

the oven is once heated, the wicks have to be turned down very low, for fear of burning the subject. My good friend, Mr. Cole, the maker, deserves great credit for turning out such a perfect implement. My family is very small now—only four in number—so the whole of my cooking is done on this coal-oil affair, the kitchen-stove never being used. The broiling is perfect, and with a proper stew-pot—a pot surrounded by water—the tenderness and juiciness of a stewed *filet de bœuf*, or of a *noix de veau*, is inexpressibly delicious. Not one cook in five hundred understands stewing. In general, people imagine that simmering, i. e., very slow boiling, is the proper thing; but, the fact is the materials of a stew should never approach a temperature of 212° F.—boiling point—by at least ten degrees. Fry the meat in scalding hot lard, oil, or other vehicle, for a minute or two—to shut up the pores and prevent the escape of the *osmazone*, &c.; put the meat and vegetables, with the stock, into the stew-pot, and *don't* cover up. Stew for from two to four hours, according to the size and age of the piece of meat, not allowing even one bubble to mount and burst, and season with pepper, salt, &c., just before dishing. No nutmeg or lemon-peel, but a few cloves, tied up in a muslin bag, improve almost all stews.

*Esparselte.*—A correspondent of the R. N.-Yorker wishes to know all about the *esparselte* or *sainfoin*, as it is called in England. It is a most valuable plant for hay, or, particularly, for sheep-pasture, but as it never succeeds except on land with a chalk subsoil, it is useless trying it here. The R. N.-Y. says the hay of the piece grown at the experimental farm carried on by the proprietor of that paper was miserable stuff—worth no more than so many sticks. That was, Mr. Carmen, because you let it stand too long, which is also the reason, as I have remarked about twenty times before, why nine-tenths of the clover which presents itself to the Montreal market is nothing but flower and stalk.

*Complete fertilisers.*—I would strongly advise farmers to have nothing to do with what are called “complete fertilisers.” I think it is pretty well ascertained that, as a general rule, *potash* is not required on heavy land, and on very few light soils that are properly farmed. Moreover, potash applied, as usual, in the spring, exerts very little influence on the crop of the year; to do any good it should be spread in the fall, and at that season, it would be wasteful to apply the other component parts of a complete manure—phosphoric acid and nitrogen—as the thaw would wash most of them into the rivers. And, lastly, potash can, in nine cases out of ten, be bought much cheaper in hard-wood ashes than in the complete fertiliser.

At present, and confining ourselves to the productions of this our own country, the fertiliser I should recommend is a mixture of two cwt. of the plain superphosphate, which I see advertised by the Smith Falls fertiliser company at \$26.00 a ton, and one cwt. of sulphate of ammonia from the gas-works, costing \$70 a ton. The mixture would therefore come to \$6.10 for the three cwt., which would be a fair dressing for an acre of grain where the land is not absolutely poor. If land is in better condition, that is, when the grain-crop has been preceded by a manured root- or corn-crop, one and a quarter cwt. of sulphate of ammonia, alone, will suffice. Mangels, I should think no one would sow without dung, and if I could afford it, I should add two cwt. of sulphate of ammonia without superphosphate, but with addition, as an experiment two cwt. of salt. Swedes do not require either salt or sulphate of ammonia, but it would be false economy to sow them without two cwt. of superphosphate in addition to a fair dose of dung. If no dung can be spared for swedes or turnips,

three cwt. of superphosphate and one and a-half cwt. of sulphate of ammonia would produce a fair crop on almost any land.

I do not prescribe for corn, as I have grown but little of that crop, and that little always with dung; but for fodder corn, 2 cwt. of sulphate of ammonia, alone, and for ripening corn, the same dose of both ammonia and superphosphate as recommended for wheat, ought to turn out well. Still, this is mere theory, and I never advise anything as regards so important a business as the use of fertilisers on corn, except as an experiment.

I reiterate the advice I have so often given: if you want to grow, say, four acres of swedes, and have only forty loads of dung, give your land the ten loads an acre, and supplement this trifling dose with two cwt. of plain superphosphate. The latter will start the plant, and carry it on till the bulbing begins, by which time, the roots will be down into the dung, and that will furnish the crop with plenty of food until it arrives at maturity. You will find this a much better and more paying plan than restricting yourself to two acres of swedes and giving them the full dose of twenty loads to the acre, or growing two acres with all dung and the other two with all artificial.

*Importations.*—If any one is inclined to import, on his own account, any quantity of artificial manure, I would strongly advise him to select the best and most concentrated samples, and to make the purchase at Liverpool rather than in London. For, suppose I want to manure at the rate of 32 lbs. of soluble phosphoric acid per acre, I can buy in Liverpool two qualities, of superphosphate, of which one analyses 16.4 per cent, the other 22 per cent of soluble phosphoric acid. If therefore, I buy the richer lot, I save the ocean and other freight of 550 lbs. on each ton; for 1450 lbs. of the 22 per cent quality is equivalent in manure-power to 2000 lbs. of the other, and the prime cost per pound of acid is the same in both, that is, in England, 2½ cents a pound. And, remember, this is guaranteed “soluble” and not the vague mixture, I am sorry to see too often advertised here at \$26.00 a ton, containing from 12 to 14 % of “soluble and precipitated phosphoric acid,” every pound of which costs the buyer TEN CENTS, instead of 2½ cents as in England. Think of our apatite going across the ocean and manuring the English fields as cheaply as that!

*Farmyard dung.*—A cow, or fattening beast, is always supposed, in England, to make 14 tons of manure—litter included—during the time she is in the house. That number of tons is sufficient to manure an acre of land properly. I do not fancy the ordinary run of farmers here get anything like that amount of dung from their cattle, for they do not use one-tenth of the amount of litter we use. As to the value of a ton of manure, that varies so much with its condition and the food the maker of it has received, that it is hardly a calculable sum. Professor Brown, of Guelph, taking Sir John Lawes' analyses and valuation as a guide, puts it at \$2 50. Detweiler, a German agricultural chemist, says that the cost of the 14 tons of manure made by a cow in one year, estimated on four different farms in Germany, was, respectively, \$11, \$14, \$5, and \$18, an average of \$12, or about 84 cents a ton. Voelcker, our R. A. Society's chemist, values the contents of a ton of farmyard dung, rotted for three months, at \$3.00! Dung of the best-fed animals in the world is to be bought in London and the suburbs of that vast town for \$1 00 a ton, and finds a ready sale at that price, though in my father's time, I have heard him say that the stable-keepers and milk-men used to have to pay the tenant-farmers for carting it away. At Sorel, and other small towns and villages