

The Colonial Farmer

LUGRIN & SON, Proprietors.

POSTAGE PAID.

SUBSCRIPTION—\$1.00 a year

OLD SERIES VOL. 12, NEW SERIES VOL. 3.

FREDERICTON, N. B., MARCH 20, 1876.

NO. 25, WHOLE NUMBER 655

The Colonial Farmer.



An Appeal to the Farmers of New Brunswick.

A Farmers' Provincial League has been organized, which at present embraces a representation of practical farmers from the old and populous Counties of Kings, Westmorland, Queen's, Sunbury, and the younger, but fertile, County of Victoria. When the agitation commenced, which has resulted in the formation of the League, some Editors of City papers contemplated the movement with distrust, and hinted that farmers had better not do so much talking, but confine themselves more closely to the care of their farms. As the movement rolled onward from 'Old Sunbury' and other County Leagues were formed, "the night that slumbers in a peasant's arm" was thought by Government officials as something that might still be real, and when the Legislature was convened, we find that the principal paragraph of the Address set forth what the Government had done in connection with Agriculture, and an ardent allusion to the pleasure it gave them in hearing of the "more frequent association" of farmers.

Without caring whether the Government is pleased or otherwise with this "more frequent association" it is what we strenuously urge upon our brethren of the plough, because it is "so of advantage to them socially and politically."

Socially.—Because it leads to an interchange of thought, an acquaintanceship with each other, a free discussion of topics about which are mutually interested, a more intimate knowledge of their numbers, and the resources in their hands, as members of the body politic, and leading to a direct culture of social amenities and refinement which must tend to greater personal elevation.

Politically.—Because if we have grievances that need removal, they can be discussed and viewed from different sectional stand-points; and dissatisfaction that might otherwise vent itself by the freewill, could then be aired and ventilated in a full concert of free holders.

From our circumstances, we are comparatively isolated to what the inhabitants of towns or villages are, and this operates against us in several ways. The newspaper occupies an important part as a medium for the interchange of opinion, and gives us the news of the day, and so far as it goes, it is well. But it is not like the electric spark that flashes out as we meet with eyes, and face with face. The page falls dull on the mind's eye—not so the voice. There are no folds of hand-shakes, as the wrapper folds of the paper. The warm greeting and the kindly remembrance, and with the living man—not the printed page; and so we urge upon farmers the formation of County Leagues where none exist; and District ones to strengthen and support the County ones. Try them. If you think our Leagues have not sufficient to command them to your trial oven—meet and discuss the matter. Have a talk over it. Show City Editors that you can talk as well as work—that if you have the muscle to do, you have the mind to direct—and you mean to direct!

To the young men who are tilling our farms, and sometimes long for more excitement, we say—go in for the League. Take a breathing spell between the labors of the seasons. Meet and compare notes. Let there be a beautiful, mental attrition upon subjects that concern the multiple industries of the farm. The recreation will be fruitful in good results, and give you a more exalted idea of the dignity of labour.

To our friends, already Leaguers, we say, keep up an unflagging interest

in your Leagues. Make them a subject of conversation when you meet, and urge an extension of them in the Parish, so that their ramifications shall lay hold of and permeate the farmers' minds, and the blood everywhere permeates the system, carrying a healthful and vigorous vitality in its course.

R. M. LEBOD,
Pres't. P. F. Leagues.

Constitution of the Provincial Farmers' League.

The following is the Constitution that was adopted at the recent meeting of the Provincial Farmers' League held in this City. We publish it for the information of farmers generally:—

NAME.
This organization shall be known as the Provincial Farmers' League of New Brunswick.

The Provincial League shall be composed of the members of the County Leagues, and the County Leagues shall be composed of the members of the Parish Leagues, and the Parish Leagues shall be composed of the members of the Farm Leagues, and the Farm Leagues shall be composed of the members of the individual farms.

OBJECTS.
1. To promote a closer union of the Farmers of this Province.
2. To create a greater desire for the knowledge of practical and scientific Agriculture.
3. To devise means for the better development of our Agricultural resources, acquiring statistical information thereof, and to secure a proper recognition of our interests in the Legislature.

