

the manure itself in the spring decided by it; and the economy of the method of spreading manure late in the fall, or dropping it in small heaps, to lie through winter and be spread the ensuing spring, and many other like practices, that we often see.

So long as the manure and compost heap is regarded as the "farmer's bank," it ought to be invested in a way to realize the largest dividends. So much four per cent. stock is held by farmers that it requires the closest observation, the most careful experiment combined with experience, to make it in any degree a paying business.

And if the frost like a stealthy thief, enters the "farmer's bank" to destroy or injure, it is best to arouse the stockholders to look after their interests.

In deciding this question we need, besides experiment and observation among individuals, the aid of one versed in chemical science to extend these researches farther and unfold the secrets hidden in the subtle book of Nature.

We would know the effects of cold and heat and other contingent forces on animal and vegetable tissues in their various combinations, and many other matters in this connection.

For such an important work we do not care to have "Prof." prefixed to the person's name who will do it, provided it be done clearly, concisely and satisfactorily taking *facts* for date.

Theoretically and plausibly it might be argued that freezing would not hurt a potato inasmuch as it is evident to the eye, said potato neither gains or loses anything thereby; or for a like reason, that it could do no harm to freeze one's hand or foot, or even be frozen all over. But of such a theorist we should be tempted to say as did Lord Byron on a slightly different subject:

"When Bishop Berkley said "there was no matter,"

And proved it 'twas no matter what he said."

If we divide the so-called "farmer's book" into three parts, viz: First, urine; second, vegetable tissue or fibre: and thirdly, animal tissues, or what is the result of the animal body, does frost prove detrimental to or change the nature of either one of these, taken separately or when combined?

Will not some one who is conversant with the subject, and knows whereof he affirms, enlighten those of us that are in ignorance, giving us therewith the whys and wherefores?—*Country Gentleman.*

#### WE SHOULD RAISE MORE CLOVER.

CONSIDERABLE experience in feeding out forage, and more observation on the subject, have brought us to the conclusion that we should raise more clover in Maine than we do.

We are aware that we shall be met with the objection that it is a coarse, bulky hay crop,—that it oftentimes lodges and wastes on the field—that it requires more barn room, ton for ton than hay from fine grasses, and that it is not so saleable in the markets.—Grant all this, and still we say its superior value as a forage crop, more than counterbalances all the objections alone raised, except the last. If we raised hay to sell, rather than feed out at home, it it would be better to raise other kinds of forage that would meet a readier sale. It may be observed here, that clover is not a grass, but a leguminous or food-bearing plant, and, therefore, its habits of growth are more of the vine order—more trailing and spreading than the grasses proper.

This causes what is called lodging, when the growth is luxuriant, and in warm, wet weather there is a tendency to fermentation, and decay among the lower leaves, and smaller branches next the ground. This may be in a great measure obviated by sowing more seed, thus producing thicker growth, with a smaller and less spreading stalk. Clover requires less work, less stirring and manipulating when mowed than grass does, in order to get it ready to put into the barn. Indeed, if the same labor of spreading and stirring, be spent upon it, that there is upon grass, the thin, broad-leaves become dried through before the thick succulent stalk does, and they fall off and a severe loss of a good portion of the crop is the result.

It is true that it requires more barn or stack room to store up a ton of it, than it does for fine forage; but, as an offset to this, you get more nutriment in a ton than in most other kinds of forage. We will enumerate some of the advantages of it. All neat stock, and also hogs will eat it in the hard or dried state, and thrive upon it. So we suppose that it should be fed only to horses, because being coarser than the grasses, they are better able to masticate it than neat stock. If the clover be cured right, all kinds of cattle eat it readily. We have fed it to calves, yearlings, and other young stock to good advantage, and sheep were not only particularly fond of it, but we found that they did better on it than they did on