

Agricultural.

Address by W. D. Wilson, at a Meeting of the N. E. Iowa Agricultural Society, abridged:—

The position of the farmer is a very high one; all labor rests on his; the first farmer was the first man. All true nobility rests upon the possession of the land, and has been so recognized from the beginning.

He emphatically represents the necessities, and continuous hard labor. Without him, man could not exist, but his rule is that the earth shall feed and clothe him and his family, and to obtain a surplus for the subsistence of others. In all, he is dependent upon his industry, soil and the seasons, and then has to wait for his crops to grow. A failure to prepare, plant and sow at the most propitious times is liable to bring him to want and to produce a food famine. His trusts are therefore very grave, and whilst they are in their proper execution, the most ennobling God ever gave to man, he too frequently esteems the labor to produce the bread and meat he was commanded to obtain from the earth by the sweat of his face, a curse instead of a blessing.

From whence are principally obtained our statesmen, our jurists, our legislators, our merchant princes, our engineers, our working men and women of the cities but from the farm? The industry and physical energy that secures success are obtained on the farm. The cities' energies are recruited from the country. Let the farmer fail to produce both men and women, the energies of the world fail. As on the mother is dependent almost the whole future of the child, so on the farm is dependent the future of the world. For all the cares and drudgery of farm life the farmer has his compensatory advantages. He is permanent—or should and can be—and thus finds security and competency, none to molest him or make him afraid, if he is true to himself.

[The lecturer, after dwelling for some time on the resources at the command of the farmer, thus proceeds to enquire, does he fully develop those resources?]

Such is his commanding position, and such are a portion of his facilities for improving it, but what does the farmer do for all this in return? For while the world is dependent upon him he is dependent upon his exertions and his intelligence in co-operating with nature. Absolutely nothing when compared with what he might do. On the contrary, he robs and impoverishes his rich inheritance and scatters abroad over the earth by drawing from its coffers and never restoring. Whilst all nature works for him, he does little or nothing for nature. The ingredients that are especially the life of the wheat plant are sent abroad never to return, and the means that are at hand to restore these important elements, such as the growth of clover and other grasses, are almost entirely neglected.

[A portion of the lecture is given to the question: What should the farmer raise for the market? There is no doubt that here too, as in the States, more attention should be paid to raising and fattening stock than has hitherto been given to this very important subject.]

That our system of farming is in many respects, radically wrong, cannot admit of a doubt. What is the object of farming should be seriously considered by all who cultivate the soil. Mainly, and almost wholly, it is to supply the human family with those articles of food, and raw material which are most needed by mankind, and which, as a consequence of that need, bring the highest prices. Therefore a farmer should study to ascertain which are the articles most in demand, and to which he can best adapt his acres, so as to supply any part of that demand and to obtain the highest profit. If he does this, his reward will be ten-fold; he will have the satisfaction of having done to the com-

munity the greatest good possible, which will satisfy him as having performed a high moral duty. He will also have the satisfaction of having produced and sold those articles that paid the best, and that will tickle his pocket, one of the most sensitive parts of our moral faculties, especially in these days. Philanthropy and self interest agree in this case.

But these are not the only benefits the farmer derives by supplying the articles that are in greatest demand; for, very generally, these articles are precisely those whose productions least exhaust his land, and they are generally such as have the greatest concentrated value. That which is produced by and from cattle, sheep, hogs, horses, &c., is embraced in the concentrated productions. Whilst wheat does not receive, on an average, a price that will pay for its average cost of production, corn commands more than double its cost of production when judiciously fed to stock.

[We will make another brief extract in which the lecturer enters into a calculation of what additional profit might be made on the farm by improvement of stock and more careful husbandry. We may ourselves often profit by the lessons taught to others.]

We will not dwell further on this point, but look a little into what might be done more than is done on the farm with a trifling additional expense, and the saving of what is produced.

