



Class 6.39.73
Number N53
Volume 1. cop. 2
Source
Received
Cost
Accession No. 14101

#### 0 - 1 - 1

·



NEW HAMPS.HIRE

## AGRICULTURAL

# EXPERIMENT STATION,

### HANOVER N. H.,

## BULLETIN NO. 10.

## CO-OPERATIVE FERTILIZER EXPERIMENTS.

COMPARISON OF MANURE, PREPARED FERTILIZER, ASHES, AND CHEMICALS.

MARCH, 1890.

## ORGANIZATION

## NEW HAMPSHIRE

OF THE

# Agricultural Experiment Station.

### BOARD OF CONTROL:

Hon.	W	ARR	en Brov	vn, P	resid	ent,	•		Han	npton Falls.
Rev.	s.	C. 1	Bartlet	т. LI	Ľ.D.,	-		-	-	Hanover.
Hon.	S.	В.	WHITTE	MORE	, -	-		-	-	Colebrook.
Ном.	G.	Α.	WASON	, –		-	-		-	Nashua.
PROF.	G	. H	. Wнітс	HER,	Secre	etary,	-		-	Hanover.

### **OFFICERS:**

G.	Н.	WHITCHEF	٤,		-		-		-			Director.
A.	H.	Wood,		-		-		-		- Su	pt. Dai	iry Dept.
H.	н.	LAMSON,	-		-		Micr	osc	opist	and	Photo	grapher.
F.	W.	Morse,		-		-		-		-	•	Chemist.
C.	L.	Parsons,	-		-		-		-		Asst.	Chemist.
C.	н.	Pettee,		-		-				•	Meteo	orologist.
J.	М.	FULLER, -			-		•		-	1	Station	Farmer.
Ċ.	W.	WHITCHER	ζ.	-				-		-	-	Clerk

### CO-OPERATIVE FERTILIZER EXPERIMENTS.

It is commonly believed that experiments with fertilizers are of little use, except in the immediate locality in which they are made; some even advocating the idea that no two parts of the same farm have the same needs, and that the use of fertilizing materials is, and must be, from the nature of the case, a hap-hazzard undertaking, upon which study and investigation can throw little if any light.

I do not believe, however, that the case is as hopelessly involved in darkness as this view would lead us to conclude, and I am convinced that the feeding of plants will in time be placed on footing more nearly approaching that on which the feeding of animals now stands. It is not the purpose of this Bulletin to discuss this part of the subject but rather to present the results of a series of coöperative experiments carried on by direction of the Station on farms in various parts of the State.

#### OBJECT OF THE EXPERIMENTS.

The object was to determine, by field tests, the relative proportion of *Nitrogen, Phosphoric acid* and *Potash* which should form the most perfect *crop ration* for the soils and crops experimented on, and in connection with this, as a means of comparison, four plots in each set were left with no fertilizer of any kind, to determine the natural capacity of the soil; one plot had one of the best commercial fertilizers found in our market, one plot had ashes and concerning one plot, No. 6, no suggestion was made, the intention being for each farmer to use whatever he might have, either in the way of manures or commercial goods on this.

#### COST OF FERTILIZER.

In each case, except plot 8 where manure was used, the fertilizer or chemicals cost 50 cents per plot or \$10.00 per acre; the manured plot had 30 bushels of farm yard manure, which is at the rate of about 7 cords per acre, the value of which, on an average, may be placed at \$20.00 (that is about twice the cost of the fertilizer, chemicals and ashes.) This amount of manure was used because it was believed to be about what our farmers would call a full average application for corn.

#### PARTIES WHO UNDERTOOK THE WORK.

The thanks of the Station and of the farmers of the State are due the following gentlemen who assisted in this undertaking: Hon. D. H. Goodell, Governor of the State, Antrim, N. H.; Hon. Warren Brown, Pres't Board of Control, Hampton Falls, N. H.; Hon. S. B. Whittemore, Member of Board of Control and of Board of Agriculture, Colebrook, N. H.; Alonzo Towle, M. D., Member Board of Agriculture, Freedom, N. H.; Charles McDaniel, Esq., Master State Grange, West Springfield, N. H.; F. T. Stanton, B. S., Strafford Corner, N. H.; C. C. Beaman, Esq., Cornish, N. H.; James Wood, Esq., Lebanon, N. H.; J. L. Gerrish, Esq., Mast Yard, N. H.; J. E. Whitcher, Esq., Strafford, N. H.

