

The matter which this page contains is carefully selected from various sources; and we guarantee that to any intelligent farmer or housewife, the contents of this single page from week to week during the year, will be worth several times the subscription price of the paper.

THE HOME.

THE MAJOR'S COOK.

"Now, Major, you must not praise the cook in her hearing," Mrs. Max said. "You will only spoil her and make her demand an increase of wages."

"Not much," the Major replied, emphatically. "I had a little experience in that matter which taught me a lesson. It was before we were married, my dear, and before I resigned. Our regiment was with General Howard, chasing the Nez Percés Indians across the mountains in Montana and Idaho. One of our lieutenants had been stationed at the Presidio in San Francisco, and the mess made arrangements with him to bring a Chinaman cook. My, how that cook could cook! The beggar brought along, in some mysterious manner, the most unexpected things. I remember one day—we had a venison roast the day before—just a venison steak with venison stew with pickled walnuts! All the officers in the mess appreciated this; but how they jumped on me when I said to the cook, 'Plenty good stew, Chung, plenty good.' All said 'was a fool.' 'Major, how could they?' said Mrs. Max.

"Oh, that's only mess-room talk. Everybody calls everybody a fool at a mess dinner. Well, as I was saying, all the boys said Chung would strike for higher wages, get impudent or haughty, and leave if we praised him. So they laid out a scheme. Whenever he brought in a particular good dish we were to turn up our noses and make mess-room remarks. That would keep Chung in a proper and lowly spirit, and generally promote harmony and discipline. The next day he gave us some mountain quail roasted in envelopes of bacon; and, really, my dear, I wish your cook could roast a quail like that. The boys all said 'ugh, or 'plah, or 'tush' and the last one threatened to throw the dish away. Chung regarded that with calm exterior, but after dinner he apparently melted in every one of his jackets, and bade us good-by. We were nearly frightened to death, and asked what ailed him.

"You no like my cooking, me no cook," that heathen answered. "We assured him we would try and stand it, and he grinned and said he would stand it for just ten 'dolla' more per lunar month. Of course, we felt silly, but there was nothing to do but pay it to him. That made \$70 a month. We paid it. Since then I've believed a little praise to the cook, judiciously administered, approaches G in domestic economy."

"I'm sure," Mrs. Max remarked, after a thoughtful observation of his finger nails, which are very pretty, "I'm sure I don't see why you didn't advertise for another cook."—St.

NEEDLESS WORK.

BY HELEN CAMPBELL.

"Oh, but you want to make home attractive!" Yes, I know you do. You want to make home attractive, and you don't know how. Where you need order and harmony and truth and beauty, you make instead—tidies! Tidies! You ever see a man who admires tidies? Did you ever think what "tidies" were for when they were first made? They were to be called "anti-macassar."

Why? Because there was a fashion in years gone by of oiling the hair, every body's hair. We accepted this fashion as brainlessly as we accept the tides now. And there was one universal fashionable lubricant for the purpose—"Rowland's Macassar Oil." The hum-bug heads, so greased, made fun of spots on the great stuffed chairs then in use. Hence the "anti-macassar." If not occurring to any one that the hair might be different or the chair might be different—only to put more human labor between the hair and the chair, to be greased and washed.

The original anti-macassar was washable. Because of this dirty and foolish habit of fifty years ago women now hang silk and velvet tidies, embroidered and lilted, painted tidies, on the backs of hard wood chairs, to be rested on by clean heads, to no purpose but the confusion of the man who walks off with the tidy on his back.

If all women, who elected the great profession of housekeeping were trained in the first principles of art—the principles of truth, use and harmony—we should have houses that would be a rest to the soul, instead of a weariness to the body. These houses which are built mainly for women, are they so built as to best suit their convenience, health and happiness? What had women have, as a rule, in the planning and arranging of their houses? As a rule, none. Happy is the woman whose husband is a carpenter, and a good-natured carpenter at that, so that she can have shelves and hooks and cupboards put where she wants them. When a man undertakes to arrange for cooking in a buffet car, or even in a dining car, he arranges a kitchen that is a mechanical marvel for compactness and convenience. He knows just what is to be done and arranges for it scientifically.

make his houses suit our convenience? You can't expect men to do it unless they would, fast enough; for men have that righteous laziness that leads to waste energy, and women, so far, show a magnanimous patience with inconvenience and needless toil worthy only of an angel or a fool!—Watchman.

HINTS FOR MOTHERS.

