

city from eating pickles upon which some Paris green had been blown by the wind, occurred quite recently. It is well settled that arsenic is dangerous even externally, and experiments have proved that its poisonous effects are developed by a smaller amount inserted in a wound than when taken into the stomach."

In the *Journal of Applied Chemistry* for September, 1874, is a case from Dr. Doremus. "Deaths from Paris green," says the *Journal*, "are becoming quite too numerous and frequent. Three persons who partook of lemonade and chow-chow pickle at No. 17, West Fifty-seventh street, New York, on the 19th of July, were soon after taken ill, and on the 21st, one of them, named John Powers, died. His sister died the next day, and Ellen Burbie, the cook, died on the 24th. Portions of the stomach and intestines of each were sent to Dr. Doremus for analysis, and in each case he detected the presence of arsenic and copper; he was therefore of the opinion that death was caused by arsenite of copper, commonly known as Paris green. In reply to a question by the coroner as to how much Paris green would cause death, he said that a very small quantity would be sufficient. A juror asked him whether he thought a grain would kill a man. He said he did, and that he would recommend the jury to warn the public against its use. Professor Doremus also said that he would take that opportunity to earnestly request that the members of the press who were present would impress upon the public the extreme danger of using so violent a poison. As an instance of the danger of using Paris green in any way about dwellings, he cited the case of the poisoning of the whole family of an eminent physician in London by a single loaf of bread, which the baker had placed, while warm, on a shelf that had been painted with Paris green. If a single grain of this poison (the 480th part of an ounce) is sufficient to cause death, it will be seen that a very little of the dust received into the system from time to time is fraught with the most fearful danger to health and life."—*N. Y. Observer*.

There is undoubtedly no little danger in the use of Paris green by persons inexperienced, and many of them, thoughtless of the risks incurred, and all would protest against the present loose use of this fearful poison. But we see no good or sufficient grounds for reversing the opinion given in the April number of the *FARMER'S ADVOCATE*. We repeat we have now had trial of it for some years, without any injurious results from its use. The potatoes have not been thereby rendered injurious to the health of those using them daily, nor has the soil on which they were grown shown the slightest premonitory symptoms of having been poisoned so as to prevent the growth of all vegetation, and experience is no doubtful guide. Professor Croft, well known as no mean authority in science, has examined stalks and tubers, and not the slightest trace of arsenic in the tubers could be detected in either of three trials. This we pointed out in our last issue, in reply to enquiries from "Old Subscriber," in Wellington Co. The minute traces of arsenic detected on or in the stalks may indicate a danger to cattle eating them. This should be guarded against, but their eating potato stalks is of very rare occurrence, and their having access to them under any circumstances should be prevented, irrespective of the use or non-use of any poison, as they are not merely useless but injurious as food.

Paris green, if to be still used for this purpose, should be bought as pure as possible, and mixed with either plaster, flour or water; if with plaster, 1 lb. to not less than 30; if with flour, 1 to 16. Plaster has the advantages of being lower in price than flour, and beneficial to the crop. Flour is preferred by some, as adhering to the plant more tenaciously than plaster. The method said by many who have tried it to be the best for applying it, is by mixing it in water, 2 tablespoonfuls of arsenic to an ordinary pail of water, and sprinkling on the plants.

In the use of Paris green we cannot be too cautious. The fatal results of even slight contact with it, though not in contending with the Colorado potato beetle, prove the great danger in using it without the greatest care. —S.

Products of a New Brunswick Farm.

From the "Colonial Farmer" we take abridged the following letter of Mr. Thompson, of Sheffield House, N. B., giving some reports of the products of his farm of thirty-eight and a half acres. While differing from Mr. Thompson's system of farming in some particulars, as, for instance, in cutting hay four years in succession off his land without top-dressing, we must admit his success in raising large produce from his farm. His letter leads us to the conclusion that he leaves the aftergrass on the meadow where it grew, uncut and unstacked. If this were so, it, of itself, forms no little substitute for top-dressing, and as a mulching, lying on the ground during the winter, it is of the greatest service to soil and grass, preserving during the winter a moderate warmth, and nourishing in the early spring the young tender grasses, when such nourishment is most necessary and of the very greatest advantage. In the rich fattening pasture lands of England and Ireland this is fully appreciated by stock feeders. The fattening fields are never pastured bare in the autumn, and after the fattened beeves are early in the season sold off or housed for stall feeding, the long rich grass is left remaining on the land for this purpose of manuring and mulching; so when the stock of the ensuing season is turned into the pastures about the 12th of May, there is an abundance of the most nutritious food. If Mr. Thompson left his three feet of aftergrass as a mulch on his mowed land, this would account in some measure for the crops of hay not falling off during the successive years of mowing.

From the good yield of his root crops we learn another cause of the general good yield of the farm. The preparation for the root crops must, to produce such results, have been thorough, and the good cultivation and manuring tell their own story in the future crops.

