

Will be published every

SATURDAY by

ANDREW LIPSETT,

at the

OFFICE ON QUEEN STREET,

Opposite City Hall, F. Ron. N. B.

Subscription, - \$1.50, in advance.

The Agriculturist.

A WEEKLY JOURNAL DEVOTED TO AGRICULTURE, LITERATURE, AND NEWS.

ANDREW LIPSETT, Publisher.

AGRICULTURE THE TRUE BASIS OF A NATION'S WEALTH.

ANDREW ARCHER, Editor

VOL. 1.

FREDERICTON, N. B., AUGUST 31, 1878.

NO. 21.

of all description,

EXECUTED ON MODERATE TERMS

RATES OF ADVERTISING.

Ordinary advertisements, 10c per line, first insertion, 15c

Each subsequent insertion, 10c

BUSINESS ADVERTISEMENTS

Inserted for 6 months or 1 year on moderate terms.

Agriculture.

For the "Agriculturist."

Mr. Editor.—Knowing the interest you take in the Farmer and in what he is doing these hard times I thought I would write you a few observations I have made in my rambles through different parts of York County.

I started from Fredericton a few days ago thinking I would wind my way to Cross Creek, Stanley. I took the road leading out near Alexander Thompson's Mills—the old Royal Road I think it is called—and in my conversation with the Farmers along the road I learned that their hay crop was larger than last year by about one-third, and that their oat and wheat crops never looked better than this year has been and upon the whole there would be fifty per cent. more of fodder raised this year than last.

When the breeders of shorthorns find the superiority of their favorite cattle so seriously threatened, they will, probably, like wise men, abandon blind faith in the merits of a family and pedigree, they will, as some of the first breeders did, select cows to breed from, the common cows of the country, for their good points and qualities, irrespective of the particular strain of their blood.

the Province, that in nine cases out of ten, they would be better off in ten years than if they had gone West.

One thing I missed in my rambles was newspapers. I found the AGRICULTURIST in a good many places, but I must say I found too many places without a newspaper of any kind being taken by the farmer, and as a consequence he was not posted in what was transpiring in the world around him. Perhaps he had seen Mr. Fisher in his canvassing tour, who had given him a copy of the Reporter or Sun, and on his reading either of those papers he found it could either state that Mr. Fisher would be elected to the Dominion House of Commons at the coming election, would cause him to scratch his head and wonder how that thing could be. They would say, "is not Mr. Pickard coming again? if he does I will vote for him, so will all my neighbors. How is it then that Mr. Fisher is going to be elected? won't the electors of York in other parts vote for Mr. Pickard? If they do surely Mr. Fisher can't be elected.

As this piece is getting to be rather long I will close, but probably you will hear from me again.

A YORK COUNTY RAMBLER, August 23, 1878.

THE BATTLE OF BREEDS.

The question of "breeds" is now occupying the minds of stock-raisers and agriculturists generally, in the old country. The "short-horn" and the "long-horn" men are still in hot controversy, as to the superior merits of their respective breeds, and the "polled breed" is vaunted as superior to both. In Paris, the "short-horn" came out, as the saying is, "at the small end of the horn" and were beaten by the polled cattle of Aberdeen, and at a late show of the Bath and West of England Society, held at Oxford, the long-horn "Herefords" carried off the long-weep prize over all other breeds.

Mr. McCombe of Tillyfour, claims that the superiority of his black polls "the finest cattle in the world," has been placed past doubt by the awards given at the Paris Exhibition. In answer to the objection of the short-horn breeders, that the best short-horn herds were not exhibited, he lately remarked (at a meeting of some Agricultural Association in the north of Scotland), that with the greatest assurance he could say that there were aged short-horn bulls in the French section superior as a lot, to anything he had ever seen exhibited in England or Scotland. More than this, Lady Pigot's group itself was individually composed of the highest and most fashionable short-horn blood in England; and in every English showyard where her ladyship had exhibited for "Family Prizes," her groups have carried all before them. He also said that the "polled breed of cattle had long been the pride of our aristocracy—they were the pride of their forefathers, and at this moment are the admiration and wonder of the world!"