A little child over the way has suffered much from ingrowing toe nails, pain which I think can be prevented. In this case, the usual remedies of hot tallow, etc., proved unavailing, hence the family physician deemed the nail extraction necessary. Knowing from experience the torture from ingrowing nails I made an effort to discover the cause, and then the cure, or rather the preventive. I have succeeded in a measure, since thirty toe nails, which have been under my supervision from infancy are not inclined to grow ingrown again. Simply because I never round off the corners as is customary in trimming the finger nails.

"But I cannot trim the toe nails straight," exclaims some mother. Probably not now since this must be begun in infancy, for a curving growth induces a curved grain in the nail which will break or split, despite a straight paring. In this case temporary relief is obtained by rubbing the center of the nail very thin, or by trimming the nail, opposite the inward growth, extremely close. Nature then makes exertion to supply the deficit, or to grow in the direction from which the nail is removed.

Do not however, cut from the profuse pink toes, or fingers of baby, the nails, as long as they can be pinched off; but when paring becomes necessary be sure to trim the nail to the center of the nail very thin, or by trimming the nail, opposite the inward growth, extremely close. Nature then makes exertion to supply the deficit, or to grow in the direction from which the nail is removed.

Do not however, cut from the profuse pink toes, or fingers of baby, the nails, as long as they can be pinched off; but when paring becomes necessary be sure to trim the nail to the center of the nail very thin, or by trimming the nail, opposite the inward growth, extremely close. Nature then makes exertion to supply the deficit, or to grow in the direction from which the nail is removed.

Do not however, cut from the profuse pink toes, or fingers of baby, the nails, as long as they can be pinched off; but when paring becomes necessary be sure to trim the nail to the center of the nail very thin, or by trimming the nail, opposite the inward growth, extremely close. Nature then makes exertion to supply the deficit, or to grow in the direction from which the nail is removed.

Do not however, cut from the profuse pink toes, or fingers of baby, the nails, as long as they can be pinched off; but when paring becomes necessary be sure to trim the nail to the center of the nail very thin, or by trimming the nail, opposite the inward growth, extremely close. Nature then makes exertion to supply the deficit, or to grow in the direction from which the nail is removed.

Do not however, cut from the profuse pink toes, or fingers of baby, the nails, as long as they can be pinched off; but when paring becomes necessary be sure to trim the nail to the center of the nail very thin, or by trimming the nail, opposite the inward growth, extremely close. Nature then makes exertion to supply the deficit, or to grow in the direction from which the nail is removed.

Do not however, cut from the profuse pink toes, or fingers of baby, the nails, as long as they can be pinched off; but when paring becomes necessary be sure to trim the nail to the center of the nail very thin, or by trimming the nail, opposite the inward growth, extremely close. Nature then makes exertion to supply the deficit, or to grow in the direction from which the nail is removed.

Do not however, cut from the profuse pink toes, or fingers of baby, the nails, as long as they can be pinched off; but when paring becomes necessary be sure to trim the nail to the center of the nail very thin, or by trimming the nail, opposite the inward growth, extremely close. Nature then makes exertion to supply the deficit, or to grow in the direction from which the nail is removed.

Do not however, cut from the profuse pink toes, or fingers of baby, the nails, as long as they can be pinched off; but when paring becomes necessary be sure to trim the nail to the center of the nail very thin, or by trimming the nail, opposite the inward growth, extremely close. Nature then makes exertion to supply the deficit, or to grow in the direction from which the nail is removed.

Do not however, cut from the profuse pink toes, or fingers of baby, the nails, as long as they can be pinched off; but when paring becomes necessary be sure to trim the nail to the center of the nail very thin, or by trimming the nail, opposite the inward growth, extremely close. Nature then makes exertion to supply the deficit, or to grow in the direction from which the nail is removed.

Do not however, cut from the profuse pink toes, or fingers of baby, the nails, as long as they can be pinched off; but when paring becomes necessary be sure to trim the nail to the center of the nail very thin, or by trimming the nail, opposite the inward growth, extremely close. Nature then makes exertion to supply the deficit, or to grow in the direction from which the nail is removed.

Do not however, cut from the profuse pink toes, or fingers of baby, the nails, as long as they can be pinched off; but when paring becomes necessary be sure to trim the nail to the center of the nail very thin, or by trimming the nail, opposite the inward growth, extremely close. Nature then makes exertion to supply the deficit, or to grow in the direction from which the nail is removed.

