

WILLAMETTE FARMER

\$3.00 per Year.

SALEM, OREGON, MARCH 17, 1876.

Volume VIII.—Number 5.

On Mixed Farming.

In your number of Feb. 4th, some of your correspondents wish to be informed if mixed farming, or raising a variety of crops, could be made remunerative. This question, if am aware, requires careful study, practice, and observation, and no system of theory farming can reach it. It will say first that in all locations and qualities of soil, all varieties of grain are not adapted; hence will not be remunerative; for instance, if the land is low or on the wet order, wheat will not fill where oats would make a heavier crop. Then, again, on dry gravelly land wheat does well, and oats and barley would be scarcely half a crop. Right here let me say it requires a thorough, practical farmer to be a competent judge of what is best adapted to put on the different soils, and make the farmer the most clear profit per acre. But again, there are soils that are well adapted for all varieties of grain, and that is a rich, deep, dry, rather sandy black soil. Such a soil will bring nearly an equal equivalent. For instance, we may look back for the last fifteen years, we find that oats and barley have been as remunerative as wheat. The same with corn, it being one dollar per bushel all the time, and on the soil I describe above, I can safely raise from thirty to forty bushels per acre, which would pay better than either wheat or oats. Again, let us examine the price of the different kinds of grain for the last ten years in Lane county. The average price for oats has been about fifty-five cents per bushel, barley about sixty-two, wheat seventy-five, so in taking the average price per bushel, and the average yield per acre, I consider the profit from all nearly equal, but at the present time there is more call for oats than any other kind of grain, selling now for seventy-five cents per bushel, and wheat about seventy-one, so I consider a clear profit of five dollars per acre was made last year by raising oats. The writer has always advocated a mixed farming, hence at the present time have a quantity of oats for sale, so we see it is not best to raise wheat alone, and neglect other varieties, which has been nearly done for the last two years. Again oats are the best feed for horses, therefore we should raise a plenty for that purpose and have some to sell. Barley, corn and potatoes can all be raised and made as profitable to fatten hogs. At the present time I find in Eugene beans selling at five and six cents per pound, potatoes at one dollar per bushel, onions, etc., at a good price. And some of these are not raised here, but are shipped from California. This is wrong. Here, again, comes the practical knowledge of knowing the right quality of soil to raise them on that will make them as remunerative to the farmer as other productions, to the farmers that live away from the river bottoms, out on the good, dry soils in the Willamette valley. It will not pay them as well to raise those articles as it will to raise wheat, oats and barley. Hence, should not raise any more than they want for their own use. But there is a class of farmers in Oregon that should raise all these articles, and they are living on soils that are exactly adapted to these articles and will pay them better to raise, than either wheat or oats. These farmers are living on the river bottoms, such as the Columbia, Willamette and all the small streams emptying into these. The soil being very rich, deep, mellow and a considerable sandy, which makes it hold moisture so much better than the dry uplands during our dry summers. Hence, being well adapted for all kinds of vegetables they should raise a large surplus, and at once put a stop to importation of any of these articles into our state, which would save a vast amount of money, and I have no doubt but they would receive as much profit for the capital laid out as any

other class of farmers in Oregon. Now, Mr. Editor, I am in favor of a mixed farming, whenever the quality of soil will admit of it. But, let me say in conclusion, to every farmer in Oregon, that, to be more successful, he must learn by experience to be a competent judge of the soil he cultivates, and know what it is best adapted for, and raise only the productions that will be most remunerative.

GEORGE BELSHAW.
Eugene City, Feb. 29, 1876.

Mixed Farming.

