

FOR FARMERS AND GARDENERS.

Farming and Gardening.

THE GARDEN, if rendered productive by proper cultivation, is one of the greatest sources of luxury and enjoyment that we know of. Is it not a source of enjoyment as well as of great benefit to the mechanic, his wife and children, to spend an hour or more every morning and evening, preparing the beds and planting the seeds? There is a peculiar glow of health imparted to the cheeks of the woman who takes pleasure in aiding in the cultivation of a garden. The atmosphere around the fresh, brown earth is exhilarating—it has life in it. It cannot but be productive of happy results, for the wife, as well as for the husband and the children who are capable, to spend some portion of the day in the garden—not alone in reviewing the progress of the plants after they spring from the ground and admiring the beautiful shrubbery and flowers and the tasteful arrangement of the varied classes of organized vegetation—but in actively enlisting in the work necessary to make the garden a place of so much beauty and attraction.

We won't ask you, ladies, (if the thrifty, industrious, intelligent house-wife, who is not afraid to soil her hands in the garden, is not a lady, we do not know who is) to handle the spade and dig the garden—tho' we could mention countries where such work is commonly performed by your sex—but, after the soil is prepared by spading, take the rake and pulverize and level the surface—and do it systematically and with dispatch, as tho' you understood the science—for if you don't, you will, if persevering; after you have made a small piece smooth and nice, stretch a string across and, with the hoe, make little furrows; in which plant the seed and cover to the depth of two or two and a half inches for radishes, peas, tomatoes, &c. For flowers generally a lighter covering is sufficient.

But it is now April, and there will elapse many lovely days for more substantial garden exercise before it is time to plant the Sweet William, the Morning Glory, the Nasturtium, and arrange the Pinks, the Dahlias, the Roses, and the multitude of beautiful and fragrant flowers and flowering shrubs that in their seasons shed forth a rich perfume to greet us at early morn as we rise to renew the labors of the day.

While it is true that most of the female portion of the community can as well as not devote a little time to horticulture, or garden culture, and that, too, with great benefit to themselves; it is equally true that few, if any, of our artisans, mechanics or laboring men are so absorbed in other pursuits as to be unable to devote a half hour or an hour each day, in the cultivation of a garden patch; and the benefits to health and general spirits accruing therefrom would alone be a compensation for the service rendered; but when it is considered that these labors, wisely applied, will yield palatable fruits and delicacies in the early part of summer, the juices and nutriment of which are then so much required to preserve the healthy tone of the system and refresh the "inner man"—who, especially the past winter, among most of us, has been forced to satiate himself on pretty "dry living"—there is a double incentive to every one who has or can obtain—and who can not?—a few rods of ground, to plant some early potatoes, peas, beets, carrots, onions, radishes, corn, mustard,—the leaves for greens and the seed to be ground for table use, tomatoes, turnips, and, as the season advances, a few hills of melons and cucumbers and perhaps, a few rods of Chinese sugar cane and a few hundred cabbages, &c.

Don't you think it will pay? Figure up the market cost of what you could raise by the improvement of time and a right application of the energy we have indicated; and, if you can demonstrate to us that the outlay will exceed the proceeds, we will acknowledge ourselves for once mistaken and the result may be that we shall thereafter distrust our mathematical abilities.—However, we anticipate no such untoward result.

But what of the practical farmer? He has no immediate and urgent demand upon us for an essay on the necessity of change from in-door employment to the more healthful, exhilarating and life-inspiring pastime of cultivating the soil. Perhaps, on the contrary, many of them think they have more out-door labor than they particularly relish. They never have a moment to devote to intellectual pursuits.

To such, if there be any, we say, don't fret and worry, and stew so much about nothing. Take the world more philosophically. Just consider for a moment that this vast, revolving, living, breathing mass, on which you have drop-

ped, like a fly on a ceiling or a pane of glass, and out of which it has been immutably decreed that, by the sweat of your face you should earn your bread—wasn't made in a day—nor in six days, as you reckon time—nor even in six months—and make yourself as comfortable as possible, enjoying all things around you over which God has made, or may in future make you steward, in the spirit of gratitude and peace.

When you have become fortified by such feelings and arguments as these, you are prepared to enter upon your labors. Go to work, then, and do your work in the season thereof, and do not be everlastingly dragging behind—plowing when other farmers are sowing—sowing when they are reaping. Be up to time and rather keep ahead of your work.

That farmer who has his work done when it should be, is never in a fret—he has the world before him and is able to command circumstances. "Time and tide wait for no man"—neither does spring "hold forth dalliance" in the lap of winter, to indulge the farmer whose tardiness—or laziness—has caused the sowing season to pass without improvement. He must suffer for his neglect.

