

age of the kind ever offered to my womanhood, and my heart could feel nothing else all day."

Poor woman; good-looking; modest to a fault; a born lady, if God ever made one, yet in her thirty-five years of life in the country she had never seen a man lift his hat to a woman.

And now comes the crux of the question: Why are farmers rude of speech and manner? Is it because they till the soil? Is it because they are in close and constant companionship with nature? Emphatically, no! What, then, makes them so? The women. Yes, the women—mothers, wives, sisters, sweethearts—they that feel the unthinking rudeness of the men of their world to a degree that the men themselves could never understand, are the very ones who are wholly—shall I say criminally?—responsible for it; for let me say this much for the farmer, that, to be different from what he is, despite the training of his womankind, would be well-nigh impossible.

In the city the boy is taught courtesy from his earliest years, for his mother knows that his success in life, whether in office, store or society, will depend largely on his manners and appearance. Besides, he grows up in keen competition with schoolmates and playmates, which is a great safety-valve to let off the extra steam of a boy's vanity and conceit. The city boy knows that, to succeed, it is not enough to be merely a boy, but he must be as smart as the next girl, and nearly as smart as the next girl; for the city boy is not so apt as the country boy to be filled with the idea that to be born a boy is to be endowed mentally and spiritually to a degree unattainable by a girl.

In the country you will hear people extol bluntness as a virtue, and condemn smooth manners as the cloak of deceit and design. And the sin of it all lies, I repeat it, with the women.

Let me explain: Boys, naturally, are the desideratum of the farmer building up a family, for it is the boys who will carry on the name and the farm, and who save the expense of a hired man as soon as their immature hands can hold the plow handles. Girls, you see, are not much use, for they only help the mother, which is never really necessary. So they only figure in the farmer's mind (not often in his testament) on account of their frills and furbelows. But if the boy is everything to the father, it is left to the mother to spoil him, and, as is the way with women, she does it thoroughly.

No sooner is a baby-boy born than he develops according to the view of his fond and foolish mother, a surprisingly superior manner. No mere girl-baby could ever suck in such a masterful way. Why, even the way he kicks his feet, with their promise of a large understanding, is a revelation to her worshipful mind. That boy is born to command, and so from his very first cry she begins to obey, and the young tyrant—not by nature, but by training—is encouraged to lord it over her and everyone else, especially his sisters.

Then, as he grows to manhood, it becomes steadily worse, for mother, sister, sweetheart, praise, flatter, and respectfully defer to his opinion. One and all wait on him constantly, and admit his superiority in every way, as a matter of course. If he wishes to go out, his mother and sisters bring his coat, brush his boots, and help him with his collar and cravat. If he comes in, he throws everything off for them to pick up and clean. Every festival, every social gathering, is but a nestful of opportunities for the growth of his self-importance and vanity, for mothers and daughters, with one accord, vie with one another to make him think of but himself, and no one else. If the poor fellow happens to have a fine farm, in addition to any pretense of form and figure, his doom, as regards courtesy and unselfishness, is sure and certain.

It is always an understood fact in the farmer's family that the farm is for the boy. If there is more than one boy, the farm may be divided, or else every nerve is strained, every penny saved, to buy each a farm, and thus settle them in life. As for the girls, who have strained and saved with the rest, they are left to catch a farm of their own by catching a farmer with it; and what way to catch a man who from his cradle has been fed on deference and flattery? Why, more deference, more flattery!

Seen in this light, is it any wonder that the women of the farm are not accorded proper respect, and, in fact, do not feel any for themselves. Can we blame them for exalting the male sex, when, from their very birth their rights and privileges are qualities and quantities undreamt of by anyone concerned. We read of the Chinese and their low estimate of baby girls. Are we, with our vaunted civilization, any better in that respect? Witness the announcement of a birth. Except it be in a family where boys are already superabundant, there will be a minor chord of disappointment, almost of shame, plainly discernible, if it be a girl. On the contrary, how the pride and satisfaction will ring if it be a boy. And as it is with the parents, so it is with the relations and friends. They will dissimulate their disapprobation of the girl very little. I have heard one grandmother say to her daughter, mother of three successive girl babies, "Ah, my

dear, you think that you love your girls and that they love you, but you will never know what love is until you get a boy."