ED. FARMER: I see in the Feb. 4th number of your paper, a communication over the signature of John J. Cook, asking what variety of crops can be raised on the farm that would make mixed farming pay. Now here is a question of great importance to farmers of this valley, and I wish I were able to answer it as it ought to be answered. If we are really reduced to wheat and oats as the only paying crop that can be produced in this valley, then indeed we are obliged to operate in a very narrow track; but, Mr. Editor, I am inclined to think better things of the future prospects of Oregon farmers. I have heard it said ever since I first began farming, which was about twenty years ago, that he was the furthest from market who had nothing to sell, and there is one thing we as farmers would do well to bear in mind, and that is that there is a home market as well as a foreign one, to be supplied; a fact which is very apt to be overlooked, and the consequence is that very often the common necessities of life become scarce and sell high, and sometimes the very things that farmers can raise the easiest are the most scarce. Why? Because they are overlooked in the tendency to run eagerly after specialties. Now a thorough system of mixed farming will correct all this. For instance, if the farmer raises wheat, oats, beans, barley, and corn, in places where that crop can be grown, also hay, potatoes, apples, pears, peaches, plums, and pork, mutton, and wool, butter, and eggs, by these crops he can use all his land both pasture and field, to good advantage, and supply home with almost everything needed in the eatable line. When grain has a good price, sell it; but when it gets so low that the farmer loses money if he takes the price offered, and pork and bacon sell well, turn as much of it into pork and bacon as he can, and sell that. In short, when grain, fruit, and vegetables are too low to pay, convert them into anything else that you can that offers a paying price. While you make some one crop your principal one, have a surplus of all these other crops, so that when your neighbor comes to you and asks if you have this or that, to sell, you can be enabled to say, yes I have it, how much do you want?

L. B. JOHNSON.
Marion County, March 4th, 1876.

H. H. GILFILL'S LECTURE.—On Sunday evening Hon. H. H. Gilfill of Salem delivered at the Baptist Church the fourth lecture of the Library course, having for his subject, "The Tombs of Buried Cities." The house was well filled with an attentive and appreciative audience. Mr. Gilfill's lecture was decidedly the best of the course, and one of the most interesting we have ever listened to. The subject is a prolific one and the lecture showed an exhaustive research into its mysterious depths by a mind capable of comprehending its importance. He carried his hearers to the ruins of the once magnificent cities of the old world and examined from the buried depths many interesting facts, and showing that there are ruins even in America that may some day offer up hidden treasures to throw light upon its earliest history. This was, we believe, Mr. Gilfill's first attempt in the lecture field and he acquitted himself with credit.—Eugene Guard.

ESCAPED.—Three prisoners confined in the Multnomah county jail made their escape on Monday evening, by digging a hole through the foundation wall. Their names are Milton Shepardson, Frank Watson and William Burke. Shepardson is one of the men arrested for the mail robbery for which Thompson, Bramlette and others are now serving a life sentence in the Penitentiary, and it is probable a large reward will be offered for his recapture.

James Fudge, while crossing the Touchet near Waitburg, last week, had his team entangled, and before he could extricate them, both horses, valued at \$300 were drowned.

Taxes.

EDITOR FARMER: Taxation is a subject that interests us all, and as nearly all have had their say, in regard to it, you will please pardon me for now having mine; and if my views are of any account, you are welcome to them, and if they are not, you are welcome to them anyhow.

In the first place I consider our system of assessing property a mere farce. Not but what our Assessors are as competent, and efficient, as can be found, but custom has made the system, or practice too strong for our Assessor, and perhaps all combined to remedy it.

The law is very explicit, that property shall be assessed at its actual cash value. That is plain enough—simple enough—and just enough for anybody. To assess, means to appraise—to fix the value of anything. And to appraise, or fix the value of anything, I consider it indispensably necessary that the Assessor must see the property, whether real, or personal.

The custom of our Assessor, is about as follows: They start out on their round of duty, and to every taxpayer they meet, whether at home or abroad, they propound questions similar to the following: How much land do you own, and how much of it is prairie? How many horses? and are they American? and how much are they worth? How many cows? are they American? and how much are they worth. And so on to the end of the chapter. They don't see one hundredth part of the personal property, but take the owner's word for it in nearly every instance; and assessed estate very often don't see that even, assessing it after night, or miles away, and even if they do see it, take no notice of its improvements in the way of buildings, fences, ditches, or whether it is in a high state of cultivation or not, but assess prairie, at so much per acre, and brush land at some other price.