The last mentioned experiment was a continuation of a series commenced in 1888, and ruined by the early frost of that year, it cannot be compared with the other results since the plan was materially modified the past year.

#### PLAN OF FIELD.

The outside dimensions of the plowed field were to be 185feet by 281 feet, this enabled one to lay off 20 plots each 33 feet by 66 feet, leaving an outside blank space four (4) feet wide all around the field and a space three (3) feet wide between each plot. Each plot was to have ten (10) rows with twenty (20) hills in each row or at the rate of 4000 hills per acre.

Table 1 is so arranged that the number of the plot is shown across the top, the kind of fertilizer used is shown in the left hand column; the number of pounds of any given substance used on a given plot will be found by looking opposite that substance, in the column<sup>a</sup> marked at the top with the number of the plot, for example, if it is desired to know what the fertilizer on plot 13 was, we look in the column headed 13, following down this we come to  $16\frac{1}{2}$  pounds and looking at the left of this we see that this was dissolved bone black; 5 pounds of muriate of potash and  $3\frac{1}{2}$  pounds of sulphate of ammonia, make up the total application on that plot.

Analysis of Fertilizer. Phosphoric acid, Potash. Nitrogen,	Dissolved bone-black, Muriate of potash, Sulphate of ammonia, Ashes, Manure, Prepared fertilizer,	Kind and Amount of Fertilizer.	TABLE 1. FER
27.4	32222 18:18:18:18:18:18:18:18:18:18:18:18:18:1	-	TILI
10 2	1bs 6 4 4	ಲು	ZERS
6.8	14 14 74	4	USE
12 33	171 23%		D IN
800.2 0.44	30 bu	30	-0 0
8 10. 8 10.	. 11br 171	9	OPEF
7 5 10.7	4 5 4 31/ 31/	10 No	ATIV
6.5	2 bu	. of	E
2.8	31 161 S	Plot.	CPER
3 12.	1bs	14	IMEN
111.4 7 2.8	181 32 32 32	15	TS.
4 7.5 20.2 2.8	333101×	16	
3 20	1bs	18	
50	2 221/2	19	
16	1bs 331/3	20	

The lower three lines of figures in the table show the chemical composition of the material used on the various plots,

thus No. 13 had a mixture which by analysis showed 10.5% of phosphoric acid, 10% of potash and 2.8% of nitrogen.

<u> </u>
~
-
0
-
≤;
$\simeq$
-
1
٥.
-
<b>A</b> A
Pres.
- 22
-
~
0
× .
-
0
-
Z
Acres 1
7
1.4
- 22
-
<u> </u>
60
$\sim$
-
_
1
E
K El
RE
SKE
USKE
USKE
IUSKEI
HUSKEI
HUSKEI
HUSKE
F HUSKEI
DF HUSKEI
OF HUSKEI
OF HUSKE
3 OF HUSKEI
S OF HUSKE
DS OF HUSKEI
DS OF HUSKEI
LDS OF HUSKE
GLDS OF HUSKE
(ELDS OF HUSKE)
TELDS OF HUSKE
VIELDS OF HUSKE
YIELDS OF HUSKE
2. YIELDS OF HUSKE
2. YIELDS OF HUSKE
2. YIELDS OF HUSKE
E 2. YIELDS OF HUSKE
LE 2. YIELDS OF HUSKE
ILE 2. YIELDS OF HUSKEI
BLE 2. YIELDS OF HUSKEI
ABLE 2. YIELDS OF HUSKEI
ABLE 2. YIELDS OF HUSKEI
CABLE 2. YIELDS OF HUSKE

