what they are worth as substitutes for meal, making due allowance for waste, irregularity of supply, and condition in which delivered.

Over Three Millions Wasted.

In moving a resolution in the House of Commons, proposing that a petition be presented to the King, praying that the British North America Act should be so amended as to provide for the abolition of the Dominion Senate, E. A. Lancaster, M. P., stated that in ten years that vegetative body on Parliament Hill had cost the country three and a quarter millions of dollars. It exercised no legislative functions, he declared, all it did being to divorce people.

Mr. Lancaster's resolution may not accomplish its final purpose just now, but some day it will. As we have previously observed, "the existence of a non-elective body like the Senate is a travesty on the idea of responsible government. It is admittedly an expensive nuisance as it is, and no one has yet suggested an acceptable plan for its reformation. By and by the consensus of opinion will arrive at the logical conclusion—abolition."

Educates and Inspires.

"The Farmer's Advocate" should be in every rural home, as it educates and inspires its readers with scientific knowledge which we, as farmers, would take a lifetime to know from experience, and possibly never learn.

Wellington Co., Ont. G. E. HONNINGER.

Sandy Fraser on Woman's Rights.

Editor "The Farmer's Advocate":

Its mony a lang day since I did ye the honor o' contributin' tae yer columns, an' ye wouldna' be hearin' frae me the noo gin I hadna' somethin' o' muckle importance tae say to a number o' the readers o' yer journal. I dinna' ken exactly hoo mony o' them wad mak' a suitable text for my sermon, but be they mony or few, I want tae tak' a rap at the farmers o' this country, wha, I'm afraid, are no sae muckle better than their auld fathers were before them, in spite of all the gude advice they hae' been gettin' frae lawyers an' ministers, to say naething o' mysel'.

And noo, what I'm wantin' tae talk about tae ye hard-hearted auld farmers is just this: Hoo are ye an' yer auld wumman gettin' along the day? Are ye still makin' her pull wi' ye on an even whiffletree, or hae' ye given her an inch or twa o' the advantage, as ye will aye be daein' for the wee pony? I'm muckle afear that wi' mony o' ye the pony gets mair than its fair share o' attention.

Noo, ma brither farmers, I juist want tae pit the case before ye, fairly an' squarely, an' tell ye some things I hae' seen, an' mair things I hae' thought, an' a few o' the mony things I wad hae' liked to hae' said relative tae this subject, o' the life oor daughters, wives an' mither's lead on the farm. The wear an' tear, an' the hurry an' worry will no' be lang in startin' up once mair, which is anither reason for ma wantin' tae pit in this last word at the present time. The question is, "Is oor life on the farm lived in the way best calculated tae give an all-round development tae oor daughters an' wives, an' is it makin' them happy an' contented in their hame?" If it's a case of wark frae daylight till lang after dark, every day in the year, and na thocht for onything else but that an' siller, we're aff the track. I kenned o' an auld farmer wha used tae keep the lantern, a' ready lit, beside his bed, so that he could grab it an' rin as sune as the clock struck three in the mornin'. The pair auld fellow is deid the noo, an' those wha pretend tae ken say that he didna' tak' ony o' his siller awa' wi' him. Anither man o' my acquaintance used tae rin frae the field tae the hoose when the auld wumman wad blaw the horn for dinner, an' them rin back tae his wark again wi' a piece o' bread in his hand, so not to waste ony time. I could aye ken his rinnin' tae dinner, but rinnin' back tae his wark again beat me.

Noo, if these men had only killed themselves, the case wad be no' sae bad, but, like every other mon on the wrong road, they made a lot mair gae the same w'y. Wives an' dochters a' had to keep up tae the pace set by the auld mon, an' it turned oot tae be a "pace that killed" the auld fellow himself, onyway.

Maist o' the time, though, its the wumman o' the hoose that gae under first, she havin' tae wark inside maist o' the time, an' gettin' no change frae day to day, but aye washin' the same dishes in the same dishpan, and sweepin' the same floor wi' the same broom, an' forty-seven hundred ither things, till at last she can dae na mair, an' her auld man has tae spend in doctor's bills a' that he saved by no' gettin' a hired girl for his wife. Sometimes she maks' oot tae dee and get awa' frae a' her trouble, an' then he has tae gae tae a' the worry an' expense o' gettin' anither aye.

I once heard a minister say frae the pulpit that "A' that bothered farmers when their wives died was that they hadna' onyone tae dae their wark an' wait on them hand an' foot." This may be true or no', but I wad like tae ken, for instance, why its aye the wumman that waits on the man, an' never the other way around? The only time I ken that a mon waits on his wife is when she pits on his collar an' necktie, an' gets him a' ready tae gang tae the kirk, an' he goes oot an' sits in the buggy an' yells at her tae come along. That's the kind o' waitin' a man does.

But, onyway an' whatever, ma friends, ye ken as weel as I dae mysel', there's somethin' wrang in the hame life o' the average Canadian farmer, an' if ye dinna' ken juist what it is, I'll tell ye. Ye expect too much frae yer wumman folks in the way o' wark, and ye dinna' show them enouch appreciation for all they do. I hae seen wimmin keepin' hoose wi'oot a sewin' machine or a washin' machine, an' wi' naething but an auld cracked stove to cook the dinner on, an' daein' it weel, but never a word o' praise or appreciation did they get frae the time they were marrit till they went tae their grave. If that sort o' life does na' tak' the ambition oot o' ony wumman, or send her tae the asylum, she's a lang piece above the ordinary.

Anither thing that is being done by turning the farm into a slave-ranch is tae gie the young lassies o' oor countrie sic a horror o' the life that they will na' marry a farmer if there is onything else in pants that they can get, an' wha can blame them? They ken what their mither's cam' through. So, for the sake o' the rising generation o' the tillers o' the soil, let us gie our