Do not however, cut from the profuse pink toes, or fingers of baby, the nails, as long as they can be pinched off; but when paring becomes necessary be sure to trim the nail to the center of the nail very thin, or by trimming the nail, opposite the inward growth, extremely close. Nature then makes exertion to supply the deficit, or to grow in the direction from which the nail is removed.

Do not however, cut from the profuse pink toes, or fingers of baby, the nails, as long as they can be pinched off; but when paring becomes necessary be sure to trim the nail to the center of the nail very thin, or by trimming the nail, opposite the inward growth, extremely close. Nature then makes exertion to supply the deficit, or to grow in the direction from which the nail is removed.

THE FARM.

THIN, EVEN SEEDING WANTED.

I have long been convinced farmers sow much more seed to the acre than is best. One great trouble at present is the uneven distribution of the seed by all the drills I have ever seen or tried. Set them to sow any quantity, from three pecks to two bushels; run them on the road and you will find every few steps as many as from three to five grains deposited on the size of a nickel and corresponding vacant places. The wanted and coming wheat drill is one that will drop one grain at a time, and can be regulated to drop grains 2, 3, 3, 3; and 4 inches apart, and if I had such a machine I would drill my wheat one grain in a place, and grains 2 1/2 inches apart in the drill. This would require a change of plump, well-mixed seed about twenty-three rounds to the acre. There are about 900,000 grains of wheat in a bushel of selected seed wheat. You can make your own calculations.

I commenced some fifteen years ago sowing just what I had, and common with three pecks; after sowing some two acres I found I had only sowed one bushel, and then regulated the machine to sow three pecks. The yield that year was twenty-seven bushels per acre, and as the soil was as good as could be judged by the eye, where I sowed the first two acres, half yielded to the acre, it was as good and banded as well as where three pecks were sown. I have considered the matter since, and I would drop one grain at a time at regular intervals, for as I said before, the best machine for drilling wheat I can get will sometimes drop as high as five grains on the size of a nickel, and the result is just what I am trying to avoid for these five grains commence the trouble for existence, and send up spindling stalks, bearing a head maybe only one-half inch to an inch long, with a half-dozen grains to the head. Now, one seed in the soil will grow sixteen to twenty-two stalks, bearing heads, if it has room to grow and draw sustenance. Say we take the low average of twenty heads to one grain, and then again the low average of five grains to the head, the result would make a yield of 400 grains to each grain sowed. Now, at this average yield, if each grain would do as well, one bushel of seed would produce one bushel of grain, and I have mentioned that his large yield of corn comes from two stalks to a hill; if you have three stalks, you will sometimes get as much; if four stalks never as much; if five stalks, no large ears, all small and puny. This is the reason, I think, why a hill struggling for existence. It was this line of thought that led the writer to sow less wheat to the acre, and I am fully convinced I am on the right track. If I only had a machine that would sow one grain at a time, I would not sow one acre more until it was worth \$1 a bushel for me.—E. A. Olesman in Practical Farmer.

I have long been convinced farmers sow much more seed to the acre than is best. One great trouble at present is the uneven distribution of the seed by all the drills I have ever seen or tried. Set them to sow any quantity, from three pecks to two bushels; run them on the road and you will find every few steps as many as from three to five grains deposited on the size of a nickel and corresponding vacant places. The wanted and coming wheat drill is one that will drop one grain at a time, and can be regulated to drop grains 2, 3, 3, 3; and 4 inches apart, and if I had such a machine I would drill my wheat one grain in a place, and grains 2 1/2 inches apart in the drill. This would require a change of plump, well-mixed seed about twenty-three rounds to the acre. There are about 900,000 grains of wheat in a bushel of selected seed wheat. You can make your own calculations.

I commenced some fifteen years ago sowing just what I had, and common with three pecks; after sowing some two acres I found I had only sowed one bushel, and then regulated the machine to sow three pecks. The yield that year was twenty-seven bushels per acre, and as the soil was as good as could be judged by the eye, where I sowed the first two acres, half yielded to the acre, it was as good and banded as well as where three pecks were sown. I have considered the matter since, and I would drop one grain at a time at regular intervals, for as I said before, the best machine for drilling wheat I can get will sometimes drop as high as five grains on the size of a nickel, and the result is just what I am trying to avoid for these five grains commence the trouble for existence, and send up spindling stalks, bearing a head maybe only one-half inch to an inch long, with a half-dozen grains to the head. Now, one seed in the soil will grow sixteen to twenty-two stalks, bearing heads, if it has room to grow and draw sustenance. Say we take the low average of twenty heads to one grain, and then again the low average of five grains to the head, the result would make a yield of 400 grains to each grain sowed. Now, at this average yield, if each grain would do as well, one bushel of seed would produce one bushel of grain, and I have mentioned that his large yield of corn comes from two stalks to a hill; if you have three stalks, you will sometimes get as much; if four stalks never as much; if five stalks, no large ears, all small and puny. This is the reason, I think, why a hill struggling for existence. It was this line of thought that led the writer to sow less wheat to the acre, and I am fully convinced I am on the right track. If I only had a machine that would sow one grain at a time, I would not sow one acre more until it was worth \$1 a bushel for me.—E. A. Olesman in Practical Farmer.