age.	Fodder.	0010	3408	2326		23338	2	2542		0718		2909	1166	1122	00400	0100	1314.		3250		2290		2595		1102	2006	6007	2861	1	3108		1890	7116	1417	2760	9006	
Aver	Corn.	69.94	10.44	40.41	NOKO	10.00	57.97		59.76		74.00		39.13	00 00	20.00	000	00.11	00 40	01.10	41.17		65.71		75.00		63.58	11 12	11.10	59.70		43.66		56.85	63.91		58.81	
	Beaman.	85	5200	11	0000	15(0)	71812	3120	2017	4500	62	3000	19	101027	112.5	0005	100	10.00	100	7148	3900	95.5	2900	941/2	4800	88	0009	4-000	%8t	3900	60	2860	110.5	30.9 0 2	3900	03	
	Brown.	321/2	2800	65 ½ 9-0-00	0070	0066	200	3160	2017	2700	69.5	3220	68.5	3260	67 1/2	2500	3	3980	00000	60	1800	56	2560	5:5	1220	671/2	3100	0707	12 000 X	3300	1 - 2	3120	<b>8</b>	3060	2740	58	
	Wood.	6814	2853	18.1	1220	1010	10.1	1111	1 25	1032 1032	83.5	3600	18.4	1584	11:3.1	1976	101 8	4127	86.3	101/2	2016	801%	3803	82 S	1280	9.66	2004	X.X.	500 <del>4</del>	1905	2614	1886	21.1	1823	2510	4134	
	Gerrish.	93	2635	69.7	1(30)	5.03 2000	2000	22.02 1010	10047	9170	6734	1555	35.8	1085	108.5	3150	79.4	2635	77.5	1000	10.55	62	1705	73.6	2325	6934	2015	80.0	2320	T.00	5414	1395	491/2	1240	1540	58.1	DOL -
	Baker.	1.77		13.6		471/2	1.01	5012	0.017	30.1/2		•	0.34	ţ	80.8		67		72.6	11.0	0.11	15.4		68.1	1.00	58%		6634	/11 2	04/2							
	Goodell.	7117	1760	71/2	520	93 93	2180	45	1020T	55 16 10	110	3080	40	1480	72	2020	54	1980	7	0+01	070	281%	1400	68	2000	36	1440	39	1800	41	10001	1080	24	960	977	1 23	1111
	Stanton.	2014	5200	371/2	1200	55 2000	3600	87.58 5.1.0	0001	103.8	0000	3000	411/2	3000	62 1/2	5000	721/2	5200	613	0000	0.00	08	32()()	115	5200	10	4500	10	2400	30	7121	1000	55	2200	22	85	ALLEN A
		0	1 ~ F	° C	4 ~ 7	3 √C	÷.	4	× '	2 ~ ~	- 0	6 ~ 5	1	E	1.1	×	C.	9 ∕ F	10 2 C			40	12. 2 8		13 × F	0	14 ~ F	15 ) C	- E	16 4 5	40	17 ~ F	10 \ C	H > or	19 5 6		

#### CONDITIONS UNDER WHICH WORK WAS DONE.

The Station put up the fertilizers except for plots 8, 6, and 12, the farmer was to furnish use of land, was to lay out the plots, and plant according to directions, record certain observed facts on blanks furnished and to harvest and report weights. For this, no compensation, other than the fertilizer was given.

#### RESULTS OBTAINED.

While the results cannot be regarded as perfect, in fact fall far short of that, nevertheless it is believed that they are valuable. Seven of the ten farmers worked on corn which was husked, (one of these by reason of sickness did not report on weight of fodder) one planted corn for ensilage, one sweet corn for a canning factory, and one experimented on potatoes.

Table 2 gives the yield per acre of husked corn, 40 lbs. per bushel as husked, and ot todder, for each plot on each of the seven sets; plots 17, 18, 19 and 20, on Mr. Baker's acre, were destroyed by crows; the last two columns in the table give the average yield of corn and iodder from each plot, for the seven tests. In this table the THREE BEST YIELDS ARE PRINTED IN BLACK-FACED TYPE, the next three best in italics.

Taking this table as it stands and the best yield of corn is seen to be from manure, followed by plots 9 and 13, while the largest amount of fodder is found on plot 13, followed by 9 and 5.

If we select and average the three best plots, not including the one with manure, in each set, we can then compare the results from chemicals with those from manure, prepared tertilizer, and ashes, and by averaging the four plots with no fertilizer we have the data for determining the relative efficiency of each method of supplying plant food. This method of condensing results has been applied to table 2 and as a result we get table 3, the upper half being tor *huskea corn* the lower for *fodder*.