When so little emotion is attached to the girl, and so much to the boy, is it anything but natural that the girl grows up ever self-sacrificing and self-effacing, and the boy selfish and domineering?

It is this kind of influence that has biased the mind almost to the point of uselessness of a great many farmers. It is that which bars them from financial success and mental improvement. It is that which kills the social life of country communities (for each farmer is so bearish that he can't bear the other). It is that which keeps them away from Farmers' Institutes and Agricultural Colleges, for they think no man can teach them, as they know it all. They are so self-satisfied and independent that they shut themselves in their obstinate egoism from the advantages that men in other walks of life have proved their safeguard and means of wealth. Take co-operation, for example. In no other walk of life have co-workers repulsed so long and stubbornly the immense benefits of organization. With co-operation throughout the country, farming would at once rise to its proper level as a profession, by increasing fourfold the profits that it brings the farmer under the present individual system. With co-operation, power machinery could be bought which would reduce the drudgery, as well as the expense. Then, too, all purchasing could be done at a much lower figure; while farm produce, held by organized producers, would fetch higher prices. Milk, for instance, could be taken to a central point, bottled and delivered, at treble the profit and infinitely less labor than under the present way.

As things now are in the country, many a farmer has to stand by helplessly and watch his house or buildings burn to ashes, while, under the co-operative system, each community could have complete fire protection at comparatively small cost to individual farmers.

And now, as everything depends on the upbringing of the child, I hark back to the parents. Do not expect your children to burn with enthusiasm for farming as a life-work if you yourselves have not been able to make it profitable and attractive. If you have so managed that you have broken down before your time, and go about always disheartened, disordered and dishevelled of appearance, do not blame your boys and girls for refusing to submit to a future prospect of similar conditions. If they show a strong desire to migrate to the city, and you as strongly desire to keep them on the farm, try this plan: Pack them off to a good agricultural school where they will get the learning that will make farming interesting; and when they come back give them a hand in the management of the farm, making sure that they receive their share of the returns. The wisest saving is not of money.

In conclusion, I would say to the mothers, wives, sisters and sweethearts of the country, the sooner you educate the men of your world to the right value of women (at present you are estimated according to your working and child-bearing capacity), and to the courtesy and consideration which is their due, the sooner will you bring to your surroundings the advantages that glitter to the eyes and appeal to the heart of the young men and women of the farm; for it is only the farmer's own will, derived from his faulty education, which keeps them away. MRS. W. E. HOPKINS, Russell Co., Ont.

Domesticating Fur-bearing Animals.

Editor "The Farmer's Advocate":

Permit me, through the columns of your valuable journal and magazine, to ask, is it not possible to add another industry to the agricultural population, by domesticating some of the fur-bearing animals?

Some of the fur-bearing wild animals of the country, if not better protected, or domesticated, that they may perpetuate their kind, must soon become extinct. As a proof of this, I may mention the buffalo, which but 25 or 30 years ago were so numerous that few entertained a thought that they would soon be exterminated. That they were ruthlessly hunted, slaughtered and wasted, is generally admitted. The few that are now left are protected. The buffalo robe is now almost a thing of the past. The wild pigeons—I think I may say, a harmless bird—once very numerous, have almost entirely disappeared; and if something be not done to save some of our native wild animals and birds, they must eventually disappear, and I think I may safely say some of them will be much missed.

