



FIG. 1895. FAY (REDUCED) SHOWING PRODUCTIVENESS.

known. The quality was excellent, for it had a brisk, sprightly, mild acid flavor, which gives it first rank ; but its small size made it a poor market berry, and slow of harvesting.

Now a great change has come over currant cultivation. With the advent of the Cherry currant, so large in berry that it captivated the buyer, and so easy to gather as to reduce the cost of harvesting, there came a great impetus to planting, some asserting that \$200.00 an acre was a common return for the crop. Then came Fay's Prolific with a wonderful flourish, and everybody planted it ; and now several others contest the first place for the commercial garden.

To determine the best variety of each color for our Ontario fruit growers to plant was the purpose of the Provincial Department of Agriculture in starting a Small Fruit experiment station at Burlington, in charge of A. W. Peart, who has now sixteen varieties of Red and White Currants in bear-

ing. On the 23rd of July the writer visited this station and found Mr. Peart quite ready to leave the interests of his four hundred acre grain farm to take us through his experimental plots on plums, pears, peaches, grapes and small fruits. In looking over his currants we found his Fays very fine, with bunches about four inches in length. The bush is not equal to that of the Cherry in vigor or endurance. The illustration, Fig. 1895, shows excellent fruiting habit, in which point there is little to choose between the two varieties, the latter of which is of European and the former of American origin. Very similar to these two popular varieties is the Versailles, from France, differing from the two former in having berries of less uniformity in size, and on the whole averaging smaller. Some of the bushes at Mr. Peart's were a marvel of productiveness, and we thought it worth while to take a snap to show their manner of fruiting. (Fig. 1894.) Belle de St. Giles, Fig. 1896, is a magnificent looking currant, so large and fine, but it does not appear to be as productive as the varieties mentioned above. The



FIG. 1896. BELLE DE ST. GILES (REDUCED.)