

clover. He has never used guano—his neighbors who have, think it lessened their crops of clover and grass; but it may have been owing to the drouth of the last two seasons.

I think, Mr. Editor, you will concur with me, in the opinion, that all this is very well except the close grazing. I know of no lands in North-Carolina that would be benefitted by grazing at all, except, perhaps, by sheep, whose dung is very rich and not so liable to deterioration by exposure on the surface. On the contrary, grazing impoverishes our soil, by taking away more than it restores. It may do good, by trampling and compacting soil, like that of Mr. Douthat, so light and dusty as to be "blown away with the March winds;" but it will not answer, as a system, generally, with us. I am decidedly in favor, however, of providing highly manured grass and clover lots for pasturing milch cows and calves, mares and colts, with moderation—the animals to be regularly penned or stabled every night, for shelter and to save manure. These fields should be so divided, that part may be mowed for hay, and a part grazed. This may be done with advantage every way, without interfering with the general system of cropping.

But to return to our neighbors of the Old Dominion: Mr. Dulany of Loudon thinks it better to cut off clover than to graze it. An experiment proved that land from which the clover had been cut, yielded 20 per cent. more wheat than that which had been grazed. Mr. Nesbit, an eminent English chemist, thinks it better to cut off two crops than to graze one, because the cattle nipping off the budding leaf, would prevent the development of that much root; whereas in cutting off the full grown stalk and leaf, the root has had time to develop in the land, and so increase the nutriment in the soil. But the farmers in Clarke would not graze their clover. Mr. Harvie, of Amelia, did not graze at all for sixteen years. The land, under that system, was much more productive in corn, oats and to-

bacco; less so in wheat. He now grazes extensively and makes more wheat; but, quere? as he uses guano, may not the increase be attributable to that?

Speaking of Tobacco and Lime above Tidewater, Mr. Witcher, of Pittsylvania, said, as far as lime had been tried in his region, it had no effect whatever. He once scattered eighteen or twenty bushels of slaked lime on an area of 40 feet diameter, which has never produced any visible effect whatever. Mr. Peter Hairston, of North Carolina, said he had tried lime without any visible effect. The lands in his section were naturally good—he knew a field that had borne grain every year since the revolution, without manure, that will now produce from ten to fifteen bushels. They make as fine tobacco as any lands in the world. Three brothers of Caswell County, N. C, had just sold their crops of tobacco in Lynchburg, at 35 to \$35½ per hundred, and the manufacturers said it sold for half its value. It had been grown on thin land, worth now \$25, formerly 10 to 12 dollars per acre. It was mainly manured with guano, 200 lbs to the acre—more made the plant too coarse. The brothers made little other crop, and cultivated 12,000 hills to the hand; at 4000 hills to the acre; and 5 or 6 plants to the pound, the sales would amount to 700 dollars to the hand. This is above the average, but a plenty will sell at 25 dollars per cwt.

The largest crop of tobacco per hand, he had ever known, was 3,500 lbs.

Col. Knight, of Nottoway, said lime is totally valueless on the chocolate and grey lands of his region; but produced a good effect on the pipe-clay land. On these lands, when put in moderate condition, clover grows finely.

A gentleman in Prince Edward cultivated, with 15 hands, 200,000 tobacco hills, 100 acres in wheat, 60 acres in oats, and 50 acres in corn.

Col. Cocke, of Powhatan, raised his plants on land not burned, and found that burning was not necessary, if sites were selected where a thick bed of leaves