

3 stones 2 lbs. Again, suppose a calf, sheep, &c., should measure 4 feet 6 inches in girth, and 3 feet 9 inches in length, which multiplied together makes 16½ square feet; that multiplied by 16, the number of pounds allowed to all cattle measuring less than five feet, and more than 3 in girth, makes 264 lbs.; which, divided by 14, to bring it to stones, is 18 stones 12 lbs. The dimensions of the girth and length of black cattle, sheep, calves, or hogs, may be as exactly taken this way as it is at all necessary for any computation or valuation of stock, and will answer exactly to the four quarters, sinking the offal, and which every man who can get even a bit of chalk may easily perform. A deduction must be made for a half-fatted beast of 1 stone in 20 from that of a fat one, and for a cow that has had calves, 1 stone must be allowed, and another for not being properly fat.

FOUNDER.

A spasmodic contraction of the muscles and viscera of the belly, which, without any other apparent disease, causes the horse to droop and lose his appetite. The founder horse is shrunken and hollow—his hair is rough—his discharges are black and dry. It will be necessary to give him repeated injections—make him drink large quantities of warm water—feed him on moistened bran, with a little hay—and awaken his appetite by all possible means. He should be exercised, but not fatigued. A founder is sometimes caused by extreme fatigue, and it may be then necessary to bleed, especially if it is accompanied by fever. A founder sometimes falls upon the feet and legs, principally upon the vertical tissue of the foot; it runs its course in a shorter or a longer time—hence the distinctions between the acute and the chronic forms of the disease. The acute is always accompanied by fever, and sometimes causes the loss of the hoof. It frequently produces a deposition of watery or spongy matter, between the hoof and the fleshy part of the foot. The chronic founder causes the hoof to grow out of shape in a variety of forms. The animal attacked by this form of the disease, has his legs stiff—he walks with difficulty—is unwilling to move—and places his feet so as to rest upon his heels. The affected hoofs are very hot, and the muscles of the leg tremble.

Hard driving, on a rough or frozen road—too long inactivity in the stable—resting too much upon one foot, when the other has some disease or hurt—green food, or too much grain—bad shoeing—a sudden cold—drinking too much cold water, when he is warm, are the most common causes of this disease. Those horses that have naturally thin hoofs, and consequently tender feet, are the most liable to it. The shoes should be removed—the stall thickly littered with straw and the horse put upon a strict diet. He should be bled—his legs bathed in cold water—and poultices, made of soot mixed up with vinegar, or clay mixed up with water in which green vitriol has been dissolved—scarifications round the top of the hoof—stimulating frictions to the legs—and purgatives, will furnish the proper treatment in these cases when recent. In an old and chronic case, the hoof should be pared or rasped, wherever it is thickened, and softening poultices, as those of flax-seed, applied; and the horse should take biters and strengthening medicines inwardly—but if it has been of long standing, it is difficult to effect a cure.

[NOTE.—Recently, the operation of cutting the nerve which gives sensation to the foot, has come into practice. It is doubtful, however, whether this is advisable in all cases of founder.]—[Manual of Vet. Medicine.

IMPROVEMENT OF CLAYEY AND SANDY SOILS.—Old Boissinault knows a thing or two, (says Abraham Smith in the Western Cultivator.) but he has not satisfied practical farmers how he might supply the defect of clay in sandy soil, and sand in clayey soil. May I venture to hint in homespun language? It is well known that there are certain vegetable matters that are quickly decomposed, such as ripe timothy, eye straw, &c. It is also well known that the defect in sandy soils is, principally, that the land lacks adhesion, and is too quick a conductor of heat and air, while the reverse is the defect in clay. Hence the remedy is indicated. With a clay soil, plow in hard woody substances, as ripe timothy, and plow in the fall. On a soil too sandy, plow under green manure, and plow at the time that the vegetable matter is full of sap, say clover in blossom, or oats just beginning to head. Chemists can tell us why and wherefore, and a practical farmer may see the effect if he will try

WEIGHT OF GRAINS.—The following we clip from a St. Louis paper, showing the weight at which the several grains and other articles therein mentioned are taken:—Wheat, pounds to the

bushel, 60; beans, 60; clover seed, 60; potatoes, 60; rye, 56; corn, 56; flax seed, 56; onions, 57; buckwheat seed, 52; salt, 50; barley, 48; castor beans, 46; hemp seed, 44; timothy seed, 45; oats, 25; bran, 20; blue grass seed, 14; dried peaches, 33; dried apples, 24; stone coal, 70.

