

as well be eating the flap of an old saddle. Besides the lambs of the year, the males of which are never castrated, the only mutton one sees in the country-towns is the carcasses of old ewes, or of rams in the spring. No wonder people declare against mutton. If, however, they could once taste a short-woolled wether of, say, eighteen months old, they would quickly change their ideas of the palatability of the meat. Nothing finer can be eaten; it is succulent, full of flavour, fat enough for all purposes, and tender. In England, instead of being cheaper than beef, as it is here, short-woolled mutton invariably fetches from three to four cents a pound more than the best Scots, Herefords, and Welsh beef. As my friend Mr. William Hale of Sherbrooke announces his intention of "going in for" Hampshire downs, my readers in the Townships will have an opportunity of judging for themselves as to the value of this particular breed. As to the Shropshire-downs, they all, or most of them, must have seen Mr. Cochrane's fine flock at Hillhurst, as well as his Ox-fords. The latter breed are certainly magnificent sheep, but to a regular *Down man* they look too much like long-wools to be favourites, retaining very largely the proportions, coat, and colour of their Cotswold progenitors. If Mr. Hale has not yet acquired a Hampshire ram, I recommend him strongly to pay a visit to Mr. Wood of Mount Kisco, New York, portraits of some of whose sheep appeared in a late number of the Journal.

*Prosperity of Agriculture.*—What queer ideas some people have of what constitutes prosperity in farming. The Graphic, of London, says, in a recent number: Agriculture shows little signs of taking fresh hope. Wages are lower, rents are lower, prices of fat beasts and fat sheep are higher. From which statements I deduce the following conclusion, viz., that the Graphic looks at the question of agricultural prosperity from a purely landlord's point of view. For, if what the farmer has to buy—land and labour—is cheap, and what he has to sell—beef and mutton—is dear, it must be clear to every one that he must be doing well. What nonsensical rubbish even such papers as the Graphic do admit into their columns.

*Potatoes.*—All the potatoes in this neighbourhood gave up growing by the second week in August. Lots of small tubers but none of any size. Land, in consequence, very foul, as the absolute absence of the shade afforded by the tops, gave full liberty to the weeds to spread as they pleased. Well, the horse-hoeing *between* the rows is now fairly attended to by most of our farmers, and I do not despair, with time, of persuading them to give a little attention to hand hoeing *in* the rows. At present, they won't hear of it, and almost boast of neglecting it.

*Too much land.*—If a man has a couple of islands to look after, an off-lying farm, in hay, to manage, besides his own home-farm of 180 acres; is it likely all the three can be well done by?

Such is the case of one of my friends here, and the consequence is that during the proprietor's absence—haymaking—at the two off-farms, the root-crops on the home-farm were neglected. The growth of weeds during the three first weeks of August exceeded anything I ever saw; and the cost of eradicating them was about double what it would have been had the attack been made when they were in their infant state.

*Cheese.*—Cheese in England, at the end of August, was

worth 9 $\frac{1}{2}$  cents, and in Montreal 9 cents. Would  $\frac{1}{8}$  of a cent pay c. f. and i. to say nothing of commission and profit?

*Superphosphate.*—This manure is cheaper and cheaper still in England, but the price here remains unchanged.

English superphos., guaranteed, 26  $\frac{1}{10}$ ...\$10.60 per 2000 lbs.  
Canadian do not guaranteed, 26  $\frac{1}{10}$ ... 26.00

Balance..... \$15.40

Well, if the manufacturer can get such a price I do not blame them for making such a charge; only it seems to me an absurd weakness on the part of the farmers to go on paying it. The truth is, I suppose, that so little is used that it is not worth while bothering about it.

*Prickly Comfrey again.*—A gentleman of good repute writes me word from Edenbridge, Kent, Eng., that he has succeeded well with this much abused crop. Will Mr. William Hale kindly let my readers know how his comfrey has turned out? I know he was growing it in 1880, but I have heard nothing about it since.

ARTHUR R. JENNER FUST.

#### FEEDING CALVES.

Prof. W. A. Henry, of the University of Wisconsin, gives the following summary of the results of elaborate experiments carried on by him in calf-feeding:

In a study of these tables we note that the young calves made the largest gains for the food consumed, which is in accordance with established facts.

To ascertain the value of the milk fed it is assumed that each pound of growth is worth four cents, and that hay is worth \$8, oil meal \$25 bran \$12 and ensilage \$3 per ton, and oats 32 cents per bushel, or a cent a pound. Charging these prices for all that the calves ate, we get the value of the food other than the milk consumed. By subtracting this sum from the value of the increased weight at four cents per pound, we have left the sum to the credit of the skim-milk. In the last column we have the value of the skim-milk per 100 quarts as returned by each calf in accordance with the above assumptions. This it will be seen varies from less than nothing with the last calf, in the second trial, to 71 cents per 100 quarts with the fourth calf in the first trial.

Two of the calves were sold before the expiration of the trial, so that the average period is in fact twenty-one weeks instead of twenty-two.

The average return from the six calves for the whole period of twenty-one weeks, after allowing for all other food articles consumed at the prices before named, is 48 cents per 100 quarts of skim-milk, or about 24 cents per 100 pounds.

Whether the assumptions that lead to the above conclusion are correct or not, each reader can easily settle in his own mind; the prices allowed for the food articles are certainly high enough, and a gain of 100 pounds in the weight of a calf would seem low enough at \$4. If the value of these several articles is reduced, then the value of the skim-milk rises proportionally. I am confident from experiments made that 100 pounds of growth cannot be made for \$4 when the calf is allowed to suck the cow. Twenty-four cents for 100 pounds may not seem a very high price for skim-milk; yet with the present prices for cheese, full-milk at the factory can scarcely realize over 50 cents per 100 pounds to the producer.

These six calves together gained 1,544 pounds, or over three-quarters of a ton in twenty-one weeks, being an average of over 12 pounds each per week.