

Lambs Dying From Swallowing Wool.

Nun bers of lambs everywhere die from obstruction and inflammation of the bowels caused by the swallowing of wool; which, although taken up only in small quantities at a time, gets agglutinated and rolled into considerable balls, on which each lock or thread of wool is rolled until one or two of these foreign bodies block the orifice opening from the true stomach into the bowels, or are lodged in the small intestines, causing spasms and by-and-by inflammation which is evidently difficult to relieve. Hair balls of a similar character and producing similar injurious effects occur in calves from their licking themselves and their neighbors, and also occasionally in horses. But the wool which has apparently destroyed your neighbor's and your own lambs is not, as you suppose, licked up from the grass. More commonly it is pulled from the udder and belly of the dam by the hungry lamb whilst vigorously seeking its early food. The obvious remedy, so frequently had recourse to, is the trimming away of any wool from the udder and belly of the ewe immediately before or after lambing. To relieve the lambs which have already swallowed such portions of wool, and which are recognised by dullness, abdominal fulness, and ineffectual diarrhoea, they should have small doses twice a week of castor-oil and laudanum, which will gently move the bowels, and will bring away the balls of wool, if they have not become too large to pass along the narrower portions of the canal. A long cold spring, such as we have experienced, increases the mortality from this as from so many other diseases; the weakly lambs are unable to bear up against any untoward condition. The ewes, besides having little milk, their off-spring come often and vainly pulling at the empty vessel, are thus more apt to have mouthfuls of the dangerous wool. *North British Agriculturist.*

Cutting off the Tails of Lambs—Shearing.

In reading a letter in your last issue, from my friend, D. H. Thing, of Mount Vernon, Me., on "Lambs and Calves," I was very much interested, and agreed with him in all but one thing, and that is in regard to cutting off the tails of the lambs. I have become convinced that cutting off the tail is injurious for several reasons, which I will state. First, it is a barbarous treatment to a little, tender lamb; it also weakens the constitution by taking from it a portion of the spine or backbone. Secondly, it deprives them of what nature has wisely given them to protect the bag from the scorching rays of the sun, which prevents the bag from becoming sore and scabby; it also deprives them of the means of brushing flies and all annoying insects from their bag and legs; but, as a matter of economy, there is a loss in the amount of wool. My shearer told me he would shear any flock of sheep for what wool was on the tail up to where it is usually cut off, which would amount to about ten cents, the price of one-fourth of a pound of wool, which is really quite a per cent. I have, for a few years past, sheared my sheep from the first to the middle of April. I am satisfied that they will do better than to let them run into warm weather. It frees them from ticks, and if there are any on the lambs, one can get them off before going to the pasture. Another advantage is, the wool, before it is exposed to the spring rains, is heavier with gluten, which makes a large per cent. difference in the weight, and as the manufacturer finds no fault—the wool working better—it is better to retain it. Some of our fancy breeders here are adopting this system of shearing in April. From some cause, unknown to me, farmers have lost a great many lambs this spring, not from the poor condition of the sheep, but from some cause unaccountable, some of our best and fattest sheep doing well with their lambs until two months old—at that age they grow weak and languid, and die.

Up to this date but little has been done in the farming line, only here and there a piece of wheat or oats sown. Grass has wintered well and is looking promising for a good crop.—*H. G. Abbott, in N. E. Farmer.*

Cruelty to Sheep.

The *Pall Mall Gazette* says: "An interesting question was raised in a case which came before the Woodbury police court, near Exeter, on Monday, when a butcher of Sedmouth was charged with cruelty to a sheep. It appears that the defendant bought some sheep at an auction and with a pair of shears cut off the tops of their ears, in some cases cutting off as much as half the ear. He did this to "mark them". It was urged in defence that it is the usual custom among farmers and butchers to mark sheep in this way. A veterinary surgeon said the sheep suffered little or no pain, the vessels being few and small in the ear. Ladies had their ears pierced for rings and did not suffer from the operation. He (the veterinary surgeon) "would not mind having part of his own ears cut off". It was less painful, he added, to the sheep to cut

off their ears than their tails. The defendant was nevertheless fined £5, much to the surprise, it is stated, of several farmers and butchers present. There is certainly no evidence to prove that, although the veterinary surgeon would not mind having his ears clipped, the sheep were equally indifferent to this disfigurement and the annoyance attendant on the operation. Moreover, the fact that ladies having their ears pierced, is no argument in favour of cutting off sheep's ears. Any proposal on the part of husbands to nip off their wives' ears for the purpose of distinguishing them from other people's wives, would, it may be imagined, be received with disapproval, and increase the animosity with which man is regarded by woman."