Now, Mr. Editor, it is obvious to any one who has traveled much, that two farms may adjoin each other, of the same number of acres, of equal amount of prairie, and yet one farm will sell for twice as much as the other, simply because it is worth twice as much, because of its condition. I understand the custom is, to assess real estate at about one half its actual cash value, but as far as I have observed, they don't assess at over one third, and in many instances, not over one fourth, its actual cash value. In Oregon, we seriously feel, and see, the effects of too large farms, causing sparse settlements, few, small, poorly attended schools, poor roads, &c. &c.

Now, Mr. Editor, my plan for a partial remedy of this evil is, ENFORCE THE LAW. Assess property at its actual cash value, and then, if some of our land monopolists are not willing and anxious to sell some of their real estate, and reduce their number of acres, and let in the poor, civilization, and improvements, I shall be very much mistaken. And as I remarked at the beginning, that our whole system of assessing property is a farce, and might just as well be dispensed with entirely. Let every man assess his own property and swear to its correctness, and as much property would be returned, as at present, and thereby save considerable expense.

LAND OWNERS.
March Co., March, 1876.

From Umatilla.

PENITENTIARY, Ore., March 6, 76.
EDITOR FARMER: I am a believer in spiritualism, and on the contrary, and most expensively a disbeliever, but I to-night witnessed a performance which I truly wonder at, and something which I cannot account for: A young man, whose name I will omit at present, was the farmer; you could blindfold him, and he could go and find it. He does not know what he is hunting for until he finds it. It will do the same thing with any person. It that is required of the person hiding the article, is to keep his mind on that one thing all the time.

This power is something which he has but lately discovered, and he does not pretend to know what it is. He says that just as soon as the person takes hold of his hand, he feels as though something was pulling his hand, and he follows it.

In this case I know it was a bluff, as I tested him myself. While the operator was absent from the room I hid a dollar in another person's boot, and when the performer came in I took hold of his wrist and, to my utter astonishment he went right down the fellow's boot after it.

This is something we cannot understand, and we would like to have some one that can, explain to us.

A CHRONIC DISORGANIZER.

When Ex-Secretary Garretson bid adieu to Iowa, going to Oregon, as he said, to recuperate his shattered health, we sincerely wished him well, and expressed the wish that he would, in that favored climate, be restored to full physical vigor. We had no reason to hope for useful work from him, in the Order, but we did hope that he would at least remain so far quiet, and profit by past experiences, wherein he had shown great liability to commit errors, as to remain, in a degree, passive and harmless.

But now comes the WILLAMETTE FARMER of Dec. 24, with nearly two columns of correspondence, touching his movements in his old role of "Organ Maker." The WILLAMETTE FARMER is an old established paper in high standing, and has, from the beginning, been a faithful and efficient worker in the cause of the Order of Patrons.

The correspondence referred to is made up, first, of a long drawn out circular sent out by Garretson to leading members of the Order in Oregon, couched in the same terms as were the circulars sent out from his office here, when the idea of publishing another paper was conceived, only he applies the lash a little more freely than he did then. A copy of this circular sent to John Minto, a leading member of the Order, in Oregon, is published in full in the WILLAMETTE FARMER, together with the reply of Brother Minto. This reply contains some wholesome advice to N. W. G. very applicable to his case, more especially as his history in Iowa is about to repeat itself in Oregon. The following are two of the points made by Brother Minto: 1st, "that the Order does not need the paper which N. W. G. proposes to place before them." 2d, "that to encourage a strife for the patronage of the Order in that direction, is a sure road to division rather than unity."

This reply brings out the fact that the paper which N. W. G. proposes to edit is owned by Brown & Stewart, publishers of the State's Right's Democrat, Mr. Brown being State Printer.

Brother Minto further says: "And here permit me a few remarks upon the words I have italicized in your circular. I read a crack of the whip between the lines there to which I, and the generality of old Oregonians, are unused. Putting the best construction upon your language, I do not think the measure of my devotion to the agricultural interests, to which I have devoted thirty-one years of my life in Oregon, is to be gauged by the alacrity I may show to co-operate with you."

The Order in Oregon is fortunate in having a man occupying a position of influence, ready to meet so bold an adventurer as N. W. Garretson, and it is apparent that his itching to inflict a newspaper upon the Order in Oregon, will meet its just reward.