At the Oxford show—above mentioned, according to the Mark Lane Express when the whole conclave of judges came into the ring to decide which was the best male-horned animal in the yard, the short-horn men were in a hopeless minority, cornered in a manner that does not often happen in a show yard. In vain, one of the short-horn judges contrasted the strong points of Sir Arthur Ingram (the prize shorthorn bull) with the weak ones of the Hereford bull Grade fat, it was all to no purpose, the judges could not get away from the Hereford, whose wonderful rib and forehead was too much for the short-horn and a show of hands showed an overwhelming majority for the Hereford. The prize for the best female horned animal was also awarded to a Hereford heifer. These champion awards were an unquestionable streak of lead for "the fancy," coming after Paris they are about as much as they will be able to hear with patience. It may be said that the triumph of the "Black Polls" at Paris and the success of the Herefords at Oxford, are only temporary defeats for the short-horn, there is still the stall and the quality in the breed that makes it superior to all others. The National Live Stock Journal is inclined to the opinion that the breeders of short-horns have relatively lost ground in point of real merit in the breed during the period of immense popularity of this favorite race has enjoyed for the last decade. They appear to have been content to rely upon the achievements of the past for a continuance of the supremacy without in the meantime adhering to the principles of a careful selection of inferior animals without which the excellence of no breed can be maintained, and a blind devotion to certain fancy strains or so-called families, without any regard to individual merit, aggravated by the in-

breeding so closely followed of these fancy strains, has seemingly tended to produce an actual deterioration in the stock.

While the chief care, it is said, of the breeder of shorthorns has been to know that the bull which stood at the head of his herd, and the cows from which he is breeding are of this or that or that family, because upon pedigree depended the fate whether the animals were worth hundreds or thousands, the breeder of Herefords has been compelled to study the question of what plan of selection, breeding and feeding will produce the best carcass of beef for the least money, for upon that has depended his chances of success.

When the breeders of shorthorns find the superiority of their favorite cattle so seriously threatened, they will, probably, like wise men, abandon blind faith in the merits of a family and pedigree, they will, as some of the first breeders did, select cows to breed from, the common cows of the country, for their good points and qualities, irrespective of the particular strain of their blood.

CROSS BREEDS FOR MILK AND MEAT.—In agricultural journals the same subjects come up again and again for discussion, because it may be said, that the subjects most interesting to the farmer, are not so very numerous. And the old saying, "so many minds, so many opinions," is as pertinent to the farmer as to men in general, and in any matter coming within his practical experience, the intelligent farmer will have his own opinion. Articles on some subjects important to farmers everywhere, taken from English or American journals may not always be applicable to the region of New Brunswick, still, the farmer who reads with intelligence, having the difference of country and circumstances in mind will not fail to draw some instruction from them. The subject of Cross Breeds for Milk and Meat has often been discussed before, and the article we copy below discusses it from an English standpoint, still it will be found of interest here. It was written by a practical farmer of great experience, in answer to inquiries on the subject.

The kind of stock to be kept for profit will depend, to a great extent, upon the quality and situation of the land. It must be borne in mind that to produce a large quantity of milk of rich quality, the cows, of no matter what breed, must be supplied with rich as well as abundant food. The Jersey and Short Horn cross, &c., the produce of a Jersey cow and a Short horn bull—sometimes prove to be the best of milkers, and they attain to a good size; they do not, however, mature early, as the calves from Jerseys are generally puny; but they will grow until quite five years of age. The milk of a Jersey is remarkable for richness rather than for abundance; and the influence of a Short horn bull would, if selected from a deep milking family, tend to increase the quantity at the expense of quality. There is much uncertainty in crossing; and, as Jerseys themselves are not all alike good milkers, their cross breed offspring will differ in as great a degree.

