

tions, but drops off forthwith when ripe. Abundance is best known. It is a very upright grower with a dense foliage. Burbank is more abundant than Abundance. The tree droops and sprawls, hence should not be sold to profane men. Fruit should be thinned on these when it sets too freely. By far the best variety that I have tested comes to me as Hytaukio No. 1. I have not been able to find it named and described in any list, and it is not much known. The fruit ripens late, much of it is very large. It is nearly round, of a whitish ground color, and covered with carmine dots and a thick white bloom. The fruit is beautiful, and its yellow flesh is delicious, raw or cooked. The skin has a slight characteristic flavor. I have shown it to many, and all agree as to its beauty and quality. Some of the gage type of plums are no doubt sweeter. The Hytaukio forms a fair open head, much like the Ogon.

The Keiffer Pear.—This variety, though scarcely new, is not yet known to many. It grows at a furious rate, and bears wonderfully every year. On warm soils in southern Ontario the quality is fairly good. For cooking, its quince-like flavor makes it very popular where known. It has come to stay, and very many of them will be here shortly. The fruit, when picked in October, is not eatable. A few weeks later it turns a lemon yellow, and is very showy, and, at that season, eatable. It should be thinned, as even the strong wood of the Keiffer cannot possibly carry its load of fruit.

Fresh Manure.

By James Long, in Rural World.

I have been reading an article by the chief agricultural chemist in France, published in a little halfpenny agricultural journal which I picked up on a French bookstall—and which is quite a new issue—in which the author in a very simple style shows the farmer how unwise it is of him to waste the fertilizing properties of his manure by exposure.

This is a question which concerns us all—it is one which has been continually discussed—but, in spite of this fact, wherever we go we find the manure heap existing, and in many cases growing in size from week to week, and month to month. When a tenant leaves a farm and is succeeded by another who takes over the manure, as in accordance with the custom in some counties he does, he often takes over a hill of organic material which has been deprived of half its fertilizing value, and pays for it, if the custom accords payment, as though none of this value was lost. It is unquestionably difficult to arrange that manure shall invariably be carried to the field and be ploughed in, but something to ameliorate the loss may always be done in the right direction. When manure is under the soil it is safe, for its mineral and nitrogenous fertilizing constituents alike cannot possibly escape, except in the one way which cannot be prevented.

I mean that the nitrogen of the soil is lost in a particular form in the drainage water. When the manure is in the heap above ground, its properties, *i. e.*, its fertilizing properties, are partially lost by volatilization and partially by waste—drainage—especially where the heap is washed by rain. A heap which has heated, or is heating when opened, submits to more rapid loss of nitrogen, although, no doubt, heated manure, *i. e.*, manure which has partially decomposed, becomes of greater value, ton for ton, when it enters the soil than fresh manure. That enhanced value, however, is dearly bought if the cost is one-half the original nitrogen which it contained. The point is that fresh manure ploughed under the soil decomposes slowly, the nitrogen liberated being fixed by the soil, and there being no waste of mineral fertilizers, as in the case of exposed manure in the heap, however carefully it may be managed. Whether dung should be spread on the land and ploughed in in autumn and early winter, each man must decide for himself.

He can ascertain the probable losses from drainage in the soil, which is greater when the soil is light, and the probable gain, if he takes account of the experience of others in

published statements. If we notice where heaps of manure have lain in the field for a week or two we find that the crop following is richer and heavier than that surrounding it. This is an indication always worthy of notice.

There are few farms upon which there are not some fields ready for the plough, and upon which manure cannot be spread. Similarly, there are few farmers who cannot institute the distribution of dung direct from the carts, as the thrifty Scotch do, instead of leaving it in heaps for future, and often delayed, distribution. Any plan which will enable a farmer to get dung under the soil at the earliest possible moment is preferable to the common plan of leaving it to decompose in the heap and waste in the manner which we have suggested.

CORRESPONDENCE

Profitable Farming

Mr. Heggie Replies to Mr. MacPherson

To the Editor of FARMING:

I am in receipt of your much appreciated paper, FARMING, dated October 11th, containing Mr. MacPherson's reply to my letter in your issue of 27th Sept.

In my letter I asked Mr. MacPherson to give me the cost of his 40-lb. pigs before putting them on to the acre of clover, fully expecting that he would give me, as well as your readers in general, the information in detail. He, however, evades this by turning the question on to me, and replies in one paragraph of his letter that the cost of his 40-lb. pigs is a problem, and in another that they cost him from 50 to 75 cents each, when purchased by his own capital and labour; and \$2 to \$3, when purchased from his "liberal neighbor."

I am inclined to think there is something in Mr. MacPherson's remark about having liberal neighbors, when he can show such magnificent profits from his one acre of clover. In discussing this subject I hope that Mr. MacPherson, as well as your readers, will understand that I leave the "liberality of my neighbors" entirely out of the question, as I do not think it should show up as an item under the head of "Profitable Farming," or above the signature of the author of "Business Methods in Farming."

I notice that Mr. MacPherson's opinion differs greatly on the question of how many pigs can be pastured on an acre of clover. For instance, in his article on "Business Methods in Farming," which appeared in your issue of 28th December last, he claims that thirty young pigs are sufficient for an acre of clover. Now he says that fifty 40 lb. pigs can be pastured for five months on an acre. (I only hope he may not augment further, as the clover will have a poor chance to grow.)

On referring to your issue of April 13th I observe that a Mr. Halliday, of Eldon, asks you a question on this point, and which, I think, Mr. Editor, you replied to by saying that an acre of clover should give pasture for from fifteen to twenty pigs with the addition of a little grain. I would never think of putting more than this on with a good quantity of grain. Clover pasture for pigs is, no doubt, the only profitable method of pork production, and I intend going largely into the business next season.

Mr. MacPherson asks me what my pigs cost when weighing 25 lbs. This is as follows: Keep of five sows during gestation, 4 tons of frozen wheat at \$15 per ton, \$60. Keep of sows for seven weeks when rearing young, 2 tons of barley-meal at \$20 per ton, \$40, one ton bran \$15, \$55; labor attending hogs, \$10; accommodation, \$5, making in all \$130. The forty young pigs were sold at \$4 a head directly they were weaned, so that the profit derived from them was \$30.

Mr. MacPherson's other question I will have to lay aside for the present. Having only lately come to this part of the country I am unable to give him the particulars desired. In the near future I hope to lay before your readers the information requested by Mr. MacPherson.

Enderby, B.C., Oct. 24th, 1898.

GEORGE HEGGIE.