We never did believe it right to inflict the cruelty of docking or cutting off the tails of either colts, hogs or sheep.

Profits of Mutton Shrep.

A correspondent of the *Practical Farmer*, residing within twenty five miles of Philadelphia, states that one of his certain and reliable sources of profits from year to year is keeping sheep. When I first began farming twenty years ago, he writes, I depended entirely upon Southdowns. They have always proved with me prolific breeders, capital nurses, hardy and good feeders, and my Southdown mutton ranks on the market with "gilt edge" butter. I inform my regular customers when I am going to have a fine leg or loin of pure Southdown, and they go off fast at three to five cents above the market price. In fact, Southdown mutton is the best mutton in the world.

If quality of meat was the only desideratum, I would make no change, but as coarser wools now bring the highest price, and as perhaps I gain a little in the weight, of which I am not altogether certain, but at least do not lose any, I have made one cross on my flock of one hundred ewes with the Cotswold. The best result and the finest carcass have resulted where the Southdown buck was used on the Cotswold ewe. I do not want any finer sheep than this makes, and I try to keep them for my purpose one half Southdown and one half Cotswold. What lambs I have to spare are all sold in advance to your butchers at about eight dollars per head. I raise roots, which I consider are indispensable in the sheep business, and with good management I have the lambs in the market in March and April. I consider the roots make a good substitute for grass, keep them in good heart and with fine health for early pasture. It promotes the flow of milk and appetite. I have always followed the advice in your paper to keep all my animals healthy and thriving. If they once go down or become stunted, much of one's feed is thrown away. Two-thirds of my ewes usually have twins. With lambs at eight to nine dollars each, and wool at fifty cents per pound, your readers can figure up my profits on one hundred ewes.

Crossing for Improvement of Common Sheep.

A correspondent asks us the following question:—"What is the best cross upon our common sheep for quality and quantity of wool, for the general market, and for weight of carcass?"

This inquiry can be replied to from so many standpoints, that an opinion in favor of either of the recognized breeds requires certain explanations. A cross of the long-wool—say Cotswold, Leicester or Lincoln—will insure an increase of carcass to nearly or quite double the value of the common, or native, dam. The fleece will have additional length, considerable improvement in style, and a perceptible increase in weight. The improvement in length and luster will add to its market value.

A cross of middle wool—say Southdown, Shropshire, etc., will add greatly to the quality of the meat, somewhat less, though considerable, to its quantity; will thicken somewhat the fleece, and give it slight additional weight, without adding much to its value per pound.

A cross of the American Merino, will make a marked improvement in fleece—adding to all its desirable characteristics, except that of length. The weight, in many instances, will be doubled, while in any other than an anomalous condition of the market, the value per pound will be somewhat increased. The size of carcass will not be increased, though its compactness and symmetry of outline will be greatly improved.

With the average farmer the more satisfactory results will be secured by a cross with the long-wool breed, or the fine wools. The one will show its chief improvements in the carcass, the other in the fleece—though the merits of neither will be confined to these prominent characteristics.

As a rule, the least satisfactory results will be derived from a cross with the "Downs"—this, not from any defect in the breed, *per se*, but rather from less diversity in size in the one, and character of fleece in the other. Sheep from this cross may reasonably be expected to withstand the hardships, sometimes privation, incident to the lot of the flock when compelled to work its living off the average farm, with better results than would be realized from a long-wool cross similarly treated—and, for "roughing it," would prove nearly equal to the results of the Merino cross.

