

cause is justly ascribed to the superabundance of filth which in many cases surrounds the newly dropped animal, a condition which favours very greatly the development of disease germs, while the raw and unclosed umbilicus affords them ample means of entrance to the circulation. It is a serious, and in many cases, fatal disease. The treatment under the most favorable circumstances is often unsatisfactory. Put the young animal with its dam into a roomy, clean, dry and well-ventilated box stall; allow plenty of soft and dry bedding, which should be changed at least twice every twenty-four hours. If there is a tendency to constipation, keep the bowels open by giving occasional doses of from two to four ounces of castor oil. Give morning and evening for two weeks (dissolved in a little water or milk): Hyposulphite of soda, two drachms; powdered gentian, half a drachm. If the animal is very weak, a half pint of good ale or porter should be administered three or four times a day. The navel, which is in a raw state, and is usually discharging more or less pus, should be dressed twice a day with a lotion of perchloride of mercury, one drachm; nuriatic acid, two drachms; water, one and a half-pint. A small quantity of this lotion should be injected with a syringe into any cavity in connection with the navel, at each dressing. The swollen and painful joints should be rubbed twice a day with the following liniment: Soap liniment, four ounces; tincture of opium, three ounces; fluid extract of belladonna, one ounce; mix. Discharging abscesses should be kept well cleansed, and dressed twice daily with a lotion composed of one part carbolic acid to twenty parts of water. Much may be done in the way of preventing this disease by giving strict attention to cleanliness at the time of parturition, and until the navel is dried up and completely healed. The application of a strong solution of carbolic acid (one part of the acid to eight or ten of water) to the navel immediately after birth is effective as a preventive measure.

ANSWERED BY DR. W. MOLE, M. R. C. V. S., TORONTO.
MARE WITH DEFORMED FOOT.

S. A. GOBBETT, Dunmore.—"I have a mare three years old with a club foot; I have pared the foot straight and had her shod, but she goes lame. Can you tell me what to do to make the horn soft, as it is very hot, brittle and hard."

If the mare was born with this condition of foot, there is very little chance of remedying the deformity. Get the blacksmith to pare both feet level, and shoe with a pair of tip shoes, allowing the heels to press on the ground.

An ointment composed of hog's lard two parts, and resin one part, melted over a slow fire, should be applied to the coronets twice a week until a new growth of horn appears.

Miscellaneous.

FLORA OF MANITOBA.

E. H. PENBUY, Neepawa, Man.: "Kindly inform me through the ADVOCATE whether a Flora of Manitoba is published, or if not, which is the best Flora of Canada, and the price."

There is no Botany published especially for Manitoba, but the most complete work of the kind for your purpose is Gray's Lessons and Manual of Botany. (Revised edition). Can be ordered through this office. Price, \$3.25.

LEGAL QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS.

[Answers to legal questions of subscribers, by a practicing barrister and solicitor, are published for our subscribers free.]

SHRINKAGE IN HOGS.

A SUBSCRIBER, Whalen, Ont.: "I sold a dressed hog on the market which weighed 200 pounds, there being nothing said about two pounds per cwt. for shrinkage, nor anything said about shrinkage on the ticket given to me by the purchaser. On delivering the hog I was deducted 1 pound for shrinkage. Can I be compelled to accept pay for 196 pounds?"

ANS.—You would have the right to refuse to deliver the hog to the purchaser as soon as you were informed that he proposed to make the deduction in weight for shrinkage, because up to that stage there was no binding contract between you and the purchaser, there being nothing agreed upon as to the deduction. There seems, however, to be a clearly established custom on the London market to deduct two pounds per hog (not two pounds per cwt.), and if this custom is established on any market it would be held by the courts to be a rule of the trade, and binding upon all parties. In the absence of any such established rule or custom of trade, the purchaser would not, of course, be entitled to deduct anything from the weight without a special agreement to that effect. From all we can ascertain, however, there appears to be this generally established custom throughout the principal markets of Ontario, of the right to deduct two pounds per hog, and generally the deduction is made by the market weigh scales clerk without any remark, when that official is required to weigh the carcasses.

SPAVIN CURE.

JOHN JONES, Oshawa. "I have a good, reliable prescription for a spavin cure. Can I purchase the ingredients, manufacture, advertise and sell the same, without infringing upon any legal rights of druggists, etc.?"

