

Editor Farmer's Advocate.

The Market.

MR. EDITOR.—I was much pleased with the remarks made by "Bridget" in your last paper, who is engaged in the market gardening. I believe it would be of advantage and profit to the city of London, as well as to the producers, if convenient stands were erected, or even spaces allotted and leased, so that purchasers might know the different parties from whom they procure their vegetables; and the salesmen might know direct where to go to. At the present time every one has to shift and change places all over the market—sometimes being at one corner, and another time at another, often being crowded out of the proper position by vendors of cakes, pies, tin jewelry, shoddy cloths, and sellers of quack medicines. I would be willing to pay for such accommodation, and from what I know of many others, they also would not grudge, but would be willing to pay an additional charge. Some time ago, one of our leading gardeners offered to erect stalls for the gardeners at his own expense, and when he had drawn as much for rent as paid himself, would have presented the building to the market committee. I hope you will use your influence to bring about a change that may be of value to us in this particular way.

WALTER CORNCROSS.

London, Jan. 14, 1870.

Editor Farmer's Advocate.

Test of Seeds.

Dear Sir,—I have for sometime been intending to write you an account of my success, or otherwise, with the Seeds, &c., which I obtained from you, particularly as you desire such information, and also, because such information may be of some use to others. There is scarcely any part of the Advocate which I read with more interest than the accounts which others give of their success, or failure, with the seeds, &c., obtained from the Emporium.

Three years ago last spring I obtained three buds, or eyes, from you, of the Early Rose Potato, which I planted and took good care of, and this year from their product I obtained a little over fifty bushels, which I have stored carefully away in my cellar till spring. I may now say, as I have tried them for three years, that there is no danger of saying too much in their favor. Their early qualities alone, render them a desirable Potato for every one who has but a small patch of land, while every farmer must desire them for their many other good qualities. Their earliness renders them superior to any other kind I ever had; their excellent table qualities, their productiveness, the ease with which they are dug in the fall,—all combine to render them a desirable potato for general cultivation. Every farmer, indeed every person in the Dominion, owes a debt of thankfulness to the Emporium for bringing them into general repute.

As to the Early Goodrich,—in quality they are passable, in productiveness superior to any other that I ever planted. But then there is one serious drawback, which must prevent them from ever coming into much favor, that is, they are liable to be scabby or rusty; and although it does not go very deep, but mostly peels off when they are cooked, yet it spoils their appearance in the market. They also produce a great many small ones, too small for any thing but hogs. They may not be the same on clay land. My soil is sandy.

The Peach Blows are a good Potato for table use, if they were not so hollow-hearted. In yield they are below the Rose, the Goodrich, or the Harrison. Their good keeping and good table qualities render them a desirable potato.

I was somewhat disappointed with the Harrisons. I had heard so much, and so much had been written, on their extraordinary productiveness, that I expected great things from them; but at taking-up time I found them inferior in yield to the Goodrich and the Rose.

The Excelsor Peas I sowed late, on purpose to escape the bug, but did not succeed, as they are considerably injured. The season was very unfavorable, and in conse-

quence the yield was poor, but better than the Crown Peas which were sown much earlier. I shall give them another trial.

The Marrowfat Beans were a good crop, and of good quality; they are an excellent cooking bean, and cannot be too highly recommended.

The Chevalier Barley, I am convinced, is of no use on such land as mine, but might do well on heavy land.

The Norway Oats were superior to my own common black-oats, but still far short of what I expected.

My Flower Seeds did splendidly, and afforded us a good deal of pleasure through the summer and fall.

RICHARD SAUL.

Strathroy, Dec. 29, 1870.

We may state that the scabbing of the Goodrich Potato is, we think, to be attributed in most cases to new manure, especially if from the pig pen or stable. So many small among them may be accounted for by the land being sandy. In general the accounts of the Goodrich and Harrison are satisfactory; but so much depends on situation, soil, &c., that we can only arrive at facts through having reports from various parts of the country, and request that many of our readers will follow the above example. We tender Mr. Saul our best thanks, and hope to hear from him soon again.—EDITOR.