4. To establish County and District Leagues.
5. To increase the comfort, and enhance the beauty of our homes, thereby making life more acceptable to our families and ourselves.

6. To work in harmony with all existing Agricultural Societies, and kindred institutions, cultivating an honest rivalry for the common good.

7. To foster mutual understanding, and co-operation, by meeting, talking, buying together, and in generally acting for our protection and advancement, as association may require.

8. We propose to avoid litigation as much as possible, by arbitration in the League, striving to secure harmony, and goodwill, and make our League perpetual.

Faithful adherence to these principles will ensure our moral, mutual, social and material advancement.

OFFICERS.
1. The Officers shall consist of a President, a Secretary, a Treasurer, and an Executive Committee, consisting of two members from each County, who with the Officers shall form a Board of Directors.

2. The President shall preside at all meetings of the Provincial League; in case of his absence a Vice-President shall fill the Chair.

3. The Chairman shall preserve order, and shall put all motions and decisions in question of order, subject to an appeal to the League.

4. The Secretary of the Board shall duly record a book kept for that purpose, all minutes, resolutions, decisions, or other proceedings of the League, reporting therein all accepted reports, orders and resolutions; and shall report, memorials and petitions submitted, together with their titles, or a brief description of their contents. He shall attend to all correspondence in connection with the League, and make an annual report of the same.

5. The Treasurer shall pay all orders of the President, commended by the Secretary, out of moneys which may come into his hands, and shall submit, at the Annual Meeting, accounts of the receipts and expenditures.

6. The Annual Meeting shall be called at such time and place as the Board of Directors may decide upon.

7. Special Meetings shall be called by order of the President, or on the requisition of five members of the League made to him.

8. The Board of Directors may be summoned at any time and place, (as provided by the previous section) and may deal with such matters as may be submitted to them, reporting their proceedings to the next regular meeting.

9. County Leagues are hereby required to pay to the Treasurer of the Provincial League, the sum of fifteen cents per year, for each regular member, on or before the first day of October, in each and every year.

For the Colonial Farmer.
The "Cow Question."

Mr. Editor.—A neighbor of mine in the course of conversation a short time since, in alluding to the ground that should be taken up by the Farmers' League, said that in his opinion, no subject needed more looking after than the "Cow Question," and to illustrate his meaning he related the following:—Said he, last spring I sold my cow (he is a miller and keeps but one cow) as she did not suit me, proposing to purchase one having a strain of improved blood, and having heard a good deal said in favor of Ayrshires, I bought one with a fair allowance of that blood. He gave her a good range

of pasture, and she only did indifferently well. Some time in September, he concluded she did not suit, sold her, and bought a common Ayrshire, turned her into the same pasture, and he assured me that during the month of October, with nothing in the shape of feed but what she grabbed out of that pasture, she gave more milk and made more butter than did the Grade Ayrshire at any time during the summer months.

I am not seeking to make a point against Ayrshire cattle, nor was he, but I am seeking to draw the attention of our Farmers to the immense difference (considered in the aggregate) there is between cows. Every farmer and dairyman will tell you that some cows will not pay for their keep—and of course good farmers turn such into beef—but taking these extra poor animals out of the question, there still exists a difference between those that are considered good, fair milkers.

The standard by which the excellence of cows is generally averaged is the milk pail, no reference being had to the better producing qualities of the milk. The writer has had brought under his notice the fact that the milk of Devon cows, although generally less in quantity than that produced by cows of other breeds, will make a much larger per centage of butter, new for cow, Jerseys only excepted, but of the breed he would not say, a great difference will exist among the individuals composing it, and the aim object of this paper, is to urge upon our farmers the necessity of thinking out inefficient animals, and replacing them so far as practical, with the best to be obtained. It was an oft-repeated truism that it costs as much to feed an inefficient cow as it does a good one, but to illustrate a little further, put it this way. A good cow will yield something near 180 lbs. butter, per season, many will do even better, while from observation and experience the writer is satisfied a very large per centage of our cows do not yield over one half the quantity named above. Any one can make a calculation on this basis—thousands of dollars are lost to the country annually by this leak.

