for the ensuing year, viz.: Messrs. Jonnson, Stone, Fergusson, and Dr. Richmond. The result of our appeal was only known through the press, by which we learned that Messrs. Christie, Burnham, Fergusson, and Richmond, had been selected; but through the kindness of D. Stirton, Esq., M.P.P. for this county, I received a list from the office of the Bureau of Agriculture, showing how the vote was cast, and as I think it would be well for all concerned to know by what majority the above gentlemen were elected. I proceed to give the names and figures, viz.: Messrs. Christie, 26; Burnham, 24; Fergusson, 41; Dr. Richmond, 37; Johnson, 20; Stone, 24; besides six other gentlemen who received 1 and 2 votes each. In looking over the returns, I found 18 Societies whose vote had not been recorded, which seemed rather strange after what had taken place in regard to the election. I therefore addressed a note to the Secretaries of those Societies, asking for information as to how they voted, and where the resolutions passed at their general meetings nominating members to the Board of Agriculture were sent. The Secretaries, with the exception of four, have kindly answered my enquiries, and have enabled me to make the following statement as to how the election would have terminated had the votes of the 14 out of the 18 Societies been correctly recorded. I may state that some of the Secretaries sent their communications to the Board of Agriculture, Toronto, and some direct to the Minister of Agriculture at Quebec. Why their votes were not taken account of is a matter for them to enquire into. Had all the votes been recorded, the result would have been as follows. Messrs. Christie, 30; Burnham, 27; Fergusson, 50; Richmond, 41; Stone, 30; Johnson, 26. Five out of the fourteen did not vote at all. It will therefore be seen that the contest would have been a close one, and I sincerely hope the action this Society took may lead to a more satisfactory mode of electing members of the Board of Agriculture. In conclusion, I would beg to return, in behalf of this Society, grateful acknowledgments to those Societies who co-operated with us in our endeavours, and trust they will continue their efforts in furtherance of the same object.

GEO. MURTON,
Guelph, Aug. 8th, 1865. Sec. S. R. W. A. S.

SUMMER-FATTENED HOGS.—On this subject "Farmer" writes as follows: For several months there has appeared in your paper, communications from the various pork packing establishments of Hamilton, sometimes full of very disinterested advice to farmers, as to how they should fatten and upon what food—at other times, when to sell—and in a multitude of suggestions urging us to have a supply of fat hogs for "summer curing." I should like to hear from some of them, what the poor simpleton of a farmer, who has taken their advice, is to do with his hundred fat pigs this summer. From all the enquiries I have made, I cannot find that there is any one in Hamilton, and in Toronto only one person (Mr. Cuff) ready or willing to purchase a single grunter from May to September. The consequence is that those tending to obesity will most assuredly smother themselves in their own lard this hot weather, and thus prove a *dead* loss to their feeders. If some of those gentlemen will advertise the number of hogs they can kill, and the price at which they will contract, the pork will be forthcoming, if the terms offered are likely to be remunerative."

SEX OF THE OFFSPRING INFLUENCED BY THE STATE OF THE DAM.—On this subject "A. Bellwood," of Clarke, writes as follows:—"Having had an extensive practice in the raising of stock, I have noted the fact that cows which are served early in the season, and with milk in the bag, invariably produce heifer calves; while those served late, and without milk, usually produce male calves. I am satisfied that these results are not from mere chance, but are governed by some fixed law of nature. I should like to know if any of your readers have noted similar results, or can throw any light on the subject."

ANS.—We commend the above communication to the special attention of such of our readers as are engaged in practical breeding. The subject belongs to the most difficult points of animal physiology, and modern researches have done but little towards eliciting definite or reliable information. If our correspondent's experience should be confirmed by that of others, some clue may be afforded for unravelling this complicated and mysterious matter. We shall be happy to make room for opinions and judgments that may be based on correct observation or experiment.

A FINE SAMPLE OF GOOSEBERRIES.—"James Corbett," of South Oshawa, writes: I send you a sample of gooseberries, composed of the following varieties: Globe Seedling, Red Rover, and Whitesmith. The mammoth seedling I sent you last year was as good or better than last year, bearing very early, but is now past. The above samples are of my own raising, and are good producers, and free from mildew.

ANS.—We thank our correspondent for affording us the opportunity of testing the qualities of his fruit. The gooseberries were very large, and finely developed, and the flavour unexceptionable. A connoisseur friend, who happened to pay us a visit shortly after the sample came to hand, expressed the opinion that it was equal to anything produced in the "old country." We should like to know what special system he pursued to produce such results.

BEE SWARMING EXTRAORDINARY.—W. H. P., of Toronto, writes: "I enclose you a slip cut from the *Devon Weekly Times* (English paper), of June 9th, 1865, respecting bees, thinking it might be worth insertion in your journal.

Mr. R. Hammond, a respected yeoman, of the parish of Silverton, has had extraordinary swarms of bees this summer. From one stock alone he has had four swarms (from the Friday to the Monday week following)—a circumstance almost unheard of in bee history.

"There is nothing in this which cannot be accounted for by a practical bee keeper, but it is certainly rather unusual to have bees so strong in the old country as to throw off four swarms in the time mentioned. If you would like to receive a few practical letters on bee management, from one who has made them his study for some years, I would be happy to write them, in order to contribute to the general stock of knowledge on the subject."