I have long been convinced farmers sow much more seed to the acre than is best. One great trouble at present is the uneven distribution of the seed by all the drills I have ever seen or tried. Set them to sow any quantity, from three pecks to two bushels; run them on the road and you will find every few steps as many as from three to five grains deposited on the size of a nickel and corresponding vacant places. The wanted and coming wheat drill is one that will drop one grain at a time, and can be regulated to drop grains 2, 3, 3, 3; and 4 inches apart, and if I had such a machine I would drill my wheat one grain in a place, and grains 2 1/2 inches apart in the drill. This would require a change of plump, well-mixed seed about twenty-three rounds to the acre. There are about 900,000 grains of wheat in a bushel of selected seed wheat. You can make your own calculations.

I commenced some fifteen years ago sowing just what I had, and common with three pecks; after sowing some two acres I found I had only sowed one bushel, and then regulated the machine to sow three pecks. The yield that year was twenty-seven bushels per acre, and as the soil was as good as could be judged by the eye, where I sowed the first two acres, half yielded to the acre, it was as good and banded as well as where three pecks were sown. I have considered the matter since, and I would drop one grain at a time at regular intervals, for as I said before, the best machine for drilling wheat I can get will sometimes drop as high as five grains on the size of a nickel, and the result is just what I am trying to avoid for these five grains commence the trouble for existence, and send up spindling stalks, bearing a head maybe only one-half inch to an inch long, with a half-dozen grains to the head. Now, one seed in the soil will grow sixteen to twenty-two stalks, bearing heads, if it has room to grow and draw sustenance. Say we take the low average of twenty heads to one grain, and then again the low average of five grains to the head, the result would make a yield of 400 grains to each grain sowed. Now, at this average yield, if each grain would do as well, one bushel of seed would produce one bushel of grain, and I have mentioned that his large yield of corn comes from two stalks to a hill; if you have three stalks, you will sometimes get as much; if four stalks never as much; if five stalks, no large ears, all small and puny. This is the reason, I think, why a hill struggling for existence. It was this line of thought that led the writer to sow less wheat to the acre, and I am fully convinced I am on the right track. If I only had a machine that would sow one grain at a time, I would not sow one acre more until it was worth \$1 a bushel for me.—E. A. Olesman in Practical Farmer.

I have long been convinced farmers sow much more seed to the acre than is best. One great trouble at present is the uneven distribution of the seed by all the drills I have ever seen or tried. Set them to sow any quantity, from three pecks to two bushels; run them on the road and you will find every few steps as many as from three to five grains deposited on the size of a nickel and corresponding vacant places. The wanted and coming wheat drill is one that will drop one grain at a time, and can be regulated to drop grains 2, 3, 3, 3; and 4 inches apart, and if I had such a machine I would drill my wheat one grain in a place, and grains 2 1/2 inches apart in the drill. This would require a change of plump, well-mixed seed about twenty-three rounds to the acre. There are about 900,000 grains of wheat in a bushel of selected seed wheat. You can make your own calculations.

I commenced some fifteen years ago sowing just what I had, and common with three pecks; after sowing some two acres I found I had only sowed one bushel, and then regulated the machine to sow three pecks. The yield that year was twenty-seven bushels per acre, and as the soil was as good as could be judged by the eye, where I sowed the first two acres, half yielded to the acre, it was as good and banded as well as where three pecks were sown. I have considered the matter since, and I would drop one grain at a time at regular intervals, for as I said before, the best machine for drilling wheat I can get will sometimes drop as high as five grains on the size of a nickel, and the result is just what I am trying to avoid for these five grains commence the trouble for existence, and send up spindling stalks, bearing a head maybe only one-half inch to an inch long, with a half-dozen grains to the head. Now, one seed in the soil will grow sixteen to twenty-two stalks, bearing heads, if it has room to grow and draw sustenance. Say we take the low average of twenty heads to one grain, and then again the low average of five grains to the head, the result would make a yield of 400 grains to each grain sowed. Now, at this average yield, if each grain would do as well, one bushel of seed would produce one bushel of grain, and I have mentioned that his large yield of corn comes from two stalks to a hill; if you have three stalks, you will sometimes get as much; if four stalks never as much; if five stalks, no large ears, all small and puny. This is the reason, I think, why a hill struggling for existence. It was this line of thought that led the writer to sow less wheat to the acre, and I am fully convinced I am on the right track. If I only had a machine that would sow one grain at a time, I would not sow one acre more until it was worth \$1 a bushel for me.—E. A. Olesman in Practical Farmer.