Table 3 shows us that the average yield ot husked corn from manure was 89.69 bushels, from the best three combinations of chemicals 90.62 bushels, from prepared fertilizer 63.58 bushels, from ashes 65.40 bushels, and from plots not fertilized 41.00 bushels.

To the farmer these figures mean a great deal, provided that they are representative results; now as the cost of chemi-

	Average.	bu. 89.69		$\begin{array}{c} 90.62 \\ 65.58 \\ 65.4 \\ 41 \end{array}$	lbs.	3739		4046 2865	2595
EMICALS.	Beaman.	bu. 112.5	110.5 106 103	106.5 106.5 88 95.5 67.4	lbs.	$\frac{4000}{5200}$	5100 $4800$	5033 $3000$	2900 3155
IS AND CH	Brown.	bu. 67.5	82.5 81 77	240.5 80.2 67.8 56 67.7	lbs.	$2500 \\ 4480$	3980 3700	4055 3700	2560
FERTULIZED	Wood.	bu. 113.1	101.75 92.50 86.25	280.50 9.9.5 80.5 20.5 20.5	lbs.	5764 4932	4298 4280	4503 2534	3803 1676
REPARED	Gerrish.	bu. 108.5	93 93 89 25	$egin{array}{c} 275.25 \\ gI.75 \\ 69.75 \\ 62 \\ 62 \\ 50.6 \end{array}$	DER. Ibs.	2150 2790	2635 2635	2686 $2015$	1705 1325
ANURE, PI	Baker.	bu. 89.75	77.1 72.75 72.6	74.15 74.15 58.25 45.4 11.6	Fod				
M 40 NOSI	Goodell,	bu. 74	97.5 93 68	$egin{array}{c} 258.5 \\ 266.2 \\ 36 \\ 38.5 \\ 23.6 \\ 23.6 \end{array}$	lbs.	2020 3080	2180 2000	$2420\\1440$	1400 1005
3. Compar	Stanton.	bu 62.5	115 103 75 87.50	$10 \frac{306.25}{70}$ 80 80 38.1 38.1	lbs.	5000 6500	5200 5200	5633 4500	3200 3050
TABLE		lanure,	set three plots, $\left\{ \right.$	rverage. rrepared fertilizer, tshes. Vo fertilizer,		danure, (	sest three plots, >	verage, repared fertilizer.	tshes, Vo fertilizer,

cals, ashes, and prepared fertilizer are the same, iny gain in product of one over the other represents profit, and we may

well ask the question, Why do chemicals average a better yield than the prepared fertilizer?

The first step in answering this is to determine just what kind of plant food has been supplied in each case, and the proportion of the several kinds. If we take the fertilizers used on those plots which gave the three highest yields in each set, and average the per cent. of nitrogen, phosphoric acid and potash, we get the results given in table 4.

		Stanton.	Goodell.	Baker.	Gerrish.	Wood.	Brown.	Beaman.	Average.
On Corn. On	Phosphoric acid, %, Potash, %, Nitrogen, %, Phosphoric acid, %, Potash. %.	7 17.8 4.1 7.3 8.6	11.5 7.6 1.8 11.5 7.6	$     \begin{array}{c}       11.2 \\       6.3 \\       2.7     \end{array} $	$11.6 \\ 5.6 \\ 3.2 \\ 10.5 \\ 12.5$	$11.3 \\ 10 \\ 1.9 \\ 5.9 \\ 24.6$	$\begin{array}{r} 3 \ 6 \\ 10.2 \\ 11.4 \\ 11.1 \\ 9.3 \end{array}$	7.0 8.7 7.8 10.8 9.0	$9 \\ 10.7 \\ 4.7 \\ 9.5 \\ 11.9$
Fodder.	Nitrogen, %,	28	1.8		1.9	28	20	2.8	2.3

TABLE 4. COMPOSITION OF BEST CHEMICALS USED.

The upper half of this table shows what kind of a fertilizer proved best for the production of corn on each of the seven farms, the last column averages all of these. The lower half of the table shows the same thing for the production of fodder, consequently these results may be regarded as applicable where the design is to raise ensilage; combining these averages and we may fairly claim, so far as the teachings of these experiments are concerned, that the best results come from a fertilizer, with the following chemical composition: (beside it is given the average analysis of 18 fertilizers sold in N. H. in1889)

	Chemicals producing best results.	Average of fertilizers sold in N. H. in 1880.
Phosphoric acid	9.25	11.08
Potash	11.3	2.57
Nitrogen	3.5	2.45

The difference is very easily seen and we are forced to conclude that our prepared fertilizers are deficient in potash.