J. E. F.

Wheat Bran is Nutritious.

Countess long believed that wheat bran was a much material for making animal food and flesh. The analysis of wheat bran and corn, by Dr. Babell, a noted pharmacist of Philadelphia, presents these facts. One hundred pounds of wheat yields 75 pounds of flour and 20 pounds of bran. The flour holds in it the tissue-making elements—gluten, albumen, etc.—1.65, of phosphorus and other salts, 0.70—total 2.35 per cent. The bran contains of tissue-making elements, 3.10; salts, phosphates, etc., 7.05—total 10.15 per cent. The bran is therefore, fourfold more nutritious than flour, or being but one-fourth as flour, it has in fact as much real value, as a food, as flour itself. Wheat flour from the mill consists mainly of starch, the blood-forming and bone-forming materials or elements of the grain are rejected in the bran because of the ignorant opinions of other generations. According to this high authority wheat bran constitutes a decidedly important article of food, whether for man or beast.

It is a well established fact that flour is more easily digested than bran, but this does not prove that it is a healthier bread. Such facts as these are apt to be too tightly regarded, but they are entitled to the confidence of the people, because chemistry has now advanced so far that the primary life-sustaining elements of all food is as well known as any kind of facts and make experiments in the manner of preparing bran as a food for stock. The fact that most animals are fond of wheat bran is pretty good evidence of its value.—The instincts which nature plants in animals are almost unerring.

EVERY FARMER SHOULD DO HIS OWN THINKING.—The Country Gentleman very truthfully says that it is only with a recent period—at least as compared with epoch of positive assertion, thirty or forty years ago—that we have found out in farming how completely truth in farming has asserted become falsehood, with how many qualifications and limitations theories must be hedged about, and what folly it is to lay down any single dogma for the universal acceptance of all. And, as a natural consequence of our agricultural literature, the tendency is no longer to pronounce upon this or that practice as right or wrong in itself, but to elicit from those who are successful the modes by which and the circumstances under which success was reached, and then to leave each reader to judge for himself how great an extent a similar course of action would suit his own case, and to determine for himself as to his interests. What we ask, in a word, is the experience of others—whose success might be tolerated in us—should think for himself.

of pasture, and she only did indifferently well. Some time in September, he concluded she did not suit, sold her, and bought a common Ayrshire, turned her into the same pasture, and he assured me that during the month of October, with nothing in the shape of feed but what she grabbed out of that pasture, she gave more milk and made more butter than did the Grade Ayrshire at any time during the summer months.

I am not seeking to make a point against Ayrshire cattle, nor was he, but I am seeking to draw the attention of our Farmers to the immense difference (considered in the aggregate) there is between cows. Every farmer and dairyman will tell you that some cows will not pay for their keep—and of course good farmers turn such into beef—but taking these extra poor animals out of the question, there still exists a difference between those that are considered good, fair milkers.

The standard by which the excellence of cows is generally averaged is the milk pail, no reference being had to the better producing qualities of the milk. The writer has had brought under his notice the fact that the milk of Devon cows, although generally less in quantity than that produced by cows of other breeds, will make a much larger per centage of butter, new for cow, Jerseys only excepted, but of the breed he would not say, a great difference will exist among the individuals composing it, and the aim object of this paper, is to urge upon our farmers the necessity of thinking out inefficient animals, and replacing them so far as practical, with the best to be obtained. It was an oft-repeated truism that it costs as much to feed an inefficient cow as it does a good one, but to illustrate a little further, put it this way. A good cow will yield something near 180 lbs. butter, per season, many will do even better, while from observation and experience the writer is satisfied a very large per centage of our cows do not yield over one half the quantity named above. Any one can make a calculation on this basis—thousands of dollars are lost to the country annually by this leak.

J. E. F.

Wheat Bran is Nutritious.