I have long been convinced farmers sow much more seed to the acre than is best. One great trouble at present is the uneven distribution of the seed by all the drills I have ever seen or tried. Set them to sow any quantity, from three pecks to two bushels; run them on the road and you will find every few steps as many as from three to five grains deposited on the size of a nickel and corresponding vacant places. The wanted and coming wheat drill is one that will drop one grain at a time, and can be regulated to drop grains 2, 3, 3, 3; and 4 inches apart, and if I had such a machine I would drill my wheat one grain in a place, and grains 2 1/2 inches apart in the drill. This would require a change of plump, well-mixed seed about twenty-three rounds to the acre. There are about 900,000 grains of wheat in a bushel of selected seed wheat. You can make your own calculations.

I commenced some fifteen years ago sowing just what I had, and common with three pecks; after sowing some two acres I found I had only sowed one bushel, and then regulated the machine to sow three pecks. The yield that year was twenty-seven bushels per acre, and as the soil was as good as could be judged by the eye, where I sowed the first two acres, half yielded to the acre, it was as good and banded as well as where three pecks were sown. I have considered the matter since, and I would drop one grain at a time at regular intervals, for as I said before, the best machine for drilling wheat I can get will sometimes drop as high as five grains on the size of a nickel, and the result is just what I am trying to avoid for these five grains commence the trouble for existence, and send up spindling stalks, bearing a head maybe only one-half inch to an inch long, with a half-dozen grains to the head. Now, one seed in the soil will grow sixteen to twenty-two stalks, bearing heads, if it has room to grow and draw sustenance. Say we take the low average of twenty heads to one grain, and then again the low average of five grains to the head, the result would make a yield of 400 grains to each grain sowed. Now, at this average yield, if each grain would do as well, one bushel of seed would produce one bushel of grain, and I have mentioned that his large yield of corn comes from two stalks to a hill; if you have three stalks, you will sometimes get as much; if four stalks never as much; if five stalks, no large ears, all small and puny. This is the reason, I think, why a hill struggling for existence. It was this line of thought that led the writer to sow less wheat to the acre, and I am fully convinced I am on the right track. If I only had a machine that would sow one grain at a time, I would not sow one acre more until it was worth \$1 a bushel for me.—E. A. Olesman in Practical Farmer.

I have long been convinced farmers sow much more seed to the acre than is best. One great trouble at present is the uneven distribution of the seed by all the drills I have ever seen or tried. Set them to sow any quantity, from three pecks to two bushels; run them on the road and you will find every few steps as many as from three to five grains deposited on the size of a nickel and corresponding vacant places. The wanted and coming wheat drill is one that will drop one grain at a time, and can be regulated to drop grains 2, 3, 3, 3; and 4 inches apart, and if I had such a machine I would drill my wheat one grain in a place, and grains 2 1/2 inches apart in the drill. This would require a change of plump, well-mixed seed about twenty-three rounds to the acre. There are about 900,000 grains of wheat in a bushel of selected seed wheat. You can make your own calculations.