In view of these considerations, added to some minor

ones, that may be classed as results of taste rather than experience, as a general proposition, we would advise a cross of the Merino in preference to the others referred to—always with the recommendation that the best rams within reach of the means of the flock-owner be used—and that none of the male animals of the cross be used as sires, no matter how near the desired standard they may approach.—*N. L. Stock Journal.*

Cows, says the *North Carolina Journal*, have almost become the medium of exchange hereabouts since the scarcity of money. A thin cow passes for \$8, a cow in good winter order goes for \$10, and a bang-up fat cow is \$13. In time we presume calves will be used for small change.

CURIOUS LAMMING INCIDENT.—During the present lambing season at Borthaugh, Roxburghshire, a five year old Cheviot ewe dropped a lamb on the 17th of April, which lived till Saturday the 13th of May, when it died. The shepherd then found another lamb, which the ewe accepted and nursed. On the 14th of May, just twenty-seven days after she had dropped the first, the ewe gave birth to another lamb, which is alive and is following and being nursed by its dam along with the set-one.

MIDWINTER PIGS.—According to the *London Field*, the middle-bred pigs are "a something between the large and small sorts—a cross breed for which the Royal Agricultural Society has not found a distinctive title." At present, says the *Field*, there is considerable variety, according to the preponderance, of either sort. The result, however, is a highly useful breed, which finds increasing favor with the tenant farmer. They have size, aptitude to feed, flesh without coarseness, hardy constitution and productiveness. They are equally valuable for pork or bacon. The breed is said to be much liked in England by those who have tested it.

EXPERIMENT IN FEEDING. A writer in the *Kansas Farmer*, in considering the question of how to make money farming, mentions several experiments in feeding stock by men who could not command money to purchase stock. One feeder took 40 head of three-year-old steers, the 20th day of October, to feed, for \$c. per lb. for all the gross weight he could put on till the 20th of February. He had a great deal of soft corn that was not merchantable, and he gave the cattle all they could eat. He fed them four months, consuming about 50 bushels of corn to the steer, and putting 270 lbs. weight upon each animal. This made his corn bring him 42c. per bushel, and he had hogs following his cattle, which will still increase his profits.

WEIGHT OF PIGS FOR MARKET.—It was only a few years ago that swine breeders were vying with each other for the greatest weight of carcass; but this is now all changed. Hogs that will weigh 500 pounds are sold at a less price per pound than those of 250 to 300 pounds. The market in England has long favoured light weights. London is chiefly supplied with pigs of less than 200 pounds weight. And this tendency of the market to pigs, well fattened, but of small weight, is just what the farmer should encourage, for it is exactly in the line of his interest. It costs more to make the second hundred pounds of a pig than the first, and still more to make the third hundred pounds, and so every pound added becomes more expensive.—*Wallace's Monthly.*

PEAS FOR CATTLE.—A. W. Stokes, Hernando, Miss., says: I have for years kept fatter cows and had more milk and butter, and for less money, than anybody I know of. First—I sow peas broadcast, three pecks to a bushel per acre, in the month of May, harrowing them in after breaking the ground well; then, in September, I pull them up just when a few begin to dry, and make hay out of the vines and peas. I get from 4,000 to 5,000 pounds per acre of hay that is eaten by cattle and horses as eagerly as if it were the best clover. Pulling up is far preferable to mowing, as cattle seem to love the roots better than the tops, and it is said to be more nutritious. No manuring is necessary, and one acre in sowed peas is worth six of fodder.

RAW V. COOKED ROOTS AS FOOD FOR CATTLE.—Dr. E. Wolff, a German chemist, reports the following experiments in feeding roots to cattle. Two cows were experimented on, which together weighed 1,650 lbs. They received daily, during the whole time, 8½ lb. of hay, 31 lb. of oat straw, 4½ lb. rapeseed cake, 4½ lb. of lentil straw, and the roots mentioned in the following table, which also gives the weight of butter and milk produced in the several cases.—

Week of Experiments	Food.	Milk per week.	Butter.	Milk to 1 lb. Butter.
First, Raw beet	82½	248½	6½	30
Second, raw potatoes	82½	282½	6½	42
Third, cooked beet	12½	288½	9½	30
Fourth, cooked potatoes	82½	218½	9½	27

From the above it will be seen that cooked potatoes greatly increased the butter, without adding so much to the volume of the milk as raw ones, which made the milk of a thin and watery appearance.—*Eng. Ag. Gazette.*