Instead of putting his seed in the ground when the soil was yet moist from the successive snows of winter or the occasional showers of spring, in which condition the plants shoot quickly and attain a healthy growth, and often mature, before the ground becomes like an ash-heap, and not unfrequently even without irrigation—that indolent farmer over yonder must sow his seed in the dry, parched earth, or go without bread—and his crop is not half a crop; and thus is he kept poor, and miserable, and fretful, and peevish, and ragged and dirty.

He lives year after year in an old dug-out that he was forced to excavate, when he first came into the mountains, to keep his family from perishing during the approaching winter. His wife and children are scantily clothed and scantily fed; and he is known as a poor man, unable to take a newspaper or to help anybody or do much of anything but to toil from day-light till dark, in misapplied and ill-timed labor, and drag out an existence in abject poverty—all the result of lack of tact—promptness and industry.

Wake up, you sleeper!—and act as though you were alive. There are elements of wealth, inexhaustible, within your reach! Use them—use them as a philosopher, a thinking, reasoning, active intelligence.

Sow and plant in the season thereof; judiciously apply your labor and care during the summer and, in the harvest, secure your crops and not let them waste thro' neglect.

Take good care of your sheep, summer and winter, and they will multiply.

Do not let the wolves eat your calves, but rear them near home till old enough to turn into the herd.

Cut and stack hay enough, in the proper time, for your cows and working animals during winter, and see to it that your stack-yards are not demolished by unruly animals and your winter feed wasted.

Make butter and cheese, according to the most approved methods.

Kill your pigs in the fall, for summer fed pork is best, because it is most profitable. Winter fed pork is very dear. If possible, get a breed of hogs that will mature and make good pork in nine or ten months.

Have a comfortable shelter for your animals, wherein they may be protected from the chilling blasts and snows of winter.

Finally, when you have made the quadrupeds as comfortable as need be, build you a good, commodious dwelling-house, and let your family multiply and live like human beings.

Do all these things and as many more as you can think of—not forgetting God and your religion—subscribe and pay for the "Deseret News"—cultivate your minds as well as your farms and store them with knowledge from good books—so shall you be blessed in basket and store and everything you put your hand unto shall prosper.

VITALITY OF SEEDS.—The plumpest are generally the best. Old seeds are not to be relied on. Some kinds of seeds retain their vitality a long time, if kept in a cool, dry state.

The following, relative to the time for which some of the most common garden seeds retain their vitality, will be found especially useful, in view of the present scarcity of some of them:—

Parsneps, rhubarb, and other thin, scaly seeds, for one year.
Balm, basil, beans, cardoon, carrot, cress, Indian cress, lavender, leek, okro or gumbo, onions, peas, peppers, rampion, scorzonera, thyme, tomato, wormwood, and small herbs in general, for two years.
Artichoke, asparagus, corn-salad, egg-plant, endive, Indian corn, lettuce, marigolds, marjoram, mustard, parsley, rosemary, rue, skirrit, spinach, and tansy, for three years.

Borage, borecole, broccoli, Brussels sprouts, cabbage, cauliflower, radish, sea-kale, tarragon, and turnips, for four years.

Beet, burnet, celery, cucumber, dill, fennel, hyssop, melon, pumpkin, sorrel, and squash, for ten years.

The vitality of seeds may be tested in a very simple way. Plant a few in a small box or pot of good, light soil, keep it warm and moist, exposing to the sun during the warm days and, if good, they will soon begin to sprout.

It is said that onion seed, when good, if soaked a few minutes in cold water and then scalded half an hour, will begin to germinate.

STARTING SEEDS EARLY, says Daniel Emerson, in the American Agriculturist, may be done by tying them up in a cloth—each kind separately—and burying them about two inches in the ground—where they can be kept moderately moist—to be taken up as needed for planting. Some will be found to have swelled, others sprouted and growing. By this method, if the seeds are good, few, if any of them will fail, and, if you do not prefer to do otherwise, each seed may be replanted where it is warranted to grow.

OAT MEAL.—In England they bolt the meal of oats nearly as white as flour. Chemists say that this meal contains more of the materials for making bone and muscle than any other vegetable substance.

What say the farmers of Utah to oat meal? Can oats be produced of sufficient weight to warrant its extensive cultivation for grinding into meal?

MANURE should be applied in the fall or winter, on the land designed for beets, carrots and parsneps and thoroughly spaded into the soil; then, in the spring, spade again, and your crop will be remunerative. It has been proved that if carrot, beet or parsnep seed be sown in freshly manured ground, the roots are apt to fork, or divide into two or more parts.