A GOOD AND DURABLE PASTE.—Dissolve about an ounce of alum in a quart of warm water, when cold and add as much flour as will make it the consistency of cream; then strew on as much powdered resin as will stand on a shilling, and two or three cloves, hold it to a consistency during all the time. It will keep for twelve months, and when dry, may be softened with water.

CANADA FARMER.

May 22, 1847.

THE BRITISH AMERICAN CULTIVATOR.

"Two of a trade can never agree" is a popular maxim which we were foolish enough to think we would be able to falsify. When we conceived the project of publishing the *Canada Farmer* we were perfectly aware of the existence of the *British American Cultivator*; of the talent of its editor (especially at English composition); of the firm hold it had secured upon the public, by means of what may be called a "Church and State connexion" with the Agricultural Societies, and of various other matters, "too numerous to mention," as the advertisements say; but, instead of regarding this journal as an obstacle in our way, we were for some time of opinion that it would be much to our advantage; that it had created a taste for agricultural reading; had convinced the farmers generally of the great benefit to be derived from a journal devoted to their interests exclusively, and of the propriety of supporting such in preference to mercantile or political journals; had, in a word, "prepared the soil," so that we would have little to do but cast in the seed! We find, however, to our great discouragement, that we were grievously mistaken. One of our agents wrote us the other day that he saw no prospect of success in that part of the country for the present, and he gave us the reason, "that the farmers in that vicinity had become so disgusted with the *British American Cultivator*, that there was no use in asking them to subscribe for an agricultural paper, the very name was enough." As a proof of the extent of the feeling, he said that a year or two ago, 250 copies of the *British American Cultivator* came to that office, (he is a postmaster) but that this year there were not 20 copies! The same difficulty has met us in other places, so that our readers will perceive "a change" has, of necessity, "come o'er the spirit of our dream," but still we have not come to the conclusion that what is *past* can be mended, or any thing of importance gained in the future, by finding fault with the "management" of that paper, or "attacking" the Editor thereof; and we are certainly unconscious of having done so. We saw plainly that the evil would cure itself; that though people might swallow "trash and nonsense" for a while, they would not always do so, especially if something better could be had. We were therefore not a little surprised to find such sentences as the following in the number for the present month:—

"In the March number they put forth structures on our management which, we think, might as well have been omitted" "the article upon which these Editors have made assertions so groundless, and, perhaps, many will think so ungentlemanly, &c."

"In the April number of the above paper the learned Editors have thought proper to make three most unwarrantable attacks upon us, and, indeed, their short career has been pointedly marked with a factious spirit of opposition to the conductor of this Magazine."

Now, really it is too bad for this "dog in the manger" to show his teeth so horridly on so slight a provocation; he has been some time thinking about it, we admit,

for the remarks which have so offended and irritated his "dogship" appeared in our number of the 12th of March, and the above "articles" did not see the light until two months afterwards. Our readers will recollect (and if any do not, we beg they will turn, when they have leisure, to our "leader" in the agricultural department of that number, headed "Maple Sugar") that our allusions to the *Cultivator* were anything but ungentlemanly, and that we said not one word about his "management." We quoted some statements of his—said "we entirely dissented from them," and gave one or two reasons for doing so. Is the Editor so thin-skinned that he must fly into a passion because others venture to differ from his opinions, and to declare that his conclusions are wholesale and his promises unsound? But what is the use of arguing with a man who does not appear to know what he intends to prove, nor the meaning of his own language.