[The Western Farm Journal, from which the above was taken, is the old established farmers' paper of Iowa, and one of the official Grange papers of that State. It is one of the largest and most ably conducted of Western agricultural papers, and from which we take more matter than from almost any other for republication in the WILLAMETTE FARMER.]

Australian Wheat.

NORTH YAMHILL, March 6, 1876.
EDITOR FARMER: In your last issue I have read with much interest the correspondence between Mr. J. Gaston and Mr. George Belshaw, touching different varieties of wheat. In the reply of the latter I understand him to say that the Chile Club and the wheat extensively raised in this country, and known as Australian or White Australian, are one and the same wheat. In this I can assure Mr. Belshaw that he is mistaken. In this county there are many kinds of Club wheat that exist in name. I can call to mind the Little Club, Big Club, Chile, and Australian Club, Fall, and Spring Club, and also what now appears to be two varieties of the Australian which I would not consider properly a Club wheat at all. How many of these exist in reality I am not able to say, but my personal observation enables me to speak only of the three varieties, the common Little

Club, the Chile Club, and the white Australian.

On the farm of Hon. Lee Laughlin, near North Yamhill, I saw last season these three varieties growing side by side, and assisted to harvest the field when ripe. There was a very marked difference, not only in the growth of the different varieties, but also in the appearance of the grain after threshing; especially was the latter the case, on comparing the Australian with either of the Club varieties. There is but slight difference between the grain of the Little and Chile Clubs, the latter being rather whiter and a little larger grained, but when growing green the difference is very marked; the Little having a very deep green color, while the Chile has about the color of growing oats; a pale green. Any person would readily have pronounced the two pieces wheat and oats respectively. The two ripen about the same, and there is but slight difference in the heads when ripe; the Chile being a little the largest. I could not state as to the yield, but am of the opinion that the difference in this respect was little if any. Of the Australian wheat, as I said before, there appears to be two kinds; but I am of the belief that they have been one and the same wheat, the difference, which is quite perceptible, being only the result of different cultivation. Both are property spring varieties. The one was introduced into this county by B. E. Stewart, of North Yamhill, and purchased of Mr. O. Dickinson, of Salem. After the first year this wheat was sown in the fall which improved the appearance of the wheat. Since then, it has been sown both as fall and spring wheat; but generally seed has been saved from that sown in the fall. The head is much longer and larger than any Club head I ever saw, and though very closely filled, has but little of the Club appearance. The grain is also larger than that of any Club I have seen. The straw is not at all like that of the Club, and is quite soft and inclined to strawfall if left standing after it is ripe. The grain of this wheat is large, white, and plump; much more so than the original, which I believe to be in part the result of becoming acclimated, and more, the result of fall sowing. The other kind, as I will call it for the purpose of designating it, was introduced by Mr. Thomas Owens, in the vicinity of McMinnville, and as I have understood also came from Mr. Dickinson. This seed has been confined almost entirely to spring sowing, and has not quite so fine appearance either in the head or grain as the other, though I think perhaps the same treatment would soon bring it to the same standard. This wheat yields well, sown in the fall; but does not stand freezing as the old white or the Burton wheat as it is called here. In 1871, B. E. Stewart raised fifty bushels to the acre from ten acres. Last year nearly all that was sown froze out badly and was reseeded in the spring. However on the place of Mr. T. C. Davis was eighty acres of it, so badly frozen that it was not counted on for a crop that would only in all probability scarcely pay for harvesting, yet it yielded over twenty-seven bushels per acre. This, I think, was of the Owens seed.

I have written much more at length than I had thought to do when I began this, and will not write further at this time.

D. C. STEWART.

A letter from Walsbury, W. T., to the Spirit, says: "Flax is not being cultivated to the extent that it was last year, owing to the fact that it proved an unprofitable crop. The seed heretofore furnished by the oil mill men has been very foul, and it is a question whether or not the cultivation of flax in this part of the country has not, on the whole, proven a detriment to the country. With it any quantity of pernicious flth and weeds, such as cockle, California mustard and the like have been introduced."