I commenced some fifteen years ago sowing just what I had, and common with three pecks; after sowing some two acres I found I had only sowed one bushel, and then regulated the machine to sow three pecks. The yield that year was twenty-seven bushels per acre, and as the soil was as good as could be judged by the eye, where I sowed the first two acres, half yielded to the acre, it was as good and banded as well as where three pecks were sown. I have considered the matter since, and I would drop one grain at a time at regular intervals, for as I said before, the best machine for drilling wheat I can get will sometimes drop as high as five grains on the size of a nickel, and the result is just what I am trying to avoid for these five grains commence the trouble for existence, and send up spindling stalks, bearing a head maybe only one-half inch to an inch long, with a half-dozen grains to the head. Now, one seed in the soil will grow sixteen to twenty-two stalks, bearing heads, if it has room to grow and draw sustenance. Say we take the low average of twenty heads to one grain, and then again the low average of five grains to the head, the result would make a yield of 400 grains to each grain sowed. Now, at this average yield, if each grain would do as well, one bushel of seed would produce one bushel of grain, and I have mentioned that his large yield of corn comes from two stalks to a hill; if you have three stalks, you will sometimes get as much; if four stalks never as much; if five stalks, no large ears, all small and puny. This is the reason, I think, why a hill struggling for existence. It was this line of thought that led the writer to sow less wheat to the acre, and I am fully convinced I am on the right track. If I only had a machine that would sow one grain at a time, I would not sow one acre more until it was worth \$1 a bushel for me.—E. A. Olesman in Practical Farmer.

I have long been convinced farmers sow much more seed to the acre than is best. One great trouble at present is the uneven distribution of the seed by all the drills I have ever seen or tried. Set them to sow any quantity, from three pecks to two bushels; run them on the road and you will find every few steps as many as from three to five grains deposited on the size of a nickel and corresponding vacant places. The wanted and coming wheat drill is one that will drop one grain at a time, and can be regulated to drop grains 2, 3, 3, 3; and 4 inches apart, and if I had such a machine I would drill my wheat one grain in a place, and grains 2 1/2 inches apart in the drill. This would require a change of plump, well-mixed seed about twenty-three rounds to the acre. There are about 900,000 grains of wheat in a bushel of selected seed wheat. You can make your own calculations.

I commenced some fifteen years ago sowing just what I had, and common with three pecks; after sowing some two acres I found I had only sowed one bushel, and then regulated the machine to sow three pecks. The yield that year was twenty-seven bushels per acre, and as the soil was as good as could be judged by the eye, where I sowed the first two acres, half yielded to the acre, it was as good and banded as well as where three pecks were sown. I have considered the matter since, and I would drop one grain at a time at regular intervals, for as I said before, the best machine for drilling wheat I can get will sometimes drop as high as five grains on the size of a nickel, and the result is just what I am trying to avoid for these five grains commence the trouble for existence, and send up spindling stalks, bearing a head maybe only one-half inch to an inch long, with a half-dozen grains to the head. Now, one seed in the soil will grow sixteen to twenty-two stalks, bearing heads, if it has room to grow and draw sustenance. Say we take the low average of twenty heads to one grain, and then again the low average of five grains to the head, the result would make a yield of 400 grains to each grain sowed. Now, at this average yield, if each grain would do as well, one bushel of seed would produce one bushel of grain, and I have mentioned that his large yield of corn comes from two stalks to a hill; if you have three stalks, you will sometimes get as much; if four stalks never as much; if five stalks, no large ears, all small and puny. This is the reason, I think, why a hill struggling for existence. It was this line of thought that led the writer to sow less wheat to the acre, and I am fully convinced I am on the right track. If I only had a machine that would sow one grain at a time, I would not sow one acre more until it was worth \$1 a bushel for me.—E. A. Olesman in Practical Farmer.

I have long been convinced farmers sow much more seed to the acre than is best. One great trouble at present is the uneven distribution of the seed by all the drills I have ever seen or tried. Set them to sow any quantity, from three pecks to two bushels; run them on the road and you will find every few steps as many as from three to five grains deposited on the size of a nickel and corresponding vacant places. The wanted and coming wheat drill is one that will drop one grain at a time, and can be regulated to drop grains 2, 3, 3, 3; and 4 inches apart, and if I had such a machine I would drill my wheat one grain in a place, and grains 2 1/2 inches apart in the drill. This would require a change of plump, well-mixed seed about twenty-three rounds to the acre. There are about 900,000 grains of wheat in a bushel of selected seed wheat. You can make your own calculations.