ANS.—We shall be happy to receive the proposed communications on bee-keeping.


# The Canada Farmer.

TORONTO, UPPER CANADA, AUGUST 15, 1865.


## Carcase and Fleece.

WE invite the attention of our readers generally, and especially those interested in sheep husbandry, to an able and elaborate report which appears on another page, and embodies the results of the investigations of a committee of the New York Wool Growers' Association, into the comparative merits of a lot of scoured fleeces, entered for competition at the recent State Wool Show. The lot comprised fourteen Merino fleeces, and one Cotswold, and while it is to be regretted that the assortment was not larger and more varied, the results of the exhibition are most valuable and instructive. The committee have evidently spared no pains in the discharge of the duty entrusted to them, and the thoroughness with which they have done their work, not only redounds to their credit as conscientious and trustworthy judges, but proves how warm an interest, and how keen a competition there is among our American neighbours, in the matter of sheep-breeding.

This examination brings out clearly what has often been affirmed respecting Merino fleeces, viz.: that there is a large percentage of waste, and an enormous shrinkage about them. Thus it will be seen by reference to the table embodied in the report, that the fleeces from the fourteen Merino sheep, weighed 176¾ lbs.,—and after cleansing, only 64½ lbs. In other words, 100 lbs. of fleece contained 64 lbs. of refuse, and only 36 pounds of real wool. The only coarse-woolled sheep shown, a yearling Cotswold ewe, far out-distanced the Merinos in this respect. Its fleece after scouring, gave at the rate of 82 lbs. of wool to 100 lbs. of fleece. In other words, 100 lbs. of Cotswold fleece, contains as much wool as 227 lbs. of Merino fleece. The per centage of shrinkage in the single Cotswold fleece was 18, while in that of the best Merino fleece it was 52. The premium offered was "for the fleece of one year's growth, or thereabouts, which on being cleansed, shall be found to give the greatest weight of wool, in proportion to its time of growth, and to the live weight of the animal." The committee set forth very distinctly the grounds on which their award was given, but there is one point in regard to which there is plainly room for friendly criticism, if not dissent from the conclusion arrived at by them. This point is well put by the *Genesee Farmer*, in some judicious comments on the report under consideration. Our excellent contemporary well observes, that it is a very important matter to decide in such a case, what is the real "live weight." Refering to Mr. Lawes' well-known experiments with various breeds of sheep, he calls attention to the fact that the live weight was determined by taking the *mean* of the weight of the sheep at the commencement, and at the end of the experiment. Instead of this being done at the recent competition, the column headed "weight of animals," gives the weight at the time the fleece was sheared, instead of the mean weight of the sheep during the time the wool was growing. It would have been difficult, if not impossible, to get at this mean weight, but it is manifestly a point of no little importance, and one which must be noted in order to obtain a thoroughly accurate judgment. Thus the Merino ewe to which the premium was given, was two years old, and weighed at the time of shearing, 49 lbs., while the Cotswold ewe was only 1 year and 20 days old, and weighed 99½ lbs., when sheared. Of course the Cotswold did not weigh 99½ lbs., during the whole time her fleece was growing. The *Genesee Farmer* proposes to assume that her weight a year ago was 54 lbs., and that she gradually increased till at shearing time she weighed 99½ lbs. Her mean weight on this supposition would be 52 lbs. Assuming on the other hand, that the prize Merino weighed 25 lbs. a year ago, her mean weight during the time her fleece was growing would be 37 lbs. Our contemporary sums up the matter thus: "Now as she produced 4.75 lbs. of scoured wool, it will be found that 100 lbs. weight of animal would produce less than 12¾ lbs. of wool, while a similar calculation will show that a Cotswold produced for 100 lbs. of average weight of animal, 14 lbs. of scoured wool. So that in point of fact, *the Cotswold produced more wool in proportion to the real weight of animal, than the prize Merino sheep.*" Our Cotswold breeders in this province, will smile with inward satisfaction at this line of argument, and assuredly they have no reason to blush for the result of a competition which tells a tale so creditable to the coarse-woolled varieties of sheep. Our American neighbours have certainly worked up their favourite fine-woolled breed to a high pitch of perfection, and it is only necessary to contrast the portrait of the Canadian first-prize Merino ram, given in our last number, with the portrait of "Gold Drop" in our issue of March 15th, to see how far we are behind them in this respect. In the progress of events, they will pay more attention to the coarser-woolled varieties, and we shall become ambitious to cope with them, in the production of the finer-woolled breeds. The general deduction, with which the report in question concludes, corresponds with what has thus far been the chief, if not the sole object of sheep farming in the United States: "*for the mere purpose of wool-raising, very large sheep are not desirable,*" British and Canadian farmers have always had an eye to carcase as well as fleece. Our American cousins are not a mutton-eating people. We are. Next to our national dish of roast beef, we prize a good roast or a boiled leg of mutton. We feel in this respect, and with far better show of reason, as the Frenchman did in regard to the English aversion to frog-eating, that "our neighbours do not know what is good for themselves." But they are learning, and while no doubt they will keep up their Merinos to the high standard already reached, and if possible out-do themselves, they will by and by be as just and generous to the claims of the butcher and cook, as they are to those of the wool-carder and cloth manufacturer.