

My friend Mr. Terry sometimes reminds me of this remark. For years he was the manure king of Ohio; made hundreds of loads of it annually; preached it early and often; indeed was said to have "manure on the brain." Suddenly he stopped keeping stock, except work-horses and one cow; and stopped making, using or preaching manure, except in a small way. For years he did not believe in hedge-fences, or wheat drills, but has lately been converted to both. But the most remarkable conversion is on plowing under clover.

In Nov. 1885, under "Notes from a Rented Farm," I wrote for the COUNTRY GENTLEMAN an article arguing strongly the unwisdom of plowing under clover for manure, and the wisdom of first taking the "money value" from the clover seed or the hay, and then plowing under the "manure value," in the form of the "haulm" (threshed clover straw), or of the manure of the live-stock fed upon the clover hay. I argued from facts, analyses of constituents, and statistics of crops, to show that under our usual present prices of hay, grain and animal products, it was a waste of money to plow under clover; and I showed from facts and statistics that, though it was wise and common under the prices of 30 or 40 years ago, yet under our present prices the common sense of the vast majority of the farmers of the land had condemned and abandoned the practice. And I closed the article with quite a long quotation from an article by Mr. Terry, written two years before, for an Ohio paper, and showing in exact figures how he lost \$100 of clean cash by plowing under 5½ acres of clover, instead of cutting it for seed or hay: lost that sum of "money value," and had no more left of the "manure value." He called it "a miserable little mistake," laughed at it, and kicked himself soundly for making it, confessed properly, and said: "This is my first mistake in that line, and will be my last," &c. See Ohio Farmer, page 414, June 9, 1883, COUNTRY GENTLEMAN, page 956, Nov. 26, 1885.

Well, the ink was not dry on my manuscript (I wrote in pencil), or rather the manuscript had actually not been mailed. When the mail brought the COUNTRY GENTLEMAN of Nov 5, 1885, with an article (page 896) by Mr. Terry, in which he mentioned, incidentally, that he was going to plow under six acres of clover, "heavy enough to make three big loads of hay to the acre." It almost took away my breath! I wrote a P. S. to my article, calling attention to the complete change of base, and asking Mr. Terry to "rise and explain" why he had reversed so recent and so emphatic an opinion. But after sending the article I wrote the editors not to print the P. S.; and I should probably never have referred to Mr. Terry's reversal of opinion, if he had not himself done so in his article of Aug. 26 (C. G. page 639), on plowing under clover.

I have not before had time to notice that article; and should not do so now (though it seemed, from his allusions to myself, a direct challenge to debate) did I not think the subject a most important one, and that Mr. Terry was exactly right three years ago, and is therefore exactly wrong now. I think he has reasons for plowing under clover, which he has not stated, nor perhaps even suspected, and which, though sound in his case, are not applicable to the average farmer, in my opinion.

Let us first notice the reason he assigns, and show whether it is sound, and then notice what I deem to be the real, and in his case sufficient reason. He says (C. G., p. 639): "Years ago I could, and did, feed out hundreds of tons of hay to dairy cows and beef cattle, so as to make it pay. Milk and beef were very much higher than they are now. Even at the low prices of potatoes and wheat for the last two or three years, I am inclined to think that clover plowed under to manure these crops would be about as profitable as if fed out in the shape of hay." And again, in the same article (C. G.,

p. 640), he says: "My ideas on this subject have not changed since I wrote against plowing under clover for manure alone, some years ago [3 years], but times and prices of farm products have changed materially."

Let us see just how much they have changed, and in which direction. His article condemning plowing under clover appeared in June, 1883, and the one favoring it appeared Aug. 26, 1886. I give the Cleveland, O., highest wholesale quotations from the Ohio Farmer of the corresponding week for the two years. In each case they give prices of the same article or grade of goods, and the comparison are as absolutely fair as I know how to make them.

No.	Article.	Price Aug. 25, 1883.	Price Aug. 26, 1886.	Per cent. of gain.	Per cent. of loss.
1.	Loose hay, per ton.....	\$12 00	\$18 00	50	.....
2.	Clover seed, per bu.....	7.00	6.50	.....	7
3.	Wheat, per bu.....	1 13	82	.....	27
4.	Potatoes, per bu.....	50	60	20	.....
5.	Ohio full cream cheese, per lb.....	9	9	.....	.....
6.	Ohio creamery butter, per lb.....	22	22	.....	.....
7.	Choice steers (Buffalo, N Y) per cwt.	6 00	5.12	.....	15

In the above table, Nos. 1 and 2 are the crops in regard to which we are inquiring whether it is wise to sacrifice their money value in order merely to make manure to produce any or all of Nos 3 to 7. Nos. 3 and 4 are direct vegetable products, and Nos. 5, 6 and 7 are animal products of Nos. 1 and 2.

Now from the above it seems that Mr. T. thought it very foolish, in 1883, to plow under hay at \$12 to produce wheat at \$1.13, but very wise in 1886 to plow under hay at \$18 to produce wheat at \$0.82. Both sets of figures are "dead against" his conclusions. The hay sacrificed as manure is higher, and the wheat produced by the manure is lower. Wheat, now, would have to be \$1.69 per bushel, instead of \$0.82, to make it pay as well to plow the clover under as it did three years ago, when he thought it very foolish to do it. Clover seed is 7 per cent. lower than three years ago, but wheat, the product, is 27 per cent. lower. These figures too are against his new conclusions. Butter and cheese are exactly the same price that they were the same week three years ago; so that here is no ground for change of opinion. Potatoes are 20 per cent. higher, but they could be produced equally well from the manure of the stock that saved the "money value" of the hay, or from the "haulm" from which the "money value" had been saved in the clover seed. Prime beef cattle are 15 per cent. lower, but there has hardly been a time in ten years when you could buy, in Northern Ohio, young beefy steers, helpers or cows at so good advantage to feed through the winter, and turn off fat in May or June at a profit, and get the money value off the clover hay.

In short, I cannot find that "times and prices of farm products have changed materially" in the three years, and certainly not in the direction to account for Mr. Terry's complete change of base. The thing that, in my opinion, makes it pay for Mr. Terry now to plow the clover under for manure, instead of working to save "its money value" by labor in cutting and threshing the seed, or feeding the hay in this — his time is worth more for something else. He can earn \$1,000 a year, more or less, with his pen, writing, and with his voice, lecturing. But not one farmer in ten can do this. The vast majority must earn their money by wise work on their own farms, or not at all. For them Mr. Terry's present advice seems to me unwise, and his exactly opposite advice of three years ago seems eminently wise. Then he said: "I plowed under 6 acres of second-crop clover, \*\*\* buried a lot of dol-