Countess long believed that wheat bran was a much material for making animal food and flesh. The analysis of wheat bran and corn, by Dr. Babell, a noted pharmacist of Philadelphia, presents these facts. One hundred pounds of wheat yields 75 pounds of flour and 20 pounds of bran. The flour holds in it the tissue-making elements—gluten, albumen, etc.—1.65, of phosphorus and other salts, 0.70—total 2.35 per cent. The bran contains of tissue-making elements, 3.10; salts, phosphates, etc., 7.05—total 10.15 per cent. The bran is therefore, fourfold more nutritious than flour, or being but one-fourth as flour, it has in fact as much real value, as a food, as flour itself. Wheat flour from the mill consists mainly of starch, the blood-forming and bone-forming materials or elements of the grain are rejected in the bran because of the ignorant opinions of other generations. According to this high authority wheat bran constitutes a decidedly important article of food, whether for man or beast.

It is a well established fact that flour is more easily digested than bran, but this does not prove that it is a healthier bread. Such facts as these are apt to be too tightly regarded, but they are entitled to the confidence of the people, because chemistry has now advanced so far that the primary life-sustaining elements of all food is as well known as any kind of facts and make experiments in the manner of preparing bran as a food for stock. The fact that most animals are fond of wheat bran is pretty good evidence of its value.—The instincts which nature plants in animals are almost unerring.

EVERY FARMER SHOULD DO HIS OWN THINKING.—The Country Gentleman very truthfully says that it is only with a recent period—at least as compared with epoch of positive assertion, thirty or forty years ago—that we have found out in farming how completely truth in farming has asserted become falsehood, with how many qualifications and limitations theories must be hedged about, and what folly it is to lay down any single dogma for the universal acceptance of all. And, as a natural consequence of our agricultural literature, the tendency is no longer to pronounce upon this or that practice as right or wrong in itself, but to elicit from those who are successful the modes by which and the circumstances under which success was reached, and then to leave each reader to judge for himself how great an extent a similar course of action would suit his own case, and to determine for himself as to his interests. What we ask, in a word, is the experience of others—whose success might be tolerated in us—should think for himself.

of pasture, and she only did indifferently well. Some time in September, he concluded she did not suit, sold her, and bought a common Ayrshire, turned her into the same pasture, and he assured me that during the month of October, with nothing in the shape of feed but what she grabbed out of that pasture, she gave more milk and made more butter than did the Grade Ayrshire at any time during the summer months.

I am not seeking to make a point against Ayrshire cattle, nor was he, but I am seeking to draw the attention of our Farmers to the immense difference (considered in the aggregate) there is between cows. Every farmer and dairyman will tell you that some cows will not pay for their keep—and of course good farmers turn such into beef—but taking these extra poor animals out of the question, there still exists a difference between those that are considered good, fair milkers.

The standard by which the excellence of cows is generally averaged is the milk pail, no reference being had to the better producing qualities of the milk. The writer has had brought under his notice the fact that the milk of Devon cows, although generally less in quantity than that produced by cows of other breeds, will make a much larger per centage of butter, new for cow, Jerseys only excepted, but of the breed he would not say, a great difference will exist among the individuals composing it, and the aim object of this paper, is to urge upon our farmers the necessity of thinking out inefficient animals, and replacing them so far as practical, with the best to be obtained. It was an oft-repeated truism that it costs as much to feed an inefficient cow as it does a good one, but to illustrate a little further, put it this way. A good cow will yield something near 180 lbs. butter, per season, many will do even better, while from observation and experience the writer is satisfied a very large per centage of our cows do not yield over one half the quantity named above. Any one can make a calculation on this basis—thousands of dollars are lost to the country annually by this leak.

J. E. F.

Wheat Bran is Nutritious.

Countess long believed that wheat bran was a much material for making animal food and flesh. The analysis of wheat bran and corn, by Dr. Babell, a noted pharmacist of Philadelphia, presents these facts. One hundred pounds of wheat yields 75 pounds of flour and 20 pounds of bran. The flour holds in it the tissue-making elements—gluten, albumen, etc.—1.65, of phosphorus and other salts, 0.70—total 2.35 per cent. The bran contains of tissue-making elements, 3.10; salts, phosphates, etc., 7.05—total 10.15 per cent. The bran is therefore, fourfold more nutritious than flour, or being but one-fourth as flour, it has in fact as much real value, as a food, as flour itself. Wheat flour from the mill consists mainly of starch, the blood-forming and bone-forming materials or elements of the grain are rejected in the bran because of the ignorant opinions of other generations. According to this high authority wheat bran constitutes a decidedly important article of food, whether for man or beast.

