

judiate the principle of sacrificing Carolina's hills for Florida's hammocks, or Louisiana's bayous, solely for the purpose of increasing the capacity of our purses, we by no means condemn those heads of families who emigrate southward and westward to obtain the means of settling their children around them. So, in the cultivation of crops, we are opposed to the monopoly of "King Cotton," though equally averse to the exclusive cultivation of small grain and raising stock. Each deserves our attention, and no one more than the other should receive it.

Our system then is to divide the plantation into three parts, a third for cotton, a third for corn, and the remaining third for oats, wheat, rye or barley and potatoes. As soon as the wheat, oats, and rye are harvested, sow broadcast upon the stubble half bushel peas per acre, plow all in immediately, and in the fall just before frost, bury under with a two-horse plow, vines and peas. The second year put cotton upon this land, corn where cotton grew the first year, and grain where the corn was. The third year succeed the small grain again with cotton, the cotton with corn, and the corn again with small grain. The fourth year begins the rotation again.

In this triennial system of rotating crops the same land produces the same crop only every fourth year, hence allowing time for the accumulation in the soil of those nutritive ingredients required for each specific crop. Another very material advantage of this system, we think, consists in diminishing the area of your cotton crop, and increasing that of your small grain without diminishing the value of your income, while it improves the land, and affords more time for making manure. Everybody knows that, a large cotton crop per hand requires the labor of the hands from January till Christmas; but the above system allows time for harvesting the summer crops, sowing the pea crop and making manure enough to apply to one-third of the land cultivated.

In making manure we venture it as our opinion, founded only upon judgment, that compost heaps, on the Bomar principle for instance, are not economy. The stable, cow house and pen, pig-pen, chicken-coop, horse-lot, and temple, are the places to make manure, and will afford, properly managed, as much as the planter has time to haul out at the required season of the year. The manure made, we may be asked, how and to what will you apply it in your biennial system? In this we have system too, and will readily explain it.

First, it will be seen the cotton succeeds the grain stubble and pea crop plowed in; this then must suffice each year for cotton. On our wheat, &c., we sow all the cotton seed we can save, if it should be fifty bushels per acre. And to the corn in the drill

we apply all the manure we can make, fresh from the stable, cow-house, or anywhere we can get it.— This manuring, aided the next year by the cotton seed, annually increases the wheat crops, and consequently we have annually a heavier crop of peas and pea vines to bury in, in the fall for the next year's crop of cotton. In the corn, we plant peas for seed and food for milch cows and negroes in the winter.

We have sometimes been told, that, "your crop of corn will fire and burn up from this application of manure;" well sometimes ours does "fire," and so does all corn; but our observation is that, where one stalk "fires" from being heated by the manure, ten stalks die of poverty. Poor land and bad management, such as plowing when too wet, or plowing too close and too deep in the advanced stage of the crop, will do ten fold more injury to corn than twice the amount of manure generally applied.

Mr. Editor, those who are continually harping on the idea, that we plant too much cotton, are either those, who pursue this identical system, or do not plant at all. This latter class advocate generally the establishment of Southern manufactories; want the South to become a world within herself—grow her own tea, drink *Southern coffee*, eat her own sugar, in fine, prohibit the importation of everything exotic because we have a country the most favored under Heaven. All this is to us arrant humbuggery, and to this class we would like to address a word, but as it would involve many other questions, particularly that of slavery, we must forbear, and conclude, Mr. Editor, with an apology for occupying so much time and space in giving you our views on a simple tho' important subject.—*South Carolina Agriculturist.*

ARTIFICIAL AND PERUVIAN GUANO.

There is very little use, we conceive, of our planters and farmers making any more efforts to obtain Peruvian guano at a lower price than that at which it is now selling. A letter before us, by J. Y. De Osma, the Minister of the Peruvian Government at Washington, settles this point. It states that the Peruvian Government conducts the guano trade with foreign countries on its own account and risk, and regulates and establishes the price of this fertilizer, and that it finds it difficult to supply the demand for it at \$50 per ton. It is also stated that only about one-fourth of the supply is consumed in the United States, and that if a cheaper fertilizer can be obtained anywhere else, our farmers are not compelled to purchase of Peru. We, indeed, cannot blame that government for obtaining the highest prices it possibly can for guano; our farmers do the very same with their products. But cannot as good a