

selves. One farmer only cracks the corn for the lambs. Ensilage was highly recommended. An inferior grade of sheep is being kept in many sections because of the low awards made on those killed by dogs. Hurdling (*folding*) sheep was recommended. Shearing early in May and sheltering the sheep when it storms before June was another point. The theory of a syndicate buying a large tract of land, fencing it with four-strand barbed-wire fencing, and keeping from 1000 to 2000 sheep on it, in charge of one or more shepherds, was believed to be a practical scheme. (1) Major Alvord had kept a flock of 200 sheep in Orange county, N. Y., without fences, by the use of a shepherd, and thought that a flock of 400 or 500 would pay well for a competent flock-master to spend his entire time while during the day, folding them safely at night. Major Alvord's man, during the first part of the season, spent all day with the flock, but later when they became accustomed to the surroundings, he would leave them for an hour or two each noon in charge of the dog, and always helped about the milking at night and in the morning while the flocks were at pasture. It was stated that 200 sheep would do well together, although the tendency would be to separate into smaller flocks. A profit of \$1 per head above all expenses on such a flock would pay, but Major Alvord thought the profit would be from \$2 to \$5 a head. The cost of keeping a ewe for one year, and raising her lamb, feeding both well and making the lamb weigh 60 lbs. was said to be \$7 in Massachusetts, but a York State man claims to do it for \$4.

COUNTRY GENT.

Flocks, or *hirsels*, as the Scotch Borderers call them, of 2,000 invariably, if left to themselves, break up into small bands of one or two hundred each, but the shepherd and his dog can keep the whole lot together with very little attention. I do not think one man can manage more than six hundred sheep, to look after them properly; and supposing his wages to be \$300.00 a year, this would amount to 50 cents a head. If the flock was a breeding one, the shepherd would require the assistance of a boy at lambing time. I suppose, in this country, 3 acres will keep a cow throughout the year: if roots are grown, much less will suffice. Eight ordinary sheep are equal, generally speaking, to one cow, therefore a sheep will consume the product of $1\frac{1}{2}$ rods of land, the rent, &c., of which may probably be worth, taking the country throughout, about 80 cents a year, making, at a rough calculation the whole cost of the sheep \$1.30. Allow the ewe to shear 4 lbs. of wool—*washed on her back*,—at 28 cents a pound = \$1.12, and the lamb, at 3 months old to weigh 40 lbs. net—at 7 cents a pound = \$2.80,—a clear profit is left of \$2.62, to say nothing of the good done to the land by the nightly fold, which, as I have said twenty times at least in this Journal, is esteemed in England to be worth nearly \$20 an acre, if, as is usually the rule, 4,840 sheep—i. e. a sheep to the square yard—pass one night on one acre.

Cabbages in winter—I sold cabbages at Jolietto market, in the spring of 1871, for 15 cents apiece. They had not their roots cut off, as I had reasoned upon the matter, and had come to the conclusion that the more they were kept growing the better. I have never had the least difficulty in preserving cabbages through the winter, but even my pet pupil, Séraphin Guévremont, persisted for two seasons in covering his with *straw*, and, in consequence, lost the whole of both crops. Fifty tons of cabbages is a fair yield for an acre of well manured land—I have seen more than twice that amount—and those that cannot find a market the cows and ewes will be deeply grateful for. Two feet between the rows

and a foot between the plants in the rows will give, allowing for misses, say, 20,000 plants per acre, and this number of cabbages at eight pounds each—not a large cabbage—will give eighty tons.

A point in keeping cabbage.—One cannot talk with some men without learning. We were recently conversing with James J. H. Gregory, the well-known seedsman at Marblehead, Mass., and he referred to a practice common on his farm which others may like to follow. His remarks were something in the following manner: "When we have a lot of cabbages that do not form hard heads, or immature cabbages that have just begun to turn the leaves in roundly, plow a furrow seven inches deep and jam the roots of the cabbages downward as close as they will stand, firming the earth about the roots and throwing what is dug out of the trench and more over the cabbages, piling it directly upon them to the depth of one foot. It doesn't seem possible, but it is true that cabbages treated in this way will to a large per cent head up finely and be fit for market in the spring. The good thing about this process of winter growing is that this cheap class of vegetables that hardly pays for harvesting in the fall, shows round profits when dug out of its burrow in the spring when cabbage is high."

This led us to thinking about the number of thousands of heads of fine cabbages, which were totally worthless from decay, seen a short time previously in another gardener's grounds. Speaking with Benjamin P. Ware, also of Marblehead, about this, and mentioning the gardener's opinion that the wet season had charged the vegetable growth with an undue percentage of water, thus causing their decay, he replied that it was not the wet season nor the fault of the cabbages. "These cabbages had their roots cut off, which destroyed their vitality, and were then either covered too early in the season or had hay placed upon the heads or were allowed to heat in some way. If they had been buried with either head or root down in the soil and covered, after the weather became cold, with a little soil, they would have kept handsomely." Ex.

Erratum.—The average yield of wheat per acre in France is 17 bushels, not 37 as erroneously printed in the January number; v. p. 10.

Potatoes for cattle.—I was very much surprised to see, in the Country Gentleman, a statement, by Prof. E. W. Stewart, to the effect that "raw potatoes are not digestible, and only operate as a laxative food, and any considerable amount *fed raw* will reduce the yield of milk, instead of increasing it."

I remember perfectly well that, before the advent of the potato-disease, large quantities of coarse potatoes were grown, both in England and Scotland, expressly for cattle-feeding. These were the *ox-noble*, the *mangel-wurtzel* potato, &c., and though vastly inferior to the *regent*, the *shaw*, and other marketable tubers, they paid well on account of the large yield they gave.

I have used potatoes here, in Canada, for milk-cows, and always found them answer the purpose for which they were given. The only trouble about them is the horribly foul odour of the dung of the cattle fed upon them in a raw state. This, I presume, is caused by some peculiar condition of the sulphur contained in the uncooked tuber, for when given boiled, the foetid smell is no longer perceptible.

I really do not see why raw potatoes should not be theoretically as good as, or rather better than, swedes, as cattle-food. Take Prof. Stewart's book, "on feeding animals," as evidence, and what do we find as the analyses of the two roots:

(1) And one which I should be glad to see carried out here.