It is a well established fact that flour is more easily digested than bran, but this does not prove that it is a healthier bread. Such facts as these are apt to be too tightly regarded, but they are entitled to the confidence of the people, because chemistry has now advanced so far that the primary life-sustaining elements of all food is as well known as any kind of facts and make experiments in the manner of preparing bran as a food for stock. The fact that most animals are fond of wheat bran is pretty good evidence of its value.—The instincts which nature plants in animals are almost unerring.

EVERY FARMER SHOULD DO HIS OWN THINKING.—The Country Gentleman very truthfully says that it is only with a recent period—at least as compared with epoch of positive assertion, thirty or forty years ago—that we have found out in farming how completely truth in farming has asserted become falsehood, with how many qualifications and limitations theories must be hedged about, and what folly it is to lay down any single dogma for the universal acceptance of all. And, as a natural consequence of our agricultural literature, the tendency is no longer to pronounce upon this or that practice as right or wrong in itself, but to elicit from those who are successful the modes by which and the circumstances under which success was reached, and then to leave each reader to judge for himself how great an extent a similar course of action would suit his own case, and to determine for himself as to his interests. What we ask, in a word, is the experience of others—whose success might be tolerated in us—should think for himself.

of pasture, and she only did indifferently well. Some time in September, he concluded she did not suit, sold her, and bought a common Ayrshire, turned her into the same pasture, and he assured me that during the month of October, with nothing in the shape of feed but what she grabbed out of that pasture, she gave more milk and made more butter than did the Grade Ayrshire at any time during the summer months.

I am not seeking to make a point against Ayrshire cattle, nor was he, but I am seeking to draw the attention of our Farmers to the immense difference (considered in the aggregate) there is between cows. Every farmer and dairyman will tell you that some cows will not pay for their keep—and of course good farmers turn such into beef—but taking these extra poor animals out of the question, there still exists a difference between those that are considered good, fair milkers.

The standard by which the excellence of cows is generally averaged is the milk pail, no reference being had to the better producing qualities of the milk. The writer has had brought under his notice the fact that the milk of Devon cows, although generally less in quantity than that produced by cows of other breeds, will make a much larger per centage of butter, new for cow, Jerseys only excepted, but of the breed he would not say, a great difference will exist among the individuals composing it, and the aim object of this paper, is to urge upon our farmers the necessity of thinking out inefficient animals, and replacing them so far as practical, with the best to be obtained. It was an oft-repeated truism that it costs as much to feed an inefficient cow as it does a good one, but to illustrate a little further, put it this way. A good cow will yield something near 180 lbs. butter, per season, many will do even better, while from observation and experience the writer is satisfied a very large per centage of our cows do not yield over one half the quantity named above. Any one can make a calculation on this basis—thousands of dollars are lost to the country annually by this leak.

J. E. F.

Wheat Bran is Nutritious.

Countess long believed that wheat bran was a much material for making animal food and flesh. The analysis of wheat bran and corn, by Dr. Babell, a noted pharmacist of Philadelphia, presents these facts. One hundred pounds of wheat yields 75 pounds of flour and 20 pounds of bran. The flour holds in it the tissue-making elements—gluten, albumen, etc.—1.65, of phosphorus and other salts, 0.70—total 2.35 per cent. The bran contains of tissue-making elements, 3.10; salts, phosphates, etc., 7.05—total 10.15 per cent. The bran is therefore, fourfold more nutritious than flour, or being but one-fourth as flour, it has in fact as much real value, as a food, as flour itself. Wheat flour from the mill consists mainly of starch, the blood-forming and bone-forming materials or elements of the grain are rejected in the bran because of the ignorant opinions of other generations. According to this high authority wheat bran constitutes a decidedly important article of food, whether for man or beast.

