

Mr. Eddington has announced that the steam plough will be at work this week on Mr. Perry's farm. It is therefore probable many of the neighboring agriculturists will avail themselves of the opportunity of witnessing its operation.—*Mark Lane Express.*

FOWLS—FOOD, &c.—When fowls are confined to a narrow space they require much care and attention to supply them with all kinds of food which they collect when running at large; and without care to supply their wants, they will not be profitable. When running at large, as they please, they devour many insects, eat gravel, lime and various kinds of herbage, seeds of various kinds, and many other things which we cannot discriminate, though we look on while they select their food.

In winter, when fowls have less access to the ground, or when they are confined in small enclosures, they have less opportunity to select the mineral substances which they require. Hence an artificial supply becomes necessary. How shall this be given? By placing the articles within their reach, so that they may take voluntarily just the quantity to which they are prompted by nature. Place old lime-mortar, bones, oyster or clam shells, broken fine, where the fowls can readily pick them up. It has been ascertained that if you mix with their food a sufficient quantity of egg shells, broken bones, oyster shells, and effete lime, which they eat greedily when so mixed, they will lay twice or thrice as many eggs as before. A well fed fowl is disposed to lay a vast number of eggs, but cannot do so without the materials for the shells, however nourishing in other respects the food may be; indeed, a fowl fed on food and water, free from carbonate of lime, and not finding any in the soil, or in the shape of mortar, which they often eat on the walls, would lay no eggs at all, with the best will in the world. A letter was read a few years ago before the British Association, from M. Sace, of Neufchâtel, Switzerland, on account of some experiments in the feeding of fowls. He states, first, that fowls to which a portion of chalk is given with their food, lay eggs the shells of which are remarkable for their porcelain whiteness. By substituting for chalk a calcareous earth, rich in oxide of iron, the shells become of an orange red color. Secondly, he informs us that some hens fed upon barley alone would not lay well, and they will tear off each other's feathers. He then mixed with the barley some feathers chopped, which they eat eagerly and digested freely. By adding milk to their food they began to lay, and ceased plucking out each other's feathers. He concludes that this proceeding arose from the desire of the hens for azote food. An idea prevails with many, that any sort of grain, even if a little damaged, will do for poultry, but this is a grand mistake. A friend of the writer once came very near losing his whole flock of valuable fowls from feeding them with damaged corn, which had been heated. Those who feed largely know better, and invariably make it a rule to feed none but the best. Eggs, if at any time are a luxury, it is in winter, and whatever promotes their production is of interest to the majority of our readers.—*Country Gentleman.*

Horticultural.

TRANSPLANTING EVERGREENS.—We select the following opportune article on the above subject from our excellent cotemporary. *The Gardeners' Chronicle.* It is from the pen of Mr. Henry Groom.

As great diversity of opinion exists as to the best time for removing evergreens, and having read your article in the *Chronicle* of the 6th ult., on removing Rhododendrons, &c., perhaps the following facts may not be uninteresting to your readers. I have long been of opinion that summer was the best time for the operation, but never having had the opportunity until the last few years of testing it to any extent, it merely remained an opinion. During the last three years I have tested it most thoroughly, and have no hesitation in saying that the months of June, July, and August are the best three months in the year for the operation. We have transplanted many hundreds at the time named, and mostly of a large size, Hollies, for instance, more than 20 feet high; Pinuses (generally bad to manage) from 15 to 20 feet high—not lost one; Deodars, 15 feet; Araucarias, 5 feet; Hemlock Spruces, 10 feet; Common Spruces, 20 feet; many plants of *Arborvitæ*, 10 feet; Yews, 15 feet; very many Portugal Laurels, from 7 to 8 feet high, and 10 feet through; Berberis, many 7 feet high; Phillyreas, Arbutus, Irish Yews, &c., of rather smaller sizes. Our loss has never in any of the three years exceeded one in fifty, and in almost every case the cause of failure could be easily explained. With the