Few persons like to breed from crosses. A Guernsey and Short horn cross, when done with for the pair, makes a fair meat producer. Steers thus bred are often plain animals, but they are rather in favor with butchers. The Hereford and Channel Island cross does not appear to answer; it is no improvement upon the one parent for milk or upon the other for beef. There would be no great difficulty in buying deep milking shorthorns, but time and care must be taken in the selection. As L. L. will not give fancy prices, I presume pedigree will not be sought for; probably the absence of milk he refers to applies to our pedigree milks and shows, where they are completely restored by reducing the flesh. Again, the latter process is not altogether under control; their tastes have been made artificial, and when stimulated are withheld, the delicate appetite being, about a reduction of it, muscle and strength greater than was intended. In fact, the purchase of untried leifers is a speculation. I should therefore advise the selection of well grown, healthy animals, who have already developed properly shaped and sufficiently large milk vessels; and these, and a bull whose parents can be traced from milking families, calves may be reared with it will generally answer expectations. I remember a team of Short Horn heifers being sent to plough as a remedy for non-breeding—a better plan perhaps than stunting their feet.

There is as much uncertainty in crossing sheep as cattle. No breed produces more profitable and early matured meat than the Shropshire in their own country. For my own

part, I prefer them pure bred, but I am not blind to their imperfections, one of which is constitutional liability to foot rot. A cross with Shropshire ewes and a Lincoln ram was, however, a failure. In the march of improvements, Lincoln Leicesters can be brought to early maturity and great weight; in the south of England, their excess of fat lowers the price per pound, and the butchers "don't want anything better than South Downs," but in their own districts, where consumers are accustomed to three inches of fat on the ribs, the difference between the market value of their mutton and that of black faced is not great. The high Norfolk breeders cross the strong Hampshire Down ewe with the Lincoln or Lincoln Cotswold ram, and the produce is highly esteemed for feeding upon the Fenslands. South Downs answer very well in the hands of the Prince of Wales and Lord Walsingham. Yorkshire produces some of our best Lincoln Leicesters. The Earl of Zetland, Col. Grant, and others have flocks of Shropshires, but they are not numerous in the northern county.

SICK FOWLS.

It does not follow that a fowl has not been diseased or out of condition for a long time when we find it suddenly dead. The first thing that occurs to us is that some new and frightful disease has made its appearance, when the fact is, perhaps, the bird had been ailing for a long time by far too many of us are inexperienced in the ailments of fowls, and do not understand the symptoms. A bird must generally be diseased for a long time before death ensues. Often times no doubt, the seeds of disease are implanted in the system before birth, and a greater or lesser extent of time is required to develop it, according to its nature. Keeping has also considerable to do with it. Either too high or low feeding is deleterious. Strong, high forcing feed often ripens the seed which becomes fatal. A dangerous and difficult stage for the hens is when they first come into laying, and another when moulting.

There is nothing that serves us like our own observation, no receipts or widely-published articles can avail us; we must know for ourselves the cause and nature of the disease before we can treat it; what might prove a healing medicine in one instance may be of no benefit in another. It is necessary to understand the nature of the bird, also the peculiarity, and in what manner affected, before endeavouring to perform a cure. The comb of a fowl is the pulse. When the bird is in health the comb is firm, though fall of blood, and a bright scarlet in colour. If the bird be diseased the comb is limp, weak, soft, and a pale pink at times; at others a purple. Diseases do not make their appearance in a moment, but creep on gradually under the cover of good appetite, may, hap, and egg-production in hens. The bird may be, and often is, found dead under the roost, and no suspicion of illness may ever have entered into the calculations of the owner.