It is a well established fact that flour is more easily digested than bran, but this does not prove that it is a healthier bread. Such facts as these are apt to be too tightly regarded, but they are entitled to the confidence of the people, because chemistry has now advanced so far that the primary life-sustaining elements of all food is as well known as any kind of facts and make experiments in the manner of preparing bran as a food for stock. The fact that most animals are fond of wheat bran is pretty good evidence of its value.—The instincts which nature plants in animals are almost unerring.

EVERY FARMER SHOULD DO HIS OWN THINKING.—The Country Gentleman very truthfully says that it is only with a recent period—at least as compared with epoch of positive assertion, thirty or forty years ago—that we have found out in farming how completely truth in farming has asserted become falsehood, with how many qualifications and limitations theories must be hedged about, and what folly it is to lay down any single dogma for the universal acceptance of all. And, as a natural consequence of our agricultural literature, the tendency is no longer to pronounce upon this or that practice as right or wrong in itself, but to elicit from those who are successful the modes by which and the circumstances under which success was reached, and then to leave each reader to judge for himself how great an extent a similar course of action would suit his own case, and to determine for himself as to his interests. What we ask, in a word, is the experience of others—whose success might be tolerated in us—should think for himself.

of pasture, and she only did indifferently well. Some time in September, he concluded she did not suit, sold her, and bought a common Ayrshire, turned her into the same pasture, and he assured me that during the month of October, with nothing in the shape of feed but what she grabbed out of that pasture, she gave more milk and made more butter than did the Grade Ayrshire at any time during the summer months.

I am not seeking to make a point against Ayrshire cattle, nor was he, but I am seeking to draw the attention of our Farmers to the immense difference (considered in the aggregate) there is between cows. Every farmer and dairyman will tell you that some cows will not pay for their keep—and of course good farmers turn such into beef—but taking these extra poor animals out of the question, there still exists a difference between those that are considered good, fair milkers.

The standard by which the excellence of cows is generally averaged is the milk pail, no reference being had to the better producing qualities of the milk. The writer has had brought under his notice the fact that the milk of Devon cows, although generally less in quantity than that produced by cows of other breeds, will make a much larger per centage of butter, new for cow, Jerseys only excepted, but of the breed he would not say, a great difference will exist among the individuals composing it, and the aim object of this paper, is to urge upon our farmers the necessity of thinking out inefficient animals, and replacing them so far as practical, with the best to be obtained. It was an oft-repeated truism that it costs as much to feed an inefficient cow as it does a good one, but to illustrate a little further, put it this way. A good cow will yield something near 180 lbs. butter, per season, many will do even better, while from observation and experience the writer is satisfied a very large per centage of our cows do not yield over one half the quantity named above. Any one can make a calculation on this basis—thousands of dollars are lost to the country annually by this leak.

J. E. F.

Wheat Bran is Nutritious.

Countess long believed that wheat bran was a much material for making animal food and flesh. The analysis of wheat bran and corn, by Dr. Babell, a noted pharmacist of Philadelphia, presents these facts. One hundred pounds of wheat yields 75 pounds of flour and 20 pounds of bran. The flour holds in it the tissue-making elements—gluten, albumen, etc.—1.65, of phosphorus and other salts, 0.70—total 2.35 per cent. The bran contains of tissue-making elements, 3.10; salts, phosphates, etc., 7.05—total 10.15 per cent. The bran is therefore, fourfold more nutritious than flour, or being but one-fourth as flour, it has in fact as much real value, as a food, as flour itself. Wheat flour from the mill consists mainly of starch, the blood-forming and bone-forming materials or elements of the grain are rejected in the bran because of the ignorant opinions of other generations. According to this high authority wheat bran constitutes a decidedly important article of food, whether for man or beast.

It is a well established fact that flour is more easily digested than bran, but this does not prove that it is a healthier bread. Such facts as these are apt to be too tightly regarded, but they are entitled to the confidence of the people, because chemistry has now advanced so far that the primary life-sustaining elements of all food is as well known as any kind of facts and make experiments in the manner of preparing bran as a food for stock. The fact that most animals are fond of wheat bran is pretty good evidence of its value.—The instincts which nature plants in animals are almost unerring.