I commenced some fifteen years ago sowing just what I had, and common with three pecks; after sowing some two acres I found I had only sowed one bushel, and then regulated the machine to sow three pecks. The yield that year was twenty-seven bushels per acre, and as the soil was as good as could be judged by the eye, where I sowed the first two acres, half yielded to the acre, it was as good and banded as well as where three pecks were sown. I have considered the matter since, and I would drop one grain at a time at regular intervals, for as I said before, the best machine for drilling wheat I can get will sometimes drop as high as five grains on the size of a nickel, and the result is just what I am trying to avoid for these five grains commence the trouble for existence, and send up spindling stalks, bearing a head maybe only one-half inch to an inch long, with a half-dozen grains to the head. Now, one seed in the soil will grow sixteen to twenty-two stalks, bearing heads, if it has room to grow and draw sustenance. Say we take the low average of twenty heads to one grain, and then again the low average of five grains to the head, the result would make a yield of 400 grains to each grain sowed. Now, at this average yield, if each grain would do as well, one bushel of seed would produce one bushel of grain, and I have mentioned that his large yield of corn comes from two stalks to a hill; if you have three stalks, you will sometimes get as much; if four stalks never as much; if five stalks, no large ears, all small and puny. This is the reason, I think, why a hill struggling for existence. It was this line of thought that led the writer to sow less wheat to the acre, and I am fully convinced I am on the right track. If I only had a machine that would sow one grain at a time, I would not sow one acre more until it was worth \$1 a bushel for me.—E. A. Olesman in Practical Farmer.

test should resemble the final trial which will be made in the field and upon the outcome of which the productiveness and the profit of the crop will very largely depend.—J. E. R.

CARE OF THE PIGS.

Ordinarily until the pigs are six to eight months old there should be no other thought in connection with the raising of them than how to make them grow. Any surplus fat at this time is in the way. The pig needs that kind of food that will develop bone and muscle, giving him size and robust constitution. These things are never accomplished by the farmer who grows enthusiastically by spurs. It is nature's way to permit of no stop-offs on the route travelled by the pig from the farrowing nest to the packing house. If he does take a stop-over at any point in his career from any cause whatsoever he does it at his own expense. Regular and even development is always nature's way, and her way should be our way.

For the first few weeks of the pig's life he is to be fed wholly through the dam and it must always be rigidly borne in mind by the feeder that when he is feeding the dam he is feeding the pig. It is very often a thoughtless indifference upon this point that is the cause of one of the most vexatious troubles with young pigs. Scours is not considered a very dangerous ailment, but it is a much more costly thing to the farmer's pocketbook than all other ailments combined. Thumps kills its victims in all probability and the thing is an end. One pig in the litter is about the limit of the trouble with thumps. But with scours it goes through the litter. The trouble does not arise perhaps from getting too strong a flow of milk over an extended period of time, but rather from too much at one time and too little at another, caused by spurts in feeding, or by sudden changes in the character of the milk caused by feeding the wrong thing. Whatever the cause the worst phase of the matter is not simply that the pigs are afflicted with a disorder so difficult to cure, but that it stunts growth permanently. The pig that has had the scours never will make the hog that it might have made had it escaped the trouble. This is a very serious well be set down as settled. Hence, the man who would make the most of his pigs must avoid scours with his pigs. This he can do only by properly feeding the dam while they are young.—Nebraska Farmer.

It is a fashion just now to prescribe fertilizers with most of the nitrogen left out, on the theory that nitrogen can be obtained more cheaply from the air and subsoil by the aid of clover and similar crops. But this attractive notion of getting our most costly fertilizing element free of charge is liable to be greatly overrated when applied to average New-England conditions. Some of the soil is rocky, and the greater portion of it is rather stiff and hard to be ploughed. Our farmers do not like to go through the expensive process of turning soil and laying down a field every few years, as must be done with clover. They usually sow clover mixed with some more permanent hay plant, like timothy, and do not care to disturb the soil until the yield becomes somewhat inferior. They prefer to top dress liberally rather than to plough under.

When the soil is finally turned again the clover has nearly all died out, and whatever nitrogen it had collected has passed into the succeeding hay crop. Hence very little surplus nitrogen can be obtained by the ordinary methods in this section. Farmers who have land that is easily worked will find some advantage in a quick rotation of crops like that advocated by the clover farmers, but the method is of some what limited application under present conditions.

If the alfalfa variety of clover proves successful here, as there is some reason to hope, the result would be to greater advantage of farmers who dread the great expense and labor of breaking up soil land. Alfalfa will trap nitrogen from the year after year without reseeded. But for the present our farmers can by no means dispense with the due proportion of nitrogen in fertilizers, and stable manure as a nitrogenous fertilizer will long continue a standard.—Massachusetts Ploughman.

It is a fashion just now to prescribe fertilizers with most of the nitrogen left out, on the theory that nitrogen can be obtained more cheaply from the air and subsoil by the aid of clover and similar crops. But this attractive notion of getting our most costly fertilizing element free of charge is liable to be greatly overrated when applied to average New-England conditions. Some of the soil is rocky, and the greater portion of it is rather stiff and hard to be ploughed. Our farmers do not like to go through the expensive process of turning soil and laying down a field every few years, as must be done with clover. They usually sow clover mixed with some more permanent hay plant, like timothy, and do not care to disturb the soil until the yield becomes somewhat inferior. They prefer to top dress liberally rather than to plough under.