There are certain parasites, known as roost lice, that are barely perceptible to the naked eye, but which torment the poor victim they have fastened upon, and worry out its life. For these there is no remedy so good as a thorough sprinkling of Persian Insect Powder. If applied in time it may effect a cure, but if allowed to run the bird becomes so reduced that weakness causes death. These insidious parasites work slowly, drawing the life from their victim by degrees. They rob their prey of sleep, and so gaining day by day that their victim fades and wastes him by inch until the end comes, and then the owner can assign no cause whatever, as there is nothing apparent but a wasted frame empty crop, and faded plumage. It is surprising what an amount of flesh a bird carries on its bones, and yet not be fat. Excessive fat is a disease of itself, and often produces death. Over-fat birds frequently drop soft eggs; so do old birds. There is some disarrangement in the digestive organs. Each department has a certain amount of work to perform, and if one member be deficient or crippled the whole suffers to a greater or less degree. A change of diet often brings about charming results.

As I have often found occasion to say before, a milk diet is highly advantageous for the heated season, and when mixed with good wheat bran and plentifully provided, is entirely sufficient without other feed at this season. When a fowl is first discovered in a dumpy state, with head drawn in and eyes closed, and the whole aspect dropping thin the first attention to lice, taking care not to frighten or exhaust the fowl in the process. Sore eyes and sore heads proceed from roup, and will generally cure themselves in chicks. In aquatic fowls the case is a little difficult to manage. In young birds the roup is not always occasioned by cold; close breeding has a good deal, if not all, to do with it. No fowls will bear so close breeding

as our common dunghill birds. Turkeys are injured almost entirely by close breeding; so also are ducks; but if care be taken certain breeds of our domestic birds can be bred very close.—Country Gentleman.

IMPROVEMENTS IN FARMING.

Although the application of labor-saving machines to agriculture is far behind the application of such agencies to the mechanics and manufactures still it is wonderful how much more work can be done, and how much more produce can be raised by the farmer of to-day than by his father forty or fifty years ago. It was stated in a paper read before the Social Science Association at Cincinnati on the patent system of the United States by Mr. Carroll D. Wright, that fifty years ago, when corn was planted by hand, two acres a day was good work for one man; now an Illinois farmer with a check-sower and horses can plant fifteen acres a day, doing the work of seven men under the old system. Before the invention of corn-shellers, shelling was done by hand, and three to five bushels a day was a man's work; now two men with a sheller driven by a farm engine can turn out 1,500 bushels a day at a cost of one-half cent a bushel. Seed sowing is now done by machines at the rate of twenty acres a day, and much more evenly and thoroughly done than in the old days of broadcast hand sowing.

In 1845 the McCormick reaper was first introduced, and 150 of them built at Cincinnati, but it did not come into general use till 1852. It enables one man and a team to perform the work of seven cradles. But even the reaper did not bind the grain into sheaves, and up to four years ago the farmer had to pay binders \$3 a day. In 1873 the first self-binder was introduced, and now a combined reaper and binder, drawn by a pair of horses and a man, will cut and bind twelve to fifteen acres of grain per day, doing the work of twelve men. Less than fifty years ago cotton was cleaned— that is, the fibre separated from the seed—by hand, at the rate of four or five pounds of cleaned cotton to the hand per day. Now with a gin it is cleaned at the rate of 4,000 pounds a day. Twenty years ago the rule was for one man with a horse and plow to cultivate twenty acres of corn; now the rule is for one man with a sulky Cultivator drawn by a pair of horses to take care of eighty acres. In 1870 there were 6,000,000 persons reported engaged in agriculture in the United States, and the product of their labor with the aid of machinery was 287,000,000 bushels wheat; 761,000,000 bushels corn; 282,000,000 bushels oats; 17,000,000 bushels rye; 29,701,000 bushels barley; 3,000,000 bales cotton; 27,000,000 pounds flax; 12,746 tons hemp; 27,316,000 tons hay; 73,635,000 pounds rice; 232,335,000 pounds tobacco; 164,000,000 bushels potatoes; and smaller amounts of other crops. But if this immense agricultural product had been raised: entirely by the slow and feeble processes in use fifty years ago, it would have required 25,000,000 persons, instead of only 6,000,000.