EVERY FARMER SHOULD DO HIS OWN THINKING.—The Country Gentleman very truthfully says that it is only with a recent period—at least as compared with epoch of positive assertion, thirty or forty years ago—that we have found out in farming how completely truth in farming has asserted become falsehood, with how many qualifications and limitations theories must be hedged about, and what folly it is to lay down any single dogma for the universal acceptance of all. And, as a natural consequence of our agricultural literature, the tendency is no longer to pronounce upon this or that practice as right or wrong in itself, but to elicit from those who are successful the modes by which and the circumstances under which success was reached, and then to leave each reader to judge for himself how great an extent a similar course of action would suit his own case, and to determine for himself as to his interests. What we ask, in a word, is the experience of others—whose success might be tolerated in us—should think for himself.

of pasture, and she only did indifferently well. Some time in September, he concluded she did not suit, sold her, and bought a common Ayrshire, turned her into the same pasture, and he assured me that during the month of October, with nothing in the shape of feed but what she grabbed out of that pasture, she gave more milk and made more butter than did the Grade Ayrshire at any time during the summer months.

I am not seeking to make a point against Ayrshire cattle, nor was he, but I am seeking to draw the attention of our Farmers to the immense difference (considered in the aggregate) there is between cows. Every farmer and dairyman will tell you that some cows will not pay for their keep—and of course good farmers turn such into beef—but taking these extra poor animals out of the question, there still exists a difference between those that are considered good, fair milkers.

The standard by which the excellence of cows is generally averaged is the milk pail, no reference being had to the better producing qualities of the milk. The writer has had brought under his notice the fact that the milk of Devon cows, although generally less in quantity than that produced by cows of other breeds, will make a much larger per centage of butter, new for cow, Jerseys only excepted, but of the breed he would not say, a great difference will exist among the individuals composing it, and the aim object of this paper, is to urge upon our farmers the necessity of thinking out inefficient animals, and replacing them so far as practical, with the best to be obtained. It was an oft-repeated truism that it costs as much to feed an inefficient cow as it does a good one, but to illustrate a little further, put it this way. A good cow will yield something near 180 lbs. butter, per season, many will do even better, while from observation and experience the writer is satisfied a very large per centage of our cows do not yield over one half the quantity named above. Any one can make a calculation on this basis—thousands of dollars are lost to the country annually by this leak.

J. E. F.

Wheat Bran is Nutritious.

Countess long believed that wheat bran was a much material for making animal food and flesh. The analysis of wheat bran and corn, by Dr. Babell, a noted pharmacist of Philadelphia, presents these facts. One hundred pounds of wheat yields 75 pounds of flour and 20 pounds of bran. The flour holds in it the tissue-making elements—gluten, albumen, etc.—1.65, of phosphorus and other salts, 0.70—total 2.35 per cent. The bran contains of tissue-making elements, 3.10; salts, phosphates, etc., 7.05—total 10.15 per cent. The bran is therefore, fourfold more nutritious than flour, or being but one-fourth as flour, it has in fact as much real value, as a food, as flour itself. Wheat flour from the mill consists mainly of starch, the blood-forming and bone-forming materials or elements of the grain are rejected in the bran because of the ignorant opinions of other generations. According to this high authority wheat bran constitutes a decidedly important article of food, whether for man or beast.

It is a well established fact that flour is more easily digested than bran, but this does not prove that it is a healthier bread. Such facts as these are apt to be too tightly regarded, but they are entitled to the confidence of the people, because chemistry has now advanced so far that the primary life-sustaining elements of all food is as well known as any kind of facts and make experiments in the manner of preparing bran as a food for stock. The fact that most animals are fond of wheat bran is pretty good evidence of its value.—The instincts which nature plants in animals are almost unerring.