Editor Farmer's Advocate.

Varna, Jan. 4, 1871.

SIR,—Last spring I sowed one half bushel of your Emporium Oats. They were a heavy crop of straw. They fell down while green as flat as a board. I cut them with the reaping hook. I had ten bushels.

Yours truly,
JOHN MCCOSH.

Editor Farmer's Advocate.

Goulbourn, Jan. 14, 1871.

SIR,—The seed grain and potatoes you sent me last spring done well. The Harrison potatoes yielded 12 lbs. to 4 oz. planting; the Goodrich 10 lbs. to 4 oz. seed; the Emporium Oats, 1 peck to 4 oz. seed; Barley, 1 peck to 4 oz. seed; Crown Peas, 2 quarts to 4 oz. seed. The Harrison potatoes I admire very much. The Goodrich I do not like so well, but they may do well next year. The Emporium Oat is a very fine grain, and ripens very early. Chevalier Barley is very good, but the Crown Peas were badly worm eaten. No more at present; you will hear from me again after next harvest.

Yours truly,
EDWARD VAUGHAN.

Editor Farmer's Advocate.

Wheat Turning to Chess.

DEAR SIR,—I am a regular reader of your very attractive and ably conducted paper, far be it from me to be thought that what I am about to say is with any feeling of derision. I like to see a topic well discussed, sifted and pulled to pieces. It is by this means that information and experience is ventilated, and as you have often remarked that one can give some good result of their observations, now Mr. Editor, this wheat turning into chess is a subject that I have for a very long time devoted great attention to, and being a practical botanist, I will only add that the deeper I take my researches the more palpable does the fact become that it is utterly impossible and against the laws of vegetable nature and life for wheat to produce chess. It may be all very well for a Texan correspondent of a Yankee paper to turn to and open a long yarn about a subject that I would tell him (if I knew him)

that he knows nothing about, and I am too sorry to observe that there is a morbid pandering with many of the American papers to insert communications in a flow of language, that is neither classical nor of plain, sound, common sense. It strikes me those things are often composed to impress one with an idea that they are written by learned botanists and scholars, and that persons of ordinary abilities are unable to refute them; but I am going to take up the cudgels in this case, and shall use them with the best skill I can command. This Texan correspondent of the New York Tribune referred to in your Dec. No., states that the roots of the wheat plant are of two kinds, seminal and coronal. In my botanic experience this latter name as applied to roots, is one that I never heard of. The term coronal in botany means the crown, and relates to the top of the head. What has this to do with root? I cannot for the life of me find out. The roots of the wheat plant, as well as all pulpy ones, are seminal, which is not a botanic term, and to my ears is an unelegant as well as unpractical phrase; he should have called it the sap root. Now if we go back to what the wheat plant originally was, we find it was a wild grass, which by improved cultivation, and frequent change of soil and climate, became what it is, and produces the staff of life. Now, I have seen in the Royal Botanical Society's Garden in London, England, the wheat plant in its original state as a wild grass, and so on through its annual cultivation, when it became the grain producing plant. There also are to be seen the wheat in head allowed to self sow itself without cultivation or care of any kind until it attains its primitive state, wild grass, and it may interest your readers to know that it takes about 30 years to come from a wild plant to the grain producing state; but for it to degenerate from this to the wild grass, is accomplished in 8 or 10 years. I need not follow the Texan's theory through the whole maze of the Hessian Fly, pasturing and freezing, passage of a heavy waggon, &c., this is all moonshine and empty balderdash. I will defy him to prove his assertion either in practice or science. Why, Sir, we will come at it in a common sense view of the case, and it is this—if wheat produces chess, it would follow according to the laws of nature that this chess would again become wheat, and chess is chess, and wheat is wheat. There is not the most remote affinity betwixt them, but say some of your writers, we can prove it, we can prove that, we have sown wheat and reaped chess. Now, I will account for this. It is a well known fact to botanists that there are certain weeds that are indigenous to particular soils, and unless the ground is ploughed to a certain depth, and thoroughly cleansed year after year, until all are got off, they will increase 50 per cent. I say once rid your land to the depth ploughed, and be cautious not to go beneath the depth of ploughing you have adopted, and you are all right; but once you go under this, if only a quarter of an inch, and you renew your acquaintance with the weed that the ground is subject to. Hence it was that your correspondent reaped chess. The fact was his land was naturally subject to it, and experience shows that what the land is subject to will grow with much more vigor than the wheat. This is a slow growing plant. The chess got a start of the wheat, overran it, kept it down, and finally smothered it. I will mention two cases that occurred to my knowledge to support my argument. These took place in England, one was a beautiful field of land on a farm joining my own. I had known this for 20 years; older residents than myself knew it for 60 years, the old occupier died; he was a good, strict, practical studious farmer, who had managed it well, and made money; he was a strict disciplinarian in his ploughing, ploughed with 4 wheels, and a gauge to regulate to a depth of six inches, and had thoroughly cleared his land to that depth. A rare thing was it to see a weed of any kind on his farm. Well, a new tenant