A WRITER, in discoursing on the relative properties of manures, says that, "after all, liquid manure, whether directly from the cattle, or made from water poured on the dung of cows or sheep, collected in a vessel prepared for the purpose, if judiciously applied, is perhaps the most active of all fertilizers, guano not excepted."

[From the American Agriculturist.]

Breeding in-and-in—Cassius M. Clay's Reply to "A Cattle Breeder."

My November article in the Ohio Farmer has aroused the "in-and-in's" like the bursting of a bomb-shell! Two articles in the Ohio Farmer, one in the American Agriculturist (page 10), and two more promised! I am likely to have my hands full. My very distinguished friend the Rev. Robert J. Breckinridge, for whose opinion on theology I have the most profound respect, led off in this error some years ago, and was followed up by Geo. W. Johnson, Esq., of Scott Co., Ky., in a still more elaborate article.

I have been often asked to reply to those articles by Kentucky breeders; but so general was the opposite belief and practice, that we all regarded the theory as the amiable eccentricity of those excellent gentlemen; and when the agricultural report of the Ohio Board of Agriculture renewed the theory, I deemed it only necessary to glance at the arguments on both sides, trusting to the axiomatic statement of philosophical facts to carry my point with reflecting men.

"A Buckeye" comes to my relief very promptly, claiming my theory as his own! and my special and worthy friend the secretary of the board, only attempts a defence by widening the meaning of "in-and-in" breeding to the extent of breeding only specific or quasi specific breeds to each other and not "crossing." My complimentary friend of New York therefore deserves a notice in passing, whilst the smoke is clearing off the home battle field.

1. ARGUMENT FROM ANALOGY.—In the human race the laws of "in-and-in breeding" are not questioned as I have laid them down. Near of kin in almost all nations have been forbidden to marry—not as is contended, for moral considerations simply, but principally on account of the physical ills which follow. If such laws are based on moral considerations, and to preserve the sanctity of the family relation even in thought, then should the brother be forbidden to marry the brother's wife, and not allowed to marry two or more sisters, &c.

But such has not been the case: on the contrary, the every day observation of every one proves the physical evils of marrying near of kin. Georgia has just prohibited the intermarriage of first cousins, by very heavy penalties; and such a law had nearly passed this State Legislature last year; and such ought to be the law the world over.

In-and-in breeding, then, in the human race, producing idiocy, a loss of all the senses, weakness of constitution, diminution in size, disease and impotence, imposes on the advocates of this theory to prove that the laws of other animals are not the same. It is not sufficient to say that man is governed by his mind and sentiments, as well as the appetites and instincts, since it is not a psychological but a physical fact which is to be determined. I boldly assert without fear of successful refutation, that man, outside of mental and sentimental phenomena, is governed by the same physical laws as other animals.

2. EXPERIENCE.—"A Cattle Breeder" attempts to avoid the stunning force of the argument that the million who produce nothing memorable, are in-and-in breeders, by claiming that they do not select within the rules of his theory! Now the in-and-in theory logically rejects selection; for if breeding the sire to the off-spring does the work of improvement, what right has he to select, which is our theory?

But the truth is, your correspondent assumes that

which is not the fact, viz., that there is generally an indiscriminate breeding without regard to the best in each man's possession. On the contrary, I venture the assertion, that among the rudest and most careless breeders, the best lamb, the best calf, the best colt, and the best pig, is reserved as a stock animal!

3. SPECIAL PROOF.—Let us now examine our own practice: I give my experience for what it is worth, and I say I have all my life found eminent advantage in introducing blood not of near of kin into my live stock, chickens not excepted. I ask every reader, what is his experience? without fear of the answer.

The Campbells of our county for many years have carried the largest hogs to the Cincinnati and Louisville markets, the largest swine markets in this country or the world; they have never been beaten. Now their theory and practice is, when they have generally 600 hogs, to go from home to select a breeder, and never to breed in-and-in. We have all been convinced of this theory as short horn breeders; so that we have repeatedly sent to England for new bloods and have even gone to Ohio for the same purpose.

4. FALSE PROOF—RACE HORSES.—Your correspondent refers to the "Stud Book," as proof that in-and-in breeding is the thing—saying such was the practice "even down to a late day." Well, I am glad these breeders are growing wiser than their sires, for at "a late day," then, he admits they have changed their practice. I have not been familiar with the "Stud Book," and can not answer for the first part of the statement; but I do say, here in Kentucky, where we have produced race horses making the best time in the world, there is not a single breeder that would ever think of such a thing as in-and-in breeding.

