

wants to know how much seed of orchard-grass is required per acre. What a question? It might as well be asked how many shot it would take to kill a wild-duck. It all depends upon circumstances—in the duck-case, on the size of the shot and the part where it strikes, in the grass-case, on the condition and quality of the land. On rough, half cultivated soils four bushels of good seed will not be found too much; on well-managed, well-manured farms, two and a half or three bushels will do. Bush harrow it in with the grain in spring, and roll afterwards. If clover is to be sown with it, seven pounds of red or five pounds of alsike will be sufficient. I wish people would sow more orchard grass and less timothy.

**BRITISH CROP PROSPECTS**—The Mark Lane Express, London, August 29th., contains crop-returns from 385 correspondents, representing every county in England, and seven counties in Wales. Reduced to percentages, their numerical significance is as follows:

	1883. Wheat.	Barley.	Oats.	Beans.	Peas
Over average...	9.1	34.5	34.0	41.6	22.5
Average.....	24.7	39.4	43.4	38.5	43.5
Under average..	66.2	26.1	22.6	19.9	28.0

In glancing at the remarks of our correspondents, we are struck with the frequent occurrence of, "blighted or mildewed." "Blighted" means defective from some cause or other, such as imperfect fructification or development of grain, or destruction by insects. Barley is in many cases said to have been much laid and knocked about by storms, and in others, to be wanting sun to ripen it properly. We fear the quality will be coarse, as a rule. The remarks on oats, beans and peas are chiefly favourable.

Similar reports from 477 correspondents, representing all parts of Great Britain, appear in the London *Farmer* of the same date, and show in percentages the following result:

	Wheat.	Barley.	Oats.
Above average .....	11.7	38.2	37.3
Average.....	25.0	42.1	35.5
Below average .....	63.3	19.7	27.2

The upshot of these returns is: that whereas the normal average wheat yield of England is twenty-eight imperial bushels per acre the yield this year will be 26.6 bushels; in other words, there will be a deficiency in the English crop of one and a half bushels, nearly, per acre. Knowing the English farmer as I do, and hearing of several who have forty bushels an acre, I am inclined to think that wheat will be quite an average. (1)

**JERSEYS.**—Is the Jersey furor all over already? At Mr. Ross' sale in Indiana de Brocq's *Glory*, for which \$1,000 had been refused, fetched \$90! *Silvia's Gilderay* sold for \$40, Mr. Ross having paid \$125 for her: *Longview Signal*, a handy and convenient name for a bull, for which an offer of \$400 had been rejected with scorn, went for \$190; *Angel Chief*, cost \$200 in Philadelphia, and fetched \$65; i.e. Brocq's *Prince* (comp. that's reasonable,) brought in \$70, \$200 having been refused. Lastly, *Cheneva*, for which cow Mr C. Easthope of Ohio is said to have been willing to pay \$1500, sold for less than one-half, \$700!

**NITROGEN.**—Sir John Lawes and Dr. Gilbert have published a pamphlet of 60 pages containing an account of the examination of some of the experimental plots at Rothamsted,

(1) More recent news confirms me in my opinion. The crop is decidedly an average, and the weather for getting it in is superb. Poor fellows, the farmers have a turn at last, and I am glad of it. There will not be more than 130,000,000 bushels of foreign wheat wanted to supply the consumption.

and on the bearing of the results on the question of the sources of the nitrogen of our crops. The essay was read at the meeting of the American Association for the advancement of Science in Montreal, last year. The experiments have been going on for more than forty years, and an enormous number of facts have been brought out bearing on the important question: whence do our cultivated plants obtain their supplies of nitrogen? The conclusion arrived at long ago by the two patient observers, Lawes and Gilbert, seems to be still unaltered. the soil rather than the atmosphere is the source of the nitrogen in plants; and a careful weighing of the argument on the side of those who hold that plants assimilate the free nitrogen of the air, is said to afford no conclusive evidence in their favour.

**THE DAIRY** has discovered that "cows will eat ripe tomatoes greedily!" No doubt about it, I have seen a cow take a bar of soap like a pill, and every one is familiar with Mark Twain's comparison of the conceited tenor's placid self-satisfaction to a calf's contentment in chewing a dish-cloth. But, for all that I don't think the discovery is of much value.

**HEADS AND HANDS.**—The question whether a farmer cultivating more than 150 acres of arable land should work with his proper hands, or devote himself entirely to the supervision of his men, is receiving a good deal of attention at the present time in the States as well as in England. It seems that, in the latter country, whereas the farmers of the southern counties have been terribly injured by the miserable weather of the past nine years, their brethren of the north, especially in the counties of Westmorland and Cumberland, have escaped almost scot-free.

Their comparative prosperity has been attributed to the custom prevailing in the said district of the farmer and his entire family working with the hired men. To my mind, the argument is rather in need of support, for there are several reasons why the meat and dairy farms of the North should be more profitable to their occupants than the purely arable farms of the South. Our own family tenants have not suffered a great deal, as they are all cheese-makers, and a moderate return of rent has satisfied them—they employ no labour, but do all the work themselves, except in hay-time. But the Rural New Yorker argues the question philosophically, and comes to the conclusion that no farmer who employs two teams and four men has any business to meddle with manual labour.

The farmer must make a difference between his own work and that of his hired man, or he will sooner or later fail in body and in business. His man has but one subject to engross his attention, the work upon which he is engaged; but with the farmer there are many weighty questions to be considered. There are the arrangement and timing of his work. There is the subject of implements and machinery, of farm improvements, of rotation of crops, and of varieties, all important questions. Then there is the commercial aspect of his business, which he can certainly not afford to overlook. If he deals with these subjects wisely, he does well, without putting his own hand to the plough. He is a poor business-man whose head is not worth more than his hands.

There are doubtless farmers to whom moderate manual labor is a true pleasure. It is not work as a privilege, but work as a duty, that we are denouncing. The farmer whose mind is so large and whose farm is so small that the care of it is no burden, and who takes delight in moving his fertile soil and his golden grain with his own hands, is of all men the most enviable. But we all agree that such farmers are too few. We find many more who come to the shady