Or if we select from table 2 those three plots which yield highest in the average of *all* of the sets namely, 9, 13 and \*6 the average composition is as below.

	Husked Corn.	Fodder,	Average of the two.
Phosphoric acid	10.7	7.	8.8
Potash	9.5	23.1	16.3
Nitrogen	2.	2.1	2.0
The best pl	ots on fodder	were 13, 9, 5.	

\*6 received a variety of fertilizers among the different experimenters.

These results are in no wise unusual; in our five years' work on the Station Farm, some of the results of which were reported in Bulletin No. 6, it has been found that the six combinations of chemicals which have given the highest income, on corn, per dollar invested have averaged:

Phosphoric acid	6.4
Potash	15.5
Nitrogen	2.5

EXPERIMENTS WITH ENSILAGE, SWEET CORN AND POTATOES.

The following are the results of experiments with the same combinations as for corn, on the crops above mentioned.

	T	ABLE 5.	
1	Towle. Sweet Corn. value per acre. \$68 60	Whittemore. Potatoes. bu. per acre. <b>17</b> 2	McDaniel Ensilage. Ibs. per acre 9120
2	28.40	110	6480
3	57.40	180	11160
4	19.60	110	*5460
5	*30.80	115	7680
6	*41.8	160	12320
7	35.40	80	7720
8	*40.40	148	11520
9	57.80	150	13760
10	57.60	143.5	11000
11	31.60	70	6200
12	55.40	71.5	12400
13	50 20	104	11920
14	60.20	128.5	10320
15	*41.20	127.5	11200
16	*42.60	90	10120
17	28.80	110	7000
18	32.60	16.3	7600
19	28.60	28	12800
20	48.20	98.5	9900
*,	A different variety of corn.		

Manure.	Towle, Sweet Corn Value of crop *	Whittemore. Potatoes bu. I 48	McDaniel. Ensilage lbs. I I 520
Average of best 2 3 plots of Chemicals, 5	\$61.33	171	12986
Prepared fertilizer,	\$60.20	1281/2	10320
Ashes,	\$55.40	711/2	12400
No fertilizer,	\$31.05	87	6850

\*An accidental changing of seed puts this plot in another series.

The superiority of chemicals over prepared goods is again demonstrated in these trials. The composition of the fertilizers giving best three yields is as follows:

	Towle.	Whittemore.	McDaniel.
Phosphoric acid %	10.8	11.6	4.0
Potash %	II.0	7.1	24.1
Nitrogen %	2.1	2.3	0.2

#### PLOT 6.

This plot, as before mentioned, had such fertilizers as each experimenter chose to apply.

Gov. Goodell applied  $32\frac{1}{2}$  pounds of Soluble Pacific Guano; unfortunately this was applied *in the hill* while all other fertilizers were broadcasted, comparison under this condition is impossible.

Mr. McDaniel used 4 bushels of her. manure on this plot; Mr. Gerrish 2 bushels of hen manure; Dr. Towle applied 28 lbs. of Quinnipiac fertilizer; Mr. Baker used 28 lbs. of Bradley's XL; Mr. Wood use  $21\frac{1}{2}$  pounds of ground bone and  $\frac{1}{2}$  bushel of ashes, Mr. Whittemore applied 28 pounds of Stockbridge Potato Manure.

		Gain over no fertilizer
Husked Corn.	bush.	bush.
Average yield with no fertilizer	41.00	
Average yield with Manure	89.69	48.69
Average yield with 3 Best Chemicals was	90.62	49.62
Average yield with Ashes	65.4	24.4
Average yield with Prepared fertilizers	63.58	22.58
Fodder.	lbs.	lbs.
Average of "nothing" plots	2176	
Average of Manured plots	3739	1563
Average of plots with Coemicals	4046	1870
Average of plot with Ashes	2595	419
Average of plot with Prepared fertilizer	2865	689

#### COMPARISON OF COST AND PRODUCT