We have yet the fox, otter, martin, mink, raccoon, lynx, and the muskrat. The bear is probably too large and ferocious a prowler to be much missed. The marten, mink, lynx and fox are also very mischievous prowlers around the farmyard, and are rarely given any quarter when discovered near the house. But the furs of some of these animals are very valuable, and, if they could be raised in captivity, would be very profitable. It

may be that some farmers who live near the edge of the natural forest might succeed in taking some of these animals when young, and, by studying their habits and inclinations, succeed in raising a very profitable little animal. I must say here that this would be largely, if not altogether, an experiment, as nearly all the fur-bearing animals are shy to produce in captivity. Why this should be so is difficult to say. But if a means could be found by which they could be made profitable in this manner, a new industry would spring up which would be interesting and profitable. It may be said this has already been tried; but some industries have been tried very many times before developing into success.

The black fox is the most valuable of all Canadian furs. Such being the case, the fox is generally selected as being the most desirable for experiments. There are from four to six at a litter. A good black fox being worth \$400 at nine months old, when they can be had, they are worth looking after. I have known several small fox farms. Each of them were taken from their burrows when cubs. Some of them were kept in captivity for several years. One of the number was fairly successful, and another quite successful, there being a litter every year. Though the sire and dam were crosses, the progeny were either black or crosses, about half each. Why the latter should have been a success, it is difficult to imagine, as no attempt was made to keep them in anything like their native element, the enclosure in which they were kept being not more than seven feet each way, and dark, and it appeared to me as though they got very little attention. I mention this instance as being the only one which was a success out of about half a dozen which came under my notice, which, on the whole, were a failure. But perhaps, had they been better understood, might, as a whole, have been a success.

The otter, which is the next most valuable fur-bearing animal, is a strong, hardy and vigorous little fellow, and is said to be easily domesticated when taken young, and makes a good pet. But no attempt at otter husbandry has come under my notice. The same may be said of the beaver; probably the latter is more docile. The mink, a very valuable little animal, not weighing more than two pounds when full-grown, in a northern climate. I am aware that some attempts have been made at mink farming, but have not heard of any success. From what I have learned of them, they are a very strong and vicious little animal. If a few are put together, they are very liable to fight and kill, as they generally fight to a finish.

The skunk (Alaska sable), were it not for their great failing to produce a more desirable perfume, might be a success in captivity, as they are very productive. The only trouble with them is that they incline to kill their young. The cause of this might be found. The skunk is one of the animals which hibernates in their dens, and come out in fine weather. The lynx is a peculiar animal; incline to lay around, with no desire to take any exercise; will gorge themselves if given enough food to do so; great care should be taken to feed them a moderate amount of food at a time, and make them take plenty of exercise, otherwise they soon die off.

The buffalo is a big, strong and robust animal. Is said to be fertile in captivity, and, although he may be difficult to manage at times, I see no good reason why he might not be placed amongst the domesticated animals, as the buffalo robes, so essential in winter, are now sold at a figure that would make them profitable.

Now, Mr. Editor, might something not be done to preserve some of our native animals and birds, and make them profitable, as well. The Ontario Agricultural College, at Guelph, is an institution established for the benefit of the country and the public at large; and also the Macdonald College, at St. Anne de Bellevue. Might they not engage a naturalist, with all the assistance he may require, at one or both of these places? Or, the naturalists might be equipped in some of the national parks or Government preserves, where they might have a more favorable opportunity of studying and experimenting with our native animals.

I know there is a law which prevents anyone from taking or having in possession any of the animals mentioned, but the Government would not prevent anyone who took them in good faith for a purpose which was likely to be a benefit to the public at large.

Montreal, Quebec.

Prof. C. C. James, of Toronto, Deputy Minister of Agriculture for Ontario, is not disposed, it is understood, to undertake the principalship of the new Macdonald College at St. Anne de Bellevue, Que. Though in many ways a tempting position, he regards his present opportunities for the public service of agriculture and the country generally so outstanding, the Provincial agricultural staff so capably manned, and the results of future work so promising, as to outweigh, in his judgment, those of the newer educational field. Ontario could ill afford to lose his distinguished services, and will regard with undisguised satisfaction his decision to remain in the Province.