You will think me very remiss in not writing you before this to give you the amount of hay from the field you saw when on my farm in 1873. I had the hay put in a mow—twenty-three tons, eighteen hundred and seventy pounds. The field was raked with a horse rake after the hay was hauled in, and probably I had one ton more of hay, which I did not put with the rest, it not of course being so pure as the other. The field measured eight acres one rod, fourteen poles and seventeen yards. The yield from this would be about three tons to the acre, including the rakings. I must say I felt a little disappointed. I thought I should have had more, as you will remember it looked first rate. I have come to the conclusion that many of the big hay crops we read about, if they were weighed and an account kept, would fall short of the estimate. My crop in 1874 was about the same. This makes four years cutting without any top-dressing, and last fall the aftergrass was three feet deep. Five years ago I laid the field down in oats, and from the yield threshed seventy bushels to the acre, and sold two tons of straw to the acre. The crop of turnips and carrots you saw turned out very well. I had on three acres, two rods and one pole, twelve hundred bushels of turnips and six hundred bushels of carrots, besides the quantity consumed by my four horses and two cows. My hay crop turned out (taking the farm altogether) very well. I sold fifty-five tons, and fed the animals before mentioned. In oats two hundred and eighty-seven bushels, and sold six tons of straw, and retained an abundance for my own use for bedding, &c.

It gives a person a better idea of the productiveness of a farm by stating what is raised on it and sold, and what stock is fed on it. There is then not so much wild guessing at random. The farm contains thirty-eight and a half acres: about thirty-five in crops, the remainder in garden, shrubbery, buildings, roads, &c. I succeeded in importing three first class men from England for draining, and have finished all up. I laid sixteen thousand feet of drain pipe from four to five feet deep, and twenty-five feet apart. This gives me about ten miles of draining. I find plowing in the fall about eight inches deep, and subsoiling two inches more, makes a first rate job, much better than too much plowing in the spring. I cross plow, narrow well, then go over the ground with a Nishwitz pulverizing harrow, then grub with one of Howard's (Eng-

lish) grubbers. This makes the field like a garden and I get good crops, which I think pays for all the extra labor. I have got work for the drainers for two years to come. I hope to have the pleasure of seeing you in St. John this summer, and I will take you to one of my neighbors, where the drainers will be at work, and I know you would be pleased at the thorough and expeditious way they put their work through. Excuse me for taxing you with so long a letter, but believing you to feel a deep interest in the subject is my excuse for it.

RICHARD THOMPSON.

Conversations with Farmers.

Wm. Goble, of Dorchester, has given us a sample of potatoes raised from the seed balls of the Excelsior in the year 1872. He has now two bushels of them. Out of the many kinds raised in the seed bed, this was the only variety he preserved. The others he considered not worth propagating.

They have a great resemblance to the Early Rose, but are somewhat darker in color and the eyes a little deeper indented. They are, he says, earlier by a few days than the Early Rose, and he has found them more productive, while they are equally good for the table. We expect to be able to state their real worth next season, as we have given them to reliable parties to plant them on different soils, and they will be able to state how far they will maintain the character they have the present year.

DIFFERENCE OF VALUE OF MANURES.

Mr. W., of Westminster, says he, some years since, manured a field of 12 acres, part with good manure from the stable, made with proper care; the remainder with manure that had been exposed to the weather and then scraped together carelessly. The field he then plowed and sowed in wheat. It was equal in quality throughout, and was cultivated alike. The crop on that part to which the well-saved manure had been applied was through its whole growth so far superior to the remainder of the field that it was frequently the subject of remark to passers by during the season. The field was sown in oats the next season, and there was fully as great a difference in the crop in its appearance throughout its growth and in its produce from the cradle and threshing machine, as there had been in the wheat crop.

Of hen manure he entertains a high opinion, having had proof of its value as a fertilizer. In manuring a field he applied to a small part of it some manure from the fowl yard very light, while the remainder of the field he manured heavily. That part to which the fowl manure was applied was after the dressing much richer than any other part of the field—almost too rank, he said. "I am quite of your opinion," he added, "that very much of the value of manure depends on our care and treatment of it, and also that the food of cattle greatly affects the value of their excretions. Rich food improves not only the stock fed, but also the value of the manure heap."

BRITISH COLUMBIA.

We have had a visit from Mr. Adam Innes, now a British Columbian. He has been four years an owner of property in that young but prosperous colony. He took up 450 acres of land in 1871. It is, he says, good fertile land, with clay bottom. The climate is very mild. His plow was only stopped by frost twice in the four years. Root crops are much heavier than in Ontario. Oats yield large crops and do not lodge; the produce is 60 to 80 bushels per acre; wheat 45 bushels. There is no wind-storm, so that the oats is not broken down; it is not subject to lodge, yet it cannot be reaped with the reaping machine, it is so very tall. Finds pork raising a most profitable