ANS.—There is no law in this Province to prevent you or anyone else from advertising and sell-

ing such a compound. That is, of course, providing you do not hold yourself out as a druggist or veterinary surgeon, and diagnose the case by examining the animal on which it is to be applied. You may advertise your medicine as a spavin cure, etc., and if you can find purchasers, of course you may sell it.

POWER TO CUT TREES.

SUBSCRIBER, Marden.:—"The Railway Company, by their servants, entered upon my land adjoining the railway track and cut down shade trees and other trees, which trees were not tall enough to have fallen on the company's railway track had they been blown down. Had the railway company the right to cut down these trees, and am I entitled to any compensation from the company?"

ANS.—By the Railway Acts, both Dominion and Provincial, the railway company have the right to enter upon land adjoining their track, and to cut down trees to the distance of six rods from either side thereof. As to your rights for compensation, that would depend upon the terms of the conveyance to the railway company of their line of track. In some cases the railway company have purchased the right to enter upon lands adjoining the track, for the purpose of cutting down timber, and it is expressly provided that the owner of the lands shall not be entitled to any compensation in respect thereof. In the absence of any such clause in the deed, the owner of the adjoining land would have the right to be paid by the company the fair value of the trees cut down. In ascertaining the rights in your case, you should have the deed inspected by a lawyer. Sometimes in these railway deeds a clause of the kind referred to is inserted.

LINE FENCE.

FAIR PLAY.:—"A and B owned adjoining farms, and A built the first part of a line fence, and before B built his part he sold his farm to C. Now, C claims that he owns part of the fence that A built, and refuses to build the part of the fence which B was to build. What are the rights as to A and C?"

ANS.—C must build his fair proportion of the line fence, and in determining what this proportion is he is not entitled to claim any part of the fence already built by A. In other words, C simply stands in the same position as B was before the sale to C.

FORCED SALE FOR DEBT.

SUBSCRIBER, Estevan, Man.:—"What can a person hold under forced sale for debt in the N. W. T.?"

Chapter 45 of the Revised Ordinances of the N. W. T. (1888) as amended by Ordinance No. 14, 1892, exempts from seizure and sale under any writ of execution issued by any court in the territories the following:

1. The necessary and ordinary clothing of the defendant and his family.

2. The furniture and household furnishings belonging to the defendant and his family to the value of \$500.00.

3. The necessary food for the defendant's family during six months, which may include grain and flour, or vegetables and meat, either prepared for use or on foot.

4. Two cows, two oxen and one horse, or three horses or mules, six sheep and two pigs, besides the animals the defendant may have chosen to keep for food purposes and food for the same for the months of November, December, January, February, March and April, or for such of these months or portions thereof as may follow the date of seizure, provided such seizure be made between the first day of August and the thirtieth day of April next ensuing.

5. The harness necessary for three animals, one wagon or two carts, one mower or cradle and scythe, one breaking plow, one cross plow, one set harrows, one horse-rake, one sewing machine and one reaper or binder.

6. The books of a professional man.

7. The tools and necessary instruments, to the extent of \$200, used by the defendant in the practice of his trade or profession.

8. Seed grain sufficient to seed all his land under cultivation not exceeding eighty acres, at the rate of two bushels to the acre, defendant to have choice of seed and fourteen bushels of potatoes.

9. The homestead of the defendant, provided the same be not more than 160 acres; in case it be more, the surplus may be sold, subject to any lien or encumbrance thereon.

10. The house and buildings occupied by the defendant, and also the lot or lots on which the same are situated, according to the registered plan of same, to the extent of \$1,500.

The defendant is entitled to a choice from the greater quantity of the same kind of articles which are exempted.

No article except the food, clothing and bedding of the defendant and his family, is exempt from seizure under an execution issued on a judgment, the subject matter of which was the price of that said article.

PAYING THE RENT AND IMPROVEMENTS.

SUBSCRIBER.:—"A friend bought a piece of land for me with his own money and in his own name; there were no buildings on the land; nothing was said about rent when I went on it. I could he make no rent, or could I make him pay for the improvements I made?"

ANS.—If you can prove the facts to be as stated in your enquiry, our answer to both your questions is, no. It might be allowed, however, if you can prove your improvements with your name, that would depend on the nature of the improvements.

DAIRY.

Some Notes on the Value of Butterfat in Cheese.

