

**Scaling Lumber.**

In these enlightened days of standard measures, standard weights, and even standard time, it does seem incongruous that no one fixed rule has been established by law for the buying and selling of so important an article of commerce as the natural products of our timber lands. In many parts of the Eastern Townships there are no less than four different log scales in use, all more or less at variance one with another, while the Provincial Government adds still one more to the list, which is used by them for levying timber dues on leased government timber lands. No doubt contracts can be made according to any one rule agreed upon, and where both contracting parties are fully conversant with the way in which this one peculiar rule will hold out in board measure over log scale no injustice would be done to either, but while all other rules, weights and measures are being for the sake of convenience and simplicity reduced to one acknowledged standard, and this usually a decimal one, it does seem as though there was some peculiar design in keeping up this puzzling state of confusion for the purpose of taking advantage of the unfortunate settler, who finds it difficult enough to master sufficiently for his own protection any one table by which he can measure the contents of his own logs before surrendering them to the insatiable man of the presiding demon of the mill yard. Taking for the rate of example logs of twelve feet in length, and of 8, 12, 24 and 36 inches in diameter, it would appear that the difference in these five tables is not only remarkably great but also that in varying they do so with no apparent regularity.

Log Rules.	Length of Log. Feet.	Diameter of Log. Inches.	Amount in Feet.
Bangor	12	8	33
Oughtred	12	8	28
Scribner	12	8	24
Quebec Government	12	8	24
Doyle's Rule	12	8	16
Bangor	12	12	78
Oughtred	12	12	68
Scribner	12	12	59
Quebec Government	12	12	50
Doyle's Rule	12	12	48
Bangor	12	24	327
Oughtred	12	24	300
Scribner	12	24	303
Quebec Government	12	24	315
Doyle's Rule	12	24	300
Bangor	12	36	770
Oughtred	12	36	692
Scribner	12	36	692
Quebec Government	12	36	710
Doyle's Rule	12	36	786

In following a comparison of the different rules in the above tables, through the various sizes of the logs, it will be seen that in the larger sized logs the discrepancies are not so great as in the small, also that some of those which cut severely on small timber give the best measure on large. This fact is well known to lumber sawyers who use two rules in buying logs, applying which ever suits their purpose best. I have also known those who ship round timber to the United States use the Scribner, or even the Doyle rule for buying logs from the farmers, and sell by and pay the duty on the Bangor scale, by which they gain in actual measure from 250 to 500 feet on every thousand feet bought and sold where the logs are 10, 12 and 14 inches in diameter. Piratical as this undoubtedly is, the case grows worse when we come to the Doyle rule, now much in vogue, and inserted in the later editions (no date) of Scribner's Log Book. In the preface it says, "Doyle's rule for measuring saw-logs has been substituted for Scribner's,

and the whole book has been carefully examined by Daniel Marsh, a practical civil engineer." Now what in the name of common sense does a civil engineer know about how many feet of boards a practical sawyer can cut from a round spruce log? Further on the publisher says, "Hence, after repeated correspondence and consultations with large lumber dealers and practical sawyers in various parts of the country, we have become satisfied that the calculations given in this table are universally considered the only fair measurement for both buyer and seller." Mark you this "correspondence and consultation" is always from *lumber dealers and sawyers*, and so also are the favorable testimonials in the book. Could we but hear the expressions of those who of late years have been driven to cutting even their best butt logs into pulp wood in order to avoid the ruinous measurements of log scales of which but few have the opportunities of understanding, we should say at heart that the Doyle rule was not "universally" approved of. Again, as the Doyle rule is not figured for logs under ten inches in diameter, millers are in the habit of "jumping" the scale of all such as containing 24 feet (for 16 ft. logs). Now if we take an 8-inch, a 9-inch and a 10-inch log and measure them by the Doyle rule, the total result will be 84 feet, while the same logs, scaled by the Bangor rule, will give 164 feet, or nearly 100 per cent. more! In other words it would take about 18 logs of these three sizes to make 1,000 feet of lumber by the Bangor rule, while the Doyle rule would exact about 36 logs for the same amount. Now the only inference that one can draw from these conclusions is, that if the Government continues to refuse to establish a uniform legal scale they must have some interested motive for doing so. W. A. HALE.