Our agriculture possesses one great advantage over our manufactures which saves it from the results of over-production. It has a foreign market for all the surplus it can yield. We cannot eat any more bread than we do at twenty years ago, although one man can produce four or five times as much, but we can always find a foreign market for what we do not ourselves consume—and this saves the farming interest from the breakdown which excessive production brings to manufactures. Were it not for this foreign market, we would have to break up our farm machinery and go back to the old hand methods, to prevent the land from being glutted with unconsumed produce.—St. Louis Republic.

BRINE THAT WILL PRESERVE BUTTER FOR A YEAR.

To three gallons of brine strong enough to bear an egg, add a quarter of a pound of nice white sugar and one teaspoonful of saltpetre. Boil the brine and when it is cold strain carefully. Make your butter into rolls, and wrap each separately in a clean white muslin cloth, tying up with a string. Pack a large jar full, weigh the butter down, and pour on the brine until it is submerged. This will keep really good butter perfectly sweet and fresh for a whole year. Be careful not put upon ice, butter that you wish to keep any length of time. In summer when the heat will not admit of butter being made into rolls, pack closely in small jars, and using the same brine, allow it to cover the butter to the depth of at least four inches. This excludes the air and answers very nearly as well as the method first suggested.—Duchess Farmer.

THE FARMER'S USE OF HIS CAPITAL.

Capital is a desirable thing to obtain, but after it is secured it needs to be judiciously employed in order that he who possesses it may secure from it its full benefits. The merchant has this in view when he sells his goods. He aims to sell the amount of his capital in trade as many times as possible in the course of the year, so as to secure a large per cent. of profit on it. The farmer should do the same. His capital is his farm; and we should feel that he is a capitalist, as much as the richest banker in the city, and strive to make as good use of his capital as the banker. The latter keeps his money in constant use, earning interest after interest, and he would be a poor banker that would suffer his capital to remain idle. How is it with the farmer? He has lands all productive, and if productive it is yielding sufficiently? How much increase is received from the pastures overgrown with juniper bushes? We hardly see a pasture but what has more or less of these unsightly bushes in them. They would seem to occupy but little space, but, supposing all the juniper bushes in a forty-acre pasture were placed together, growing as they naturally do, the farmer would hardly believe that ten or fifteen acres of his pasture, and perhaps more were actually yielding him nothing. Truly so much of his capital is useless.

We might name also the land covered with small scrubby trees, that can never attain full size which might be cleared and converted into grass grown fields. The low swampy lands that by the use of drainage could be yielding heavy harvests; the huge boulders and stumps of trees in fields, mown around year after year without being removed; the land overgrown with weeds choking out the crops, and fast going to seed and thus still further putting off the day of clean culture, and then the double use of land by growing two crops the same year, decreasing thereby the rate of interest allowed for its use, taxes, and all consequent expenses attendant on the employment of capital. Land so worked can be made to support a larger proportion of live stock to the acre than is done by the ordinary method. And so one might go on enumerating the thousand and one ways, that the farmer's capital is allowed to run to waste. There is no business that requires the watchful eye and busy brain of the keen business man, so much as this one business of farming, and he who would hope to reach the desired honor of being known as a successful farmer, must ever be on the alert for improvement. No drone can ever reach that result. He who would reap well must sow well.

HEALTHFULNESS OF FRUIT.—Dr. B. F. Dunkley has made public some interesting facts derived from his own experience in regard to the healthfulness of fruit.

When he first went to Danaburg, Mo., thirty years ago, no orchards were there, and few vegetables were raised. The diet of the people consisted of corn bread, bacon and a little black coffee, without sugar or cream. Inflammatory disorders, especially as relate to the lungs, brain, bowels and heart, prevailed in the winter, and were often attended with fatal results. Malignant dysentery, the pest of armies, shut off from fruit, afflicted many of the inhabitants in the summer and fall, and in the spring it was not uncommon for the whole families to be sickly with scurvy, the disease so fatal to sailors on long voyages before canning fruit was discovered. Dr. Dunkley told his great surprise, that their blood needed no medicine other than vegetable acids, and he ordered them to eat oranges, lemons and sheep sorrels. Now fruit and garden vegetables are abundant in the locality, and the disease are not so malignant a type, and yield much more readily to treatment. When the orchard first began to bear, Dr. Dunkley noticed that those children whose fathers had planted apple trees all plentifully of the fruit both green and ripe, and had most excellent health, while children living where no apples grow were dying of flux.