We have been inquiring for years in regard to the following points in the management of a farm, and we feel that we place the figures below rather than above the real facts:

There is an average wasted annually off every farm of what is produced.....	\$75.00
What could be produced in addition to the general productions of the farm.....	75.00
Improvement of stock, by a small expenditure.....	75.00
Improper feeding of stock and bad shelter.....	75.00
Loss from improvident damage to farm tools.....	25.00

The above presents an average loss on each farm in the above items of \$325.00; but suppose we take only the average of two hundred dollars, and as we have not less than 200,000 farmers in the State, it gives the startling aggregate of forty millions of dollars! that might be saved the State by using proper economy and with a small additional cost only in breeding animals not exceeding an average of \$25 to each farmer.

IS FARMING IN THE WESTERN STATES PROFITABLE?

As the great dependence of the American farmer for remuneration for his expenditure of money and time on the land is on the net prices he receives for his grain, the following article from the Chicago Tribune is conclusive proof that farming in that country cannot bring in much profit:—

It is becoming a serious question what is to be done with the grain products of the country. During the last sixty days, there has been a general advance in the rates of freights all over the country, and the effect is crushing upon those who produce the lower-priced varieties of grain.—This advance has not affected the wheat-growers so much, because there is comparatively very little wheat going forward. This is, however, accidental. As an illustration, let us give some figures.—The cost of moving corn from a point one hundred miles distant from Chicago, by the way of the lakes and the Erie Canal, including the intermediate charges, to New York, is 41½ cents. This does not include any charge or profit in that city. The price of corn in New York is 65 cts. Allowing three cents per bushel to cover profits and expenses in New York, there is left to the producer just 21 cents per bushel for his corn. In oats, the case is

even worse. It costs to deliver oats from a point like distant from Chicago, in the boat at New York, 31 cents per bushel.—Oats are selling in New York at 40 to 44 cents. If 2 cents per bushel be allowed for expenses and profits in New York, there is left to the producer six to ten cts. per bushel for his oats at the place of growth.

Of course, there is a limit beyond which wheat, corn, and oats cannot be transported, except at a cost equalling or exceeding the value of the article. The rate of freight on oats has almost reached that point now. They may be still further advanced until they prohibit the transportation of corn, and even of wheat. The present freight charges to New York are nearly double the average rates of last year, and the advance in freights is of necessity taken from the price of the grain in the hands of the producer.

The rise in domestic freights is in sympathy with the advance in ocean freights, but the oppression upon the producers is none the less severe. It consumes their product. It is no longer a case of sending one bushel to pay the freight on another; that operation no longer pays. The producer, if freights go any higher, or the price of grain should fall in Liverpool, will have to send some money along, in addition to the corn, to pay the freight on the latter.

REDUCING BONES.

In the discussion of wheat culture, at the late Agricultural Convention in Newport, N. H., Mr. Pattee, of Warner, gave a formula for reducing bones, as follows:—

Place them in a large kettle, mixed with ashes and about one peck of lime to a barrel of bones. Cover with water and boil. In twenty-four hours all the bones, with the exception, perhaps, of the hard shinbones, will become so much softened as to be easily pulverized by hand. They will not be in particles of bone, but in a pasty condition, and in excellent form to mix with muck, loam or ashes. By boiling the shinbones ten or twelve hours longer, they will also become soft. This is an easy and cheap method of reducing bones. If the farmer will set aside a cask for the reception of bones in some convenient place, and throw all that are found on the farm into it, especially if one or two dead horses come into his possession, he will be likely to find a valuable collection at the end of the year, which would prove a valuable adjunct to the manure-heap.

SUTTON'S NEW GIANT HYBRID COW CLOVER.