What was the *Cultivator* endeavouring to the best of his ability no doubt, to show in the article from which we quoted? The advantage of producing our sugar at home instead of importing it. How did he go to work to show this. By bringing forward facts to prove that we can produce it cheaper than we can import it! no such thing. "We are of opinion that sugar can be" &c., is all that bears upon that point of the question. But as to the value of the sugar imported, compared with that of the wheat and flour exported by us, a thing entirely collateral to the main question, he makes an abundance of remark. Now, "we are of opinion" that it makes very little difference as to the principle involved, whether we consume one thousand, or one hundred thousand pounds worth of imported sugar every year. To put the principle we allude to, in the plainest possible shape, for we fear that the *Cultivator's* acquaintance with the principles of political economy is such as to require plainness, let us suppose that a farmer, who subscribes to the *Cultivator*, and has implicit confidence in its doctrines, takes it into his head to make his own sugar; he has no maple trees, or if he has, he finds that the sap, as many found this spring, "wont run". He plants the sugar beet, weeds, hoes, and pulls them; scrapes and presses them; boils and purifies the juice, and at last gets it into sugar. He makes 500 lbs., and upon counting the cost he finds it to amount to 1s. per pound. With the same labour and expense he could have raised 200 bushels of wheat more than he did raise, in consequence of his time being occupied with the sugar. This would have brought him \$200, with which he could have purchased the same amount of sugar and had \$150 to spare! Has he gained or lost by the "home production." Let the *Cultivator* answer. Bear in mind, we do not assert that our figures would be borne out by experiment, we only suppose a case. We believe that the farmer would lose more than we have supposed, by such an operation. But if he loses at all the principle applies, and if it applies to the individual, it will apply to communities, and to nations. We went so far as to recommend experiments to "test the feasibility of making sugar on a large scale from the products of Canadian soil," and we laid down the "principle" just illustrated, in these words, "It is good policy to produce at home as many of the articles of home consumption as we can, provided we do not spend more time and incur more expense, than if applied to some other object would enable us to purchase from others." We now retract even the above recommendation, for upon investigation, we find that a sufficient number of experiments have already been made in the Northern States, in a climate more favourable than ours, to show that it is utterly impracticable to make sugar from the beet with profit.

The great burden of the *Cultivator's* article is upon the question whether for the past ten years our imports of sugar did not cost us more than our exports of wheat and flour

would pay for! Did we ever raise such a question? Not at all. We made no reference to the *past* because he made none. We quoted his own language, and quoted it fairly. We will give another extract from the same article: "If Canada could by any process place herself in a position to be independent of other countries for sugar," "so far as the actual wealth of the country is concerned the gain would be equal to the surplus products of wheat." Does not this look to the future? Is there anything retrospective in it? The same idea is repeated six or seven times in about half a column, but not a word does he say about the past. It was not to make provision for years gone by, but for the future, that his advice was given. The present and the future tenses were used, and no others. We denied his statement with regard to what "would be gained," and we gave us proof of the absurdity of this conclusion the returns of a single port for the last year, leaving every reader to judge, which every reader is capable of doing, whether our exports of wheat will be likely to diminish. We showed a balance of £200,000 in our favour at the port of Toronto for the last year, and we wished that to be placed alongside of his statement that "as important as is the export of wheat from Canada, still that portion of this article that is really the growth of Canada would fall short in a series of ten or fifteen years of supplying the country with sugar." But what will the reader think of the truth and honesty of this wonderful writer and compiler of "schedules," when to effect his paltry purpose he will belie himself and misquote his own words? "Our statement was," says he, "and we firmly adhere to it, notwithstanding the would-be-thunder attempted to be hurled (!) at us 'that in a series of ten or fifteen years the wheat which we have exported would fall short of supplying this country with sugar.'" No such thing. Such a statement is not contained in the whole issue of nonsense which composes his "article." And how does the reader suppose he undertakes to prove this last assertion? By showing "that there was imported into Great Britain of wheat from the British Colonies! in '36, '37, and '38, none; in '39, twenty-seven quarters; and in '40, 8,192 quarters; and that there was imported from Great Britain into these colonies" during the same time 1,857,936 bushels, "and we have," says this Solomon of wisdom, "1,792,183 bushels, being the excess of our imports over exports—so that in this series of years we had no surplus wheat to pay for sugar." Was there ever before an Editor who could find money to pay for printing, and people to read such nonsense as this! Will not the man see that it is not the "imports of Great Britain" that are in question, nor the exports of the "British colonies"? The exports and imports of Canada are the subject of discussion; and if he will look into our seventh number, he will find in an article headed "Our Surplus Grain" a tabular statement of the exports by sea from Montreal and Quebec for the last nine years. This table is taken, we believe, from an annual circular, published by Douglass & Glass, Montreal, merchants. Their statistics being obtained from the proper source, may be relied upon. In 1838, when, as he makes his readers believe, we exported none, he will find that we exported 59,204 barrels of flour; and in 1840, when he says we only exported 8,192 quarters, we exported 315,612 barrels of flour, and 142,059 bushels of wheat. During the last 9 years, exclusive of '47, it appears that we have sent down the St. Lawrence nearly sixteen millions of bushels (ground and unground). A small portion of this may have been the growth of the Western States. Whether the sugar we have imported during this "series of years" cost us 14 or 15 millions of dollars we leave to the *Cultivator* and his "schedules" to prove. But this is not the question we only refer to it to show that a writer who mistakes Great Britain for Canada and Canada for the "British colonies," (