EVERY FARMER SHOULD DO HIS OWN THINKING.—The Country Gentleman very truthfully says that it is only with a recent period—at least as compared with epoch of positive assertion, thirty or forty years ago—that we have found out in farming how completely truth in farming has asserted become falsehood, with how many qualifications and limitations theories must be hedged about, and what folly it is to lay down any single dogma for the universal acceptance of all. And, as a natural consequence of our agricultural literature, the tendency is no longer to pronounce upon this or that practice as right or wrong in itself, but to elicit from those who are successful the modes by which and the circumstances under which success was reached, and then to leave each reader to judge for himself how great an extent a similar course of action would suit his own case, and to determine for himself as to his interests. What we ask, in a word, is the experience of others—whose success might be tolerated in us—should think for himself.

The Old Farm Gate.

BY EUGENE J. HALL.

The old farm gate hangs, sagging down, on rusty hinges, bent and brown; its arch is gone, and here and there it shows the traces of decay. The old farm gate has seen, each year, the blossoms bloom and disappear; the bright green leaves of Spring unfold and turn to Autumn's red and gold. The children have upon its ledge, and in and out with rapids swing, when their strong bodies were great, and when hope was fair and faith was sure. Beside that gate have lovers trod, and the slow, steady way; And soiled each promise with a kiss, To welcome home the new-made bride, When Lilacs bloomed and locusts fair, With their sweet fragrance filled the air. That gate, with rusty weight and chain, Has closed upon the solemn train That bore his little form away, Upon a dreary Autumn day. The hinges gray and mosses green Upon its rusted posts are seen; Its arch is gone, and here and there It shows the traces of decay. Yes, dear to me above all things, In that old gate, now sagging down, On rusty hinges, bent and brown.

The Agricultural Press.

BY EUGENE J. HALL.

The Agricultural Press.—One hundred years ago [? was unknown, to-day it has no superior. And as we enter upon our centennial, it is with pride we refer to it. We mean when we say the agricultural press, those who write for the benefit of the tiller of the soil, and those papers published in the interest of the farmer. The farmer to-day has access to a literature as pure, as elevating and instructive for his calling, as any other profession. This is the more wonderful, when we remember that fifty years ago, "book farming," or science applied to agriculture, was scarce and by ninety-nine of every hundred farmers in the land. Now the farmer that has not one or more weekly papers on his table, is going to the wall, "or west." It is a truism, he cannot grow nor soil and compete with the well-read, well-posted farmer. It is plain to us that in the future there is still greater elements for this press. The portals of science are being thrown open, the wonderful storehouse of nature is being tiller of the soil. "Pamphlet just begins to shed its light on the first great occupation of man. Entomology, botany and other kindred sciences have a storehouse of knowledge so full of interest to the tiller of the soil, that though the next centennial may seem a great way off, they will not have nearly begun to unfold their wonders, when our second centennial shall herald its coming with bells and cannon. See what has already been done in perfecting animals, fruits, flowers and vegetables! And yet no one can deny that we have but just entered this field of progress. It needs no prophetic vision to assure the farmer that his mission is coming to the front, and that the agricultural press has but just begun its career. Onward to-day, is the watchword.—A. S. Moss, *Chastanaut Farmer*.

Measuring by the Eye.

BY EUGENE J. HALL.

Years ago, says a correspondent of the Boston Transcript, when we went to school in a little weather-beaten school-house, what exciting contests there used to be over the teacher's favorite exercise of having the scholars estimate with the eye the size and weight of different objects in the room! He would hold up his cane, and have each one tell how long he thought it was, and it was a lucky child that could come within half a foot of the right length. He would measure a book, and then have the scholars try to reproduce the measure on the wall. He would mark off an inch or a foot on a yard in some conspicuous place, and then see how near a "right" could come to the same length upon the black board. And it was astonishing how wide astray one would go. The fact is, our eyes do estimate as ridiculously even upon the commonest things. At first thought, which is all you say at first, a three-year-old child or a four-barrel horse, could do anything but actual measurement convince you that some child is half as tall as a six-footer. There is an old saying that a child two years old is half as tall as he ever will be; and after a few experiments in measuring one can easily believe it, but not before.

Open Your Windows.