

A SERIOUS LOSS.

To the Editor of the Journal of Agriculture:

SIR.—To say all that I think should be said upon the above subject, would require more space than you can well spare; but if you will try and cram this in, I will try another word or two at a future time, that is if you think it will be of any use. It is not farmers only who require stirring up with reference to this "serious national loss," but as all are more or less sufferers from it, so "all breeds" should be educated up to the mark concerning the necessity of preventing it in future.

That our young folks are leaving the country is for the time a very serious loss; but I want to show the old folks that they are in a great measure accountable for it. Profitable employment is what the young men go abroad to seek, while the old men at home are wasting as much manure every year, as would (if saved, and applied to the land as it should be), supply profitable employment for hundreds of those who now go to the States.

Our farming operations are mainly dependent on the muck heap, and as a consequence of a limited or reduced quantity of manure we have a limited or reduced crop to harvest. We are apt to thank God for an abundant harvest, and if we believe it right to be thankful for the harvests we now reap while we are every year wasting the greater portion of our manure, how should our thanks arise for a harvest the result of God's blessing upon a *faithful and judicious application of all the manure made in the country?* The man who wastes manure is no friend to himself or the country; and yet with very few exceptions, there is hardly a farmer that saves *one-half* of what his cattle make, and even what he does save does not go on his land as good and strong as it comes from his cattle.

I have been lately in a part of the country where they raise more wheat than they require for themselves, and where they will take a great deal of trouble to haul mussel mud, &c., on to the land; but a more careless set about their muck heaps I don't want to see. While there, I met with some very intelligent farmers, one of whom, after manuring pretty extensively for other crops, manured *three acres* very highly for turnips. This evidences a pretty heavy stock of cattle, and as he allowed to me that he only saved the dry droppings, and had no means of saving or applying the liquid portion, his loss of manure must have been immense, and equal (I have no doubt) to the raising of a crop full as large as that he did raise that season. And then look at it in its compound interest light. Had he saved *all* and applied it to his land as judiciously as he knew how, the result would have been an

increased power of feeding more and more stock every successive season.

Now what may be said of this one (so to say) prosperous farmer, may be said of almost every farmer in the country, *all losing at the least one-half of the "main stay" and support of the land.* None of them saving the liquid portion of the manure and very few saving the solid portion as well as it should be saved. This is not only a serious loss but a most fearful one, when we take into consideration that there are over 300,000 head of cattle in the country, the urine of which would fill a small lake in a very few years. To save this and apply it judiciously would give employment to many, and would under God's blessing, also give more abundant crops, and so much money would not go out of the country to buy the food we now cannot raise for ourselves.

No doubt *improved* stock is a very good thing, and *improved* seed and farming implements are very much to be desired; but in order to make these as fully beneficial as they should be, we want an *improved* method of saving and making manure, we want improved muck heaps, that will (like our squah and pumpkins) grow to an enormous size in one season, not at the expense of feeding us with our cattle, but by simple saving and making. I believe that more real good will accrue to this country from adopting a system of giving premiums for saving and making manure, than from any of the present modes of spending the Government grant. Only get the *old folks* into the habit of making big muck heaps and liquid manure tanks, and I predict that some of the *young folks* who have left the country will have to come back and help apply it to the land. And as a means of helping on the "improved muck heap" movement, I would suggest to the Board that as soon as six members of any local society shall have constructed ample liquid manure tanks to their stables, stalls, &c., that the society shall be presented with a water cart and portable pump.

Yours truly,

J. H. HODSON.

BEES! BEES! BEES!

Having undertaken to give such information as shall enable you to add considerably to your income, by means of a small investment, I might now fulfil my promise by simply telling you to invest a few dollars in Bees. My object, however, is not only to tell you that Bees will do all that I have promised;—(for this is patent to every one) but also to try and make you see this, in such a light as will induce you to follow the advice given. And in order to do this, I will first point out the fact, that there is a Bee-pasture surrounding every house in the country,

actually producing a certain amount of honey every year, and which amount of honey is altogether lost to those who have free right to obtain and use it,—simply because they have not the busy Bees to gather it for them. Whereas, if any one were but wise enough to keep as many colonies of Bees as would suffice to collect the amount of honey which God has placed within his reach—he would be surprised at the immense quantity the little labourers would procure for him. No positive estimate can well be made of the quantity of honey any given pasture will yield; but when we learn that one Bee-keeper, last season sent as much as 20,000 lbs of honey from his own Apiary, to a salesman in New York—(for every pound of which he realized 30 cents) we may safely infer that if any pasture can produce as much as *ten tons* of honey in one season—it would not be unreasonable to expect half that quantity as an average of what might be collected in any well settled neighbourhood.

Just imagine then that there has been even only *one ton* of honey actually within your reach every year, which through neglect has been allowed to pass away uncollected, and which, had you kept Bees enough to collect, would have added a nice little sum to your income. Take notice also, that every acre of Beech or Buckwheat will produce from *ten to fifteen* pounds of honey every day while it is in blossom.

Now from these few remarks you may glean something of what may result from the outlay of a few dollars in procuring a few Colonies of Bees to collect at least some portion of the sweets of nature.

I would now try and show you what I deem the best mode of procedure in this matter. A small beginning could be made by purchasing *one* hive—and with care *one* hive would soon multiply, and increase so as to be able to collect all the honey within reach;—but I would not advise such a tardy and really wasteful mode of going to work—for I believe it may be laid down as an axiom, that whatever quantity of honey *less than two tons* you fall short of obtaining, that quantity will be just so much lost to you—since by keeping Bees enough to gather it, it might be yours.

Every strong colony of Bees wintered will produce (upon an average) in a moderately good season, about ten dollars worth of honey and Bees, so that you may almost regulate your salary by the number of Hives you choose to keep over during winter. Every ten strong colonies, adding a hundred dollars, more or less, according to season.

Let me ask you to draw a comparison between the Cows you keep on your farm, and the Bees you might employ to collect honey for you. The number of Cows is generally regulated by the num-