BY J. W. WHEATON, SECRETARY OF THE WESTERN ONTARIO DAIRYMEN'S ASSOCIATION.

Although the subject of paying for milk according to the percentage of butterfat has been widely discussed at some seventy-five local dairy meetings held in different parts of Western Ontario, and at the larger conventions held during the past winter, still there seems to be a doubt in the minds of many as to whether the method is just or not. Some fifty factories in Western Ontario have adopted this system, but here and there patrons are met with who are supplying milk to these factories, who claim that the system is not just and that milk poor in butterfat will make as much cheese as milk rich in butterfat. As a rule, most of these discontents have cows that give a poor quality of milk, and therefore it is to their own interests to assume that the basis is not a just one. The practical dairymen who have advocated the general adoption of this system of paying for milk by our cheese factories, are quite willing to pay due deference to the opinions of patrons and others when these opinions are reasonable and are founded upon fact, and not upon a mere "I think so." But when the statement is heard that three per cent. milk will make as much cheese as four per cent. milk, then, quite naturally, proof is looked for, and if the proof is not forthcoming, the statement must be taken as the outcome of a mind full of prejudice against it. Frequently the report is heard that the persons advocating this system are doing it from sinister motives, and because they are likely to profit by the sale of machines and apparatus used for testing. Now, this is a very uncharitable statement, and seems to be used by those opposed to the system as a last resort. The majority of those who have talked butterfat during the past winter, and have advocated the general adoption of the system by our factorymen, are holding responsible positions under such regulations as would lose them their situations if they accepted any commission on the sale of machinery connected with the industry.

It may be interesting, as well as profitable, to review just now the various experiments that have been carried on to prove that the percentage of butterfat in milk will indicate the quantity of cheese that can be made out of it. These experiments were carried on in different localities and among different surroundings, and were under the charge of thoroughly competent and practical men—men who were ignorant upon the subject and as to what the results would be themselves, and took charge of the work merely to find by accurate test what the real facts were. The results of their work carried on at localities far apart, and under different circumstances, show practically the same thing, thus proving conclusively that the percentage of butterfat in milk indicates the quantity of cheese that can be made out of it.

First, we have the elaborate and comprehensive work carried on under the direction of Dr. Vanslyke, of Geneva, N. Y. In brief, the results of his experiments go to show that in milk with from 3 to 4.5 per cent. of butterfat the casein increases in like proportion to the butterfat, and that there is a tendency when the percentage of butterfat becomes high in the fall, for the casein to increase in a slightly faster proportion than the fat. In two illustrations he shows the increase in casein per 100 lbs. of milk of 3 and 4 per cent. fat respectively, as follows:

(Lb. of fat in 100 lbs. of milk.)	(Lb. of casein in 100 lbs. of milk.)
No. 1.....3.	2
No. 2.....4.	2.67 (=2 $\frac{2}{3}$).

Then he shows in the following table what the different milks are worth if paid for according to quality, at a value of 25 cents per lb. for fat and 2 cents per lb. for casein:

No. 1.	
Three lbs. of fat, at 25c.....	75c.
Two lbs. of casein, at 2c.....	4c.
Total.....	79c.

No. 2.	
Four lbs. of fat, at 25c.....	100 c.
Two and two-thirds lbs. of casein, at 2c.....	5 $\frac{1}{3}$ c.
Total.....	105 $\frac{1}{3}$ c.

Difference in favor of No. 2..... 26 $\frac{2}{3}$ c.

And also in the following table he shows the value of these milks under the pooling system:

100 lbs. of milk of No. 1 contain 3 lbs. of fat.

" " " " " 2 " " " 4 " "

200 " " " " 1 and 2 contain 7 lbs. of fat.

7 lbs. of fat at 25 cents = \$1.75.

One hundred lbs. of each kind of milk is received; therefore, No. 1 would be worth 87 $\frac{1}{2}$ cents, No. 2 would be worth 87 $\frac{1}{2}$ cents. Thus proving that a person supplying 100 lbs. of No. 1 milk would get 12 $\frac{1}{2}$ cents that should go to the person supplying No. 2 milk.

A number of experiments were carried on at Perth, Ont., under the direction of Prof. Robertson, and under the immediate charge of Mr. J. A. Riddick, who is thoroughly practical, and accurate and careful in everything he undertakes.

It will take up too much space to give the details of this work. From a large number of experi-