**Mr. Drummond's Appeal.**

I would have preferred to leave unnoticed the article on page 343 of your number of November last, referring to the awards in my favor on Ayrshires in Toronto. I find that readers of that article are inclined to look upon it as of a sarcastic turn, not calculated to be either just to the judges of that class, or to their awards. I cannot see why there should be anything but an open acknowledgment of the accuracy of the judges' decision in my case. Although it is not surprising that some of the exhibitors of Ayrshires frequenting western shows should, as usual, endeavor to impress upon judges their astonishment that eastern Ayrshires should get prizes at western shows, although competent judges could not avoid awarding prizes to the best cattle, even if from the east. It may fairly be presumed that those dissatisfied and disappointed were the unsuccessful ones and their friends. They could not be competent judges, nor the disinterested public, inasmuch as the same herd was awarded the first honors at Kingston, Ottawa, Toronto and Hamilton, by different combinations of judges. I have taken information recently in reference to the ability of the judges you referred to, who were strangers to us, and who were independent and careful in examining the proper points of Ayrshire animals, showing a knowledge of their business. Two of them, I am informed, had, for many years, been successful Ayrshire breeders in Scotland, and the third in Western Canada; they are now Western men and respected. The exhibitions were open to public competition. It seems hardly fair that attempts should be made to at all influence

judgment because of the locality, although it may please some to endeavor to get judges who will favor particular persons or sections of Canada. The question of judging is a burning one to some. 'Tis hard to please all! Doubtful remarks in cases where honest, impartial men are chosen as judges, are neither just to judges nor to owners.

Yours truly,

JAMES DRUMMOND,

Park Hill, Petite Cote, Montreal.

The following is the clause complained of by Mr. Drummond:—

"The Ayrshire men found a formidable opponent in Mr. Drummond, of Montreal, and the judges fairly 'took their breath away from them,' by the way they let the prize tickets go east. We assume that the judges were honest and conscientious, and that they were competent, but we must say we have seldom heard more dissatisfaction and disappointment expressed over the work of an awarding committee."

In writing this there was not the slightest intention to throw discredit on the judges, or Mr. Drummond's splendid Ayrshires. On the contrary, we pronounce them "formidable opponents," and assured that the judges were honest and capable, we did not wish to infer or be understood otherwise, and no thought of sarcasm was entertained. We do not understand how any person could construe our remarks, or understand them to mean any way but favorable to Mr. Drummond and the judges. Had we thought Mr. Drummond, or the judges, had acted unfairly, we should certainly have spoken with no uncertain sound. Or, had we considered the judges had made glaring errors, we should have pointed them out. These are undoubtedly the duties of an agricultural paper. A just report by the press is worth much more to the exhibitors of live stock and agricultural implements than their simple appearance on the show grounds. It is most important that these reports be prepared by experienced, honest and practical men—such being our view, we always have a large staff of such men at the greatest shows, especially at the Toronto Industrial, which to-day is the most important live stock show in America, and where nearly all of the principal breeders meet. We are always glad to see good herds come from the eastern countries and provinces, and are also pleased when they are good enough to win in western shows. The eastern sections are sorely in need of good herds, from which the farmers may buy and thus improve their common stock. Such breeders as Messrs. Drummond, Brown, Stewart, Yuill, Jones and Reburn, deserve great credit and encouragement. It is to be regretted that eastern farmers do not patronize them as they ought. What would Canadian agriculture be to-day if it were not for such public-spirited persons as these? Yet, the country generally receives greater benefit from their importations and herds than the breeders do themselves; yet, many farmers grudge them the small profits they make from their pure-bred animals, and either do not patronize them at all or refuse to pay remunerative prices for their stock. No class of men in Canada have done so much toward building up and rendering profitable Canadian agriculture as the fine stock breeders, yet no class of public men have received so little recognition at the hands of the people and the government. Importing and breeding fine stock is a very expensive business, which frequently returns but small profits to the men engaged in it, but from which the country receives great benefits.