As a rule, diversified farming is the best, except in localities pre-eminently adapted to one branch. A snug little orchard; fields of grain, grass, corn, and root crops; a manageable drove of cows or sheep; a pair of choice breeding mares; a pen of good geese; a yard of poultry; some extra crops to experiment on—this old fashioned method is about the safest and most comfortable after all; for specialities require special knowledge and special conditions of success. They are like a one-legged milking stool—can't stand alone; while varied farming has various supports.—Golden Rule.

EFFECT OF CASTRATION UPON STALLIONS.

It is a commonly received notion that castrating a stallion after he has arrived at mature years will make him dull and lazy, but the idea is altogether erroneous. Such displays of animation as are excited purely by his sexual desires will of course be wanting, but aside from these, no change in his disposition will be manifested. Any horse that is kept close stabled and given but little exercise is in the case with most stallions, will, when brought out, show a playful disposition; but when put at regular work, much of this will disappear. Very few horses are gelded on the European continent, and yet the stallions that are used for work are found to be as tractable and quiet as geldings would be under similar circumstances.

Stallions are usually greatly superior to mares and geldings in courage. It is a rare thing to find a stallion that is "skittish," or easily scared. In this particular castration produces a great change in most horses. The horse that, as a stallion, was not afraid of anything, could not be frightened, and was never known to shy, or run away from any object, often becomes a timid, slightly creature when gelded. The stallion, in a herd of wild horses, appears to consider himself protector of the herd, and instead of flying at the approach of danger is rather disposed to stand his ground, and in many cases even to act on the aggressive, and never designs to fly until the females of his herd are in motion. This same cool indifference to danger appears to attach to the domesticated stallion, and makes him much less liable than a mare or gelding to take fright and shy or run away.—Chicago Live Stock Journal.

COVERING MANURE.—It is remarkable that more attention is not given to the subject of covering manure from the weather, and especially from too much rain. Those who have given the matter particular attention have found that manure so protected is worth double that which is left out in the open air. Two loads for one is a profit few farmers can afford to lose. There is no question which so vitally concerns the farmer as this one of manure. Much that he does has reference to it. Straw is not to be sold because it makes manure. Stock is fed through the winter for the express purpose of manure-making. Articles which scarcely pay to send to market are nevertheless taken to the city in order that manure may be brought back as a return load; and yet the whole of the manure made remains all the season exposed to the sun, wind and rain until it is diminished one-half its value. The trouble is probably that few really believe that exposed manure undergoes this loss. But the matter has been too thoroughly tested to admit of a doubt. We know first-class farmers who did not themselves believe it, until by actual experiment they found out its truth. In arranging farm buildings it will pay well to look as much to the preservation of the manure as to the hay or grain; and those who have their buildings already finished without these manurial arrangements will find that twenty five or fifty dollars spent on boards for a covered shed will rank among the best investments ever made.—American Stock Journal.

AGRICULTURE IN FRANCE.—A writer to a contemporary says:—French agriculture seems behind English on the whole. The produce is also far more widely varied. Take an English district, such as for example as East Anglia, Kent, Surrey, Northumberland, and the Lothians, the major part of its farming approximates to the general standard of the district. But in France, within a journey of five miles, you will pass many times through samples of the best and worst farming, with all grades and degrees of quality lying between them. This doubtless arises from the excessive division of land. French farming, over scores and scores of miles, resembles allotment farming, on a larger scale than the labourers' plots in England. Of course the means, skill, tastes, and character of these hosts of proprietors are endlessly varied; and almost equally so is the amount of produce reaped from the land. The less borne in upon the traveller by thousands of illustrations, placed so sharply and closely in juxtaposition, is, that the natural fertility of the land is of far less value as a factor in production than the capital and skill that are put into it.