When the soil is finally turned again the clover has nearly all died out, and whatever nitrogen it had collected has passed into the succeeding hay crop. Hence very little surplus nitrogen can be obtained by the ordinary methods in this section. Farmers who have land that is easily worked will find some advantage in a quick rotation of crops like that advocated by the clover farmers, but the method is of some what limited application under present conditions.

If the alfalfa variety of clover proves successful here, as there is some reason to hope, the result would be to greater advantage of farmers who dread the great expense and labor of breaking up soil land. Alfalfa will trap nitrogen from the year after year without reseeded. But for the present our farmers can by no means dispense with the due proportion of nitrogen in fertilizers, and stable manure as a nitrogenous fertilizer will long continue a standard.—Massachusetts Ploughman.

It is a fashion just now to prescribe fertilizers with most of the nitrogen left out, on the theory that nitrogen can be obtained more cheaply from the air and subsoil by the aid of clover and similar crops. But this attractive notion of getting our most costly fertilizing element free of charge is liable to be greatly overrated when applied to average New-England conditions. Some of the soil is rocky, and the greater portion of it is rather stiff and hard to be ploughed. Our farmers do not like to go through the expensive process of turning soil and laying down a field every few years, as must be done with clover. They usually sow clover mixed with some more permanent hay plant, like timothy, and do not care to disturb the soil until the yield becomes somewhat inferior. They prefer to top dress liberally rather than to plough under.

When the soil is finally turned again the clover has nearly all died out, and whatever nitrogen it had collected has passed into the succeeding hay crop. Hence very little surplus nitrogen can be obtained by the ordinary methods in this section. Farmers who have land that is easily worked will find some advantage in a quick rotation of crops like that advocated by the clover farmers, but the method is of some what limited application under present conditions.

If the alfalfa variety of clover proves successful here, as there is some reason to hope, the result would be to greater advantage of farmers who dread the great expense and labor of breaking up soil land. Alfalfa will trap nitrogen from the year after year without reseeded. But for the present our farmers can by no means dispense with the due proportion of nitrogen in fertilizers, and stable manure as a nitrogenous fertilizer will long continue a standard.—Massachusetts Ploughman.

It is a fashion just now to prescribe fertilizers with most of the nitrogen left out, on the theory that nitrogen can be obtained more cheaply from the air and subsoil by the aid of clover and similar crops. But this attractive notion of getting our most costly fertilizing element free of charge is liable to be greatly overrated when applied to average New-England conditions. Some of the soil is rocky, and the greater portion of it is rather stiff and hard to be ploughed. Our farmers do not like to go through the expensive process of turning soil and laying down a field every few years, as must be done with clover. They usually sow clover mixed with some more permanent hay plant, like timothy, and do not care to disturb the soil until the yield becomes somewhat inferior. They prefer to top dress liberally rather than to plough under.

When the soil is finally turned again the clover has nearly all died out, and whatever nitrogen it had collected has passed into the succeeding hay crop. Hence very little surplus nitrogen can be obtained by the ordinary methods in this section. Farmers who have land that is easily worked will find some advantage in a quick rotation of crops like that advocated by the clover farmers, but the method is of some what limited application under present conditions.

If the alfalfa variety of clover proves successful here, as there is some reason to hope, the result would be to greater advantage of farmers who dread the great expense and labor of breaking up soil land. Alfalfa will trap nitrogen from the year after year without reseeded. But for the present our farmers can by no means dispense with the due proportion of nitrogen in fertilizers, and stable manure as a nitrogenous fertilizer will long continue a standard.—Massachusetts Ploughman.

It is a fashion just now to prescribe fertilizers with most of the nitrogen left out, on the theory that nitrogen can be obtained more cheaply from the air and subsoil by the aid of clover and similar crops. But this attractive notion of getting our most costly fertilizing element free of charge is liable to be greatly overrated when applied to average New-England conditions. Some of the soil is rocky, and the greater portion of it is rather stiff and hard to be ploughed. Our farmers do not like to go through the expensive process of turning soil and laying down a field every few years, as must be done with clover. They usually sow clover mixed with some more permanent hay plant, like timothy, and do not care to disturb the soil until the yield becomes somewhat inferior. They prefer to top dress liberally rather than to plough under.