

mixed meal, and 22 lbs. of carrots, and she gave 35 lbs. of milk per day. I then left off the carrots and gave the same amount of meal, and all the hay she would eat, which was 33 lbs. per day. After feeding so for week, I found she gave 23 lbs. of milk per day. I then gave her the carrots as before, and in eight or ten days she came up again to 35 lbs. of milk per day.

This shows that carrots are worth to me to feed cows, 82 cents per 100 lbs. Hay is worth \$20 per ton in the barn, and at three cents per quart, or one cent per pound, for milk, 6 lbs. less hay, and 12 lbs. more milk, gives 18 cents for 22 lbs. of carrots. Next winter I hope to have another opportunity for experiment.—*Rural New-Yorker*.

Another writer in the *Germantown Telegraph* recommends pumpkins, and for the same reason. He says:

"I cut my pumpkins into eighths, and then submit them to the operation of the 'rasper,' and a better feed for most animals than they make I do not want. The process is a summary one, and the pumpkin is presented in a condition which might well tempt the human palate. In the winter, mixed with chaffed hay, or refuse matter of any sort, and a little cob-meal, it makes a most grateful feed, and one that all animals devour with the keenest avidity. Apples rasped in the same way, are also much liked by stock. If sweet, very little other food will be required, sweet apples being very alimentary, and very salutary in their effects upon the animal system—especially upon cows in milk, causing a healthy action on the secretory glands, and consequently causing a copious and sustained flow of the richest milk.

One great reason why there is so frequent and general a failure of the lactescent product during the winter months, is the privation of succulent aliment which these animals are subjected to. In very many, perhaps in a majority of cases, the only food they receive from the time they are taken from the pasture, until they return to it again the subsequent spring, is dry hay or stalks; no roots are given them, because their owners don't think roots worth raising, and if they are allowed an occasional feed of meal or unground grain, it is given to them dry, without any previous preparation, not even so much as a moistening of water being allowed. Now, this is a perversion of all reason, and as directly opposed to the obvious requirements of nature as and thing well can be. Let a man be confined during a period of eight months to dry biscuit, with only an occasional flagon of spring-water, and that half of the time of poor quality, and what suppose you, Mr. Editor, would be his condition at the end of the term? Would not the privation of succulent food operate injuriously upon both the fluids and solids of his system? It appears reasonable to suppose it would. Now, what is the legitimate inference in the case of the cow or other domestic animals? Every one can answer."

The same sentiments are expressed in the following from the *New-England Farmer*:

"If you desire your cows to yield liberally to the pail, you must feed them with something better suited to the secretion of rich milk than dry provender. Chopped roots, or meal-slops of some kind, should be given them twice a day, at least, say morning and evening. They should also be provided with littered beds, dry lodgings—moderately warm; be regularly watered thrice each day, just before being fed; be curried or combed once a day, and salt, with occasionally a little ashes or fine bone-dust mixed, two or three times a week. They also like a variety of food. Roots, cut or rasped, and mixed with cut-hay or straw, then stirred and left for an hour or two, make a mess which they will eat very greedily. We think that hardly attention enough is giving to the bedding of cows, as the more quiet and comfortable they are, the less food will be required to sustain the system, and may therefore go to produce flesh or milk. A gentleman who has constantly employed several pairs of working oxen for many years, states that oxen will travel fifteen miles a day, being well 'littered down' at night, as easy as twelve miles and lie upon the bare floor. If this statement be correct—and it seems to us consistent—it is a pretty important matter that all our cattle are well provided for in this respect."

—:—

#### GUANO AND PEAT ON POTATOES.

We have frequently recommended Peruvian guano as a manure for potatoes, thinking, from their comparatively high price, that its application would be found not only beneficial but profitable. Two years ago, H. C. Ives, Esq., at our recommendation, applied 600 lbs. of Peruvian guano on two acres of potatoes, and left other two acres adjoining without any thing. The guanoed two acres yielded 410 bushels, and the unguanoed two acres 238 bushels, and thus 300 lbs. of Peruvian guano per acre, costing about \$9, gave an increase of 86 bushels.

This year, Mr. Charles W. Seelye, of Rochester, applied 300 lbs. of Peruvian guano on two acres of potatoes, leaving four rows in the centre of the field without any dressing. The two acres produced about 225 bushels. The four rows without guano gave 11 bushels, and four rows the same length with received guano, gave 14 bushels. This is equal to an increase of 24 bushels per acre, and estimating them worth half a dollar per bushel, (a portion of the crop was sold on the ground at 62½ cents per bushel,) will certainly yield a handsome return for the \$1.50 invested in guano. We saw these potatoes early in the summer, and the difference between the four rows, and the guanoed portion on each side, was very perceptible, and indicated a much greater increase than was realized. This was probably owing to the great drought which shortly

afterward set in, for it is well known that guano requires a moist season to bring out its full effect. The small increase as compared with Mr. Ives' experiment, is also probably owing to the same cause. Peruvian guano has been used in England, as a manure for potatoes, to a considerable extent, for eight or ten years. We may fairly conclude, therefore, that English farmers find its application profitable; otherwise, the practice would soon be abandoned. But potatoes generally command a higher price here than in England, and if guano is a profitable manure for potatoes there, why is it not at least equally so here? Guano will give as great an increase of wheat here as there; in fact, if we may credit the statements of Virginia and Maryland farmers, it gives a somewhat greater increase; but its application here, as a general thing, will not be so profitable as in England, because wheat sells at a much lower price. With potatoes, carrots, cabbage, beets, onions, etc., the reverse holds true, and we believe a judicious application of good Peruvian guano will be found profitable. Under some circumstances, when hay is high, it will also yield a good return on meadow-land. If any of our readers have used guano, nitrate of soda, "Mapes' improved," or other super-phosphate of lime, we should be glad to hear from them.—*Rural New-Yorker*.

Peat for Potatoes.—Rev. Mr. Clift, of Stonington, Ct., relates the following experiments, made by himself the past season, to test the value of peat as a dressing for potatoes. He says:

"From the fact that potatoes have almost uniformly done well in reclaimed peat swamps, even when the rot was extensive in other places, we inferred that it would be a good dressing for potatoes. The part of the garden selected for the experiment had been trenched, and manured in the bottom of the trenches with the contents of the pig-sty. On the 24th of May, we planted three drills, about twenty feet in length, with large, sound potatoes. In drill No. 1, nothing was put. No. 2, several bushels of peat that had been thrown up for the action of the winter frosts upon it, spread over the potatoes. In No. 3, one quart of guano was carefully sprinkled.

The potatoes were dug and weighed on the 31st of August. No. 1, gave thirteen pounds; No. 2, twenty-one pounds; No. 3, nine pounds. Those in the peat were much larger and fairer than the others, and lacked a pound of equalling the weight of the other two rows. The season being exceedingly dry has been unusually favorable to the success of the peat. It has retained the moisture, so that they have suffered less from drouth than the adjoining rows. It has been quite as unfavorable for the guano, that manure requiring to be ploughed in the preceeding fall, or a wet season, to bring out all its virtues. It would not be safe to infer that peat was a better fertilizer than guano,