came in; he was an advocate of deeper ploughing. It happened this field I speak of was in turnips, had been hand hoed twice, and was as clear as a flower bed for seeding down to pasture; it was ploughed and put into barley to a depth of 7 inches, was well manured, and the consequence was that the land being subject to charlock or wild mustard, a gay crop of this soon made its appearance owing to the deeper ploughing; it soon overcame the barley, and the result was that at harvest the field did not produce its seed, but it produced charlock for two or three years, and choked each crop until it finally had to be followed a whole 12 months, and a crop of it grown, then ploughed down while in blossom, and thus it was got rid of; but had the ploughing been anything over this 7 inches, similar results would have followed, and the field would have been covered with charlock. The other was a case where a nobleman was improving a part of his property, in so doing he had occasion to build a bridge of stone to pass from one side to the other. The land about was naturally subject to a noxious weed known as the tailor's needle—I've seen it occasionally in grain samples in Canada—possessed of great ambition and vigor in the shape of overcoming any crop that did not start fast. Well, Sir, they had to sink to the depth of sixteen feet to get a firm foundation for the piers of the bridge. Rainy weather set in for a week, picture my surprise to look at the bottom and all around these holes to see the tailor's needle growing as thick as it could stick, and they to in a place that had never been open to air since the world was created, thus proving that certain soils are naturally subject to the growth of certain weeds go to what depth we may. I am open to any queries in this matter that your readers may advance.

Yours truly,
HOMESPUN.

CURE FOR LICE ON CALVES.—To remove these vermin from the calf without inflicting any injury to the latter, take the water in which potatoes have been boiled, and wash the calf with it. A few applications will completely rid them of the baneful pests. Having used it frequently in such cases myself with entire success, I can confidently avouch its efficiency.

LUCIAN MOHAINES.

Westminster, Jan. 17, 1871.

Editor Farmer's Advocate.

No Politics.

SIR,—In the last number of your valuable paper there is an article headed Politics, Independent, Conservative or Reform, asking the opinion of your subscribers with regard to the course you should pursue. In reference to political papers you say your mind must be as a matter of course worked and biased by the food it receives. Now, Sir, if the mind must be worked and biased by purely political papers, would it not be equally worked and biased by agricultural-political papers? In your prospectus for the present year you make your boast that yours is the only paper published in Canada unbiassed by political party or religious sect. Now, Sir, what are we to infer from all this? Have you made up your mind to enter the arena of political strife, and now ask the opinion of your subscribers to sanction your change of position? or are we to believe that it is the freak of a rather eccentric, (but as I believe) well meaning Editor? or are we to come to the conclusion that a non-political agricultural paper cannot be supported in Canada? If this is the conclusion we are to arrive at, may we not soon expect to have our grain and seeds called by political names, such as Conservative wheat, Reform barley, Clear Grit oats, Brown potatoes, &c. The anomalous position which has at times forced upon you the question of running political or non-political, would in my opinion come upon you with ten times the force if you cast in