5. FALSE PROOF—BAKEWELL.—I deny that Bakewell's rule was breeding in-and-in. W. C. Spooner says that Bakewell kept his method of breeding "a profound secret," and "it died with him." This same author, member of the Royal Council of Veterinary Surgeons in England, says, that it was known, however, that Bakewell, on the contrary did make a "wide selection of sheep" in the beginning. The Leicester being the principal stock, he is supposed to have used also the Warwickshire, the old Lincoln, the Teeswater, the Ryland, and the South Down.

Now, here is a man on the ground, and one of the best English writers on sheep, who proves all the opposite of the in-and-in theory, so far as Bakewell is concerned. But so soon as Bakewell died, and close breeding was kept up by his successors, the sheep failed, as all impure bloods will do, when the original active methods of crossing fail. This, Spooner, who was a great admirer of the Dishley sheep, admitted; for he says that "weakness of constitution and sterility," and a "tendency to lessen in size" came to be defects of that breed of sheep which since Bakewell's time have been remedied by crossing with the Cotswolds and Bampton Notted.

6. COLEMAN ON THE DISHLEY'S.—Coleman, in his European agriculture, Vol. 2, p. 336, says, in a letter from an eminent Smithfield salesman, "he finds these words: 'It is necessary that I should qualify these observations by saying that no doubt Leicester sheep (Dishleys or Bakewells), have been of immense service; and some of the best of them have been exceedingly good, having tendency to fatten more quickly than others. But you will find my dislike of them shared by almost all practical men. They certainly have degenerated exceedingly, becoming small and light of flesh. * * * The average weight of those coming to market is about seventeen pounds per quarter. * * * They have lost size, flesh and worth.' Again Coleman says, 'it is admitted that the Dishleys are not hardy.'

Now what does all this prove?

1. That Bakewell did not take a pair of Leicesters and breed in-and-in with them, and with good feed and shelter, all the requisites, make a celebrated flock. But that he first made a "wide selection" of the "improved" Leicesters from other flocks, like the Collings, and then used a very wide range of crosses running into not only varieties of long wooled sheep, but into distinct specific varieties, as the South Downs.

2. That by this process he made a flock of world wide reputation.

3. That the rules of the Bakewell club kept up a close breeding, and in consequence, the breed and fame of the Dishleys ran down, and was only saved from utter ruin by crossing on the Cotswolds and Bampton Notts.

7. R. L. ALLEN'S "Domestic Animals, N. Y., 1852," page 12, says, "Breeding in-and-in, or propagating from animals nearly allied, may be tolerated under certain circumstances, between those of the same generation as brother and sister." But "it is always better to avoid close relationship, by the selection of equally meritorious stock-getters of the same breed from other sources."

8. JONAS WEBB—SOUTH DOWNS.—Jonas Webb, of Babraham, Cambridgeshire, England, has pursued neither the practice of in-and-in breeding, nor crossing on sheep of specific differences. He began his herd by a wide selection of the best of the breed, and placed them in three distinct classes, and is now forming four or five with a view to judicious avoidance of close breeding. The consequence is, his flock is world wide in its reputation; clear of all the defects of the Bakewell breed, and still advancing in reputation; because he has followed, and yet follows the true physiological laws.

But why need I multiply authority or argument? I know nothing of the Hereford herd alluded to; but venture that if the truth was all known, "A Cattle Breeder" would be as wide of the mark there, as in the Bakewell case, and the "Stud Book."

With regard to the old Colling's tale, which has made fools of so many men, the ground is too old to be again traversed in this article, and in this day. I will only say again that C. Colling—1. Made a wide selection of the best herds to start upon. 2. That from all the evidence, he never had a better breeder than Hubback, which he bought of another. 3. That he admitted himself that he never had a better cow than Lady Maynard. 4. That the breeding in-and-in, so far as it went, injured the stock. The "Dutchess tribe," which stock I am now breeding to, through a grandson of Grand Duke (10,264) is all the worse for the close breeding, which is now abandoned by Mr. Thorne, and others holding that stock. 5. That purity of blood is better than crosses on specific breeds. 6. The Galloway and Kyrie alloy is repudiated. 7. That the Collings, or at least Charles, was a prime Barnum and Humberg, and should never again be named by philosophical breeders, or logical essayists.

Asking your pardon for so long trespassing upon your columns, in a controversy so manifestly one-sided, I await another broadside from the "Rest of Mankind."

White Hall, Ky., Jan. 5, 1859. C. M. CLAY.