Messrs. Sutton & Sons, Reading, have sent us a specimen of their new Giant Hybrid Cow Clover, which has already given two cuttings this year, the sample sent being of the third cutting. The specimen we have received is nearly thirty inches in height, and appears to be very succulent. Messrs. Sutton state that it has been produced by a cross between the common red clover and cow-grass, and has been found to succeed well on soils that will not grow the common red clover. It appears, therefore, well deserving of a trial.—*Irish Farmers' Gazette*.

MR. MECHE ON THE ENGLISH HARVEST. Mr. Mechi, the great scientific farmer, sums up the results of the English harvest in the London Times. He says he is no alarmist, but he believes that England will have to pay for foreign corn, in quantity and price, £15,000,000 to £20,000,000 sterling more than in a good wheat season.

CORN FOR SOILING.—An American paper says a dairy, whose butter is excelled by no other in the Philadelphia market, pretty much sustained 58 cows on sowed corn from the middle of last July to the middle of October, and that too from the product of three acres. It was estimated that no less than ninety tons of food were taken from the three acres.

OLD PASTURES OR NEW.

There are two opinions about pastures. One is that it is more profitable to feed only newly seeded land, using it not more than two years before plowing it up for a reseedling; and the other to let it remain for many years, allowing the surface to become fully occupied by the native grasses, these being supposed to be the best adapted to develop its power of production.

If we consider this question according to the general practice of farming communities in this country, we can not hesitate to decide that the greatest profit will follow the first named method, for there is no disputing the proposition that timothy, red-top, orchard grass, and red clover, newly sown on a well prepared and well manured soil, will produce much more forage (and of a highly nutritious kind) than will a close turf of blue grass, white clover, etc., which has for many years had full possession of the ground, and has had no artificial stimulation. The difference in amount will be much more than enough to repay the cost of breaking up, manuring and seeding.

It is not now a question whether the cows will do better on one kind of pasture than on the other, only which will produce the largest money profit. If a single cow were allowed to roam over ten acres of short old pasture, picking up her whole living in white clover and the tender sprouts of blue grass, there is no denying that she would give more milk, more butter, and more cheese than she would if feeding, however abundantly, on the coarser grasses of an artificial pasture. But our purpose in farming is not to get the largest possible yield from our cows, but to get the largest possible yield from our land. The cows are only implements for converting the products of the field into the saleable products of the dairy.

An average first-class cow coming in in May, will make 200 lbs. of butter in the season on good natural pasture, but she will require at least three acres of land for her exclusive use. At 30c. per lb. the season's produce will be \$60—or \$20 per acre. On a good artificial pasture she may give only 180 lbs., worth \$54, but she will be fully supported by the produce of a single acre. Supposing that one-third of the produce is consumed by the interest on the extra number of cows, and by the cost of keeping up the pastures—which is surely a very liberal allowance—we shall have \$36 instead of \$20 as the return per acre. In addition to this, we shall make ourselves much more independent of variations of the seasons, for a well worked rich meadow is far less injured by excessive drouth than any natural pasture on the same soil could be. This, of itself, will often equal the drawback we have allowed for extra cost.

To put the proposition in another form, we may expect, from the foregoing calculation, as large a cash profit from ten acres of artificial as from eighteen acres of natural pasture, and there would be far less risk from unusual drouth. It is not proposed, of course, that rough or waste lands should be used for artificial pastures (they would not repay the cost), only that such fields as are susceptible of profitable subjection should not be left wild.

How nearly natural pastures may be made equal to artificial ones by the use of the harrow and liberal top-dressings is a proposition not considered above. The cost would generally be less than that of reseedling, and the result equally good. In any case, no pasture—old or new—should ever be over stocked.—*American Agriculturist*.

QUANTITY OF ROOTS FOR STOCK.

An intelligent farmer in Ireland gives the following as the respective quantities of roots consumed by the different classes of stock on his premises:—

"Stall-fed, 7½ to 8 tons per head; store cattle, 4 to 6 tons per head; fattening sheep, 15 to 17 cwt. per head; other sheep, 10 to 13 cwt. per head."