IMPORTANCE OF GOOD SEED.—At the farmer's field meeting, Dr. Sturtevant of Wausaukum Farm illustrated the value of good seed corn by the following calculation of possibilities. By planting corn in drills three and a half feet apart, and four kernels every fifteen inches in the drill, 31,000 stalks to the acre would be secured. If each one of these stalks should produce one ear, nine inches long and containing six ounces of grain, the result would be 31,000 ears, which, multiplied by six ounces, equals 186,000 ounces, or 11,625 pounds, equivalent to 297 bushels of shelled corn. Or, by planting in hills three and a half feet each way, and five kernels in a place the result would be 17,750 stalks per acre. Allowing an acre to each stalk as before, the yield would be 106,625 ounces, or 6667 pounds, equal to 119 bushels shelled corn to the acre. No better argument is needed in favor of planting only reliable seed, and every farmer should determine to select and save his best specimens for future planting.—American Cultivator.

EGG EATING.—I wish to give your readers a little of my experience regarding egg eating. I once had a very fine lot of B. B. R. Games, and thought a great deal of them, but after all the care I gave them they were more an annoyance to eat their eggs as soon as laid. Day after day I went to my coop for eggs, but in vain, I did not get so much as a sight of one. I tried almost every thing I could think of, but still in vain. At last I got an egg and broke the butt open large enough to get to the inside. Then I mixed up some good strong mustard and filled it full, putting a piece of shell over the part broken. I went to my coop and put the egg in the nest. I had no sooner dropped the egg than one of my hens bounced on it like a cat on a mouse. She struck her bill in it and dropped the egg on the floor (not waiting for me to retire). No sooner did it touch the floor than the rest of the fowl went for their share; they got it all of them. They soon walked off wiping their beaks against everything they came across. They left a little for manners' sake. It resulted, (the joke), in my gathering my eggs the next day, and I have not had any occasion to repeat the experiment until last week, when I tried it with the same result, and since then I gather eggs every day.—Poultry Yard.

EFFECT OF SALT ON WHEAT.—In an interesting series of experiments recently made on the farm of the Royal Agricultural Society of England, the manurial value of salt was unmistakably indicated. An acre of wheat dressed with three hundred pounds of common-salt yielded thirty-nine bushels of grain, with a proportionate amount of straw, while an adjoining acre left unmanured, produced only twenty-nine bushels per acre. The entire cost of crop is not stated, but this experiment shows that the additional ten bushels resulting from the salt were produced at a cost of thirty cents each. In another place a piece of ground intended for wheat was plowed the preceding fall and, again in May, when it was sowed with salt, and afterwards plowed before seeding. On the 1st and 2nd of September wheat was sown at the rate of two bushels to the acre. The crop when harvested, yielded, according to the estimate of the owner, not less than forty bushels of grain to the acre, with a luxuriant growth of straw. From these and many similar cases the inference seems to be that salt is a specific for the wheat crop, imparting solidity to the grain and firmness to the straw. Much, however depends on the nature of the soil; on many soils salt does no perceptible good.

AGRICULTURE IN FRANCE.—A writer to a contemporary says:—French agriculture seems behind English on the whole. The produce is also far more widely varied. Take an English district, such as for example as East Anglia, Kent, Surrey, Northumberland, and the Lothians, the major part of its farming approximates to the general standard of the district. But in France, within a journey of five miles, you will pass many times through samples of the best and worst farming, with all grades and degrees of quality lying between them. This doubtless arises from the excessive division of land. French farming, over scores and scores of miles, resembles allotment farming, on a larger scale than the labourers' plots in England. Of course the means, skill, tastes, and character of these hosts of proprietors are endlessly varied; and almost equally so is the amount of produce reaped from the land. The less borne in upon the traveller by thousands of illustrations, placed so sharply and closely in juxtaposition, is, that the natural fertility of the land is of far less value as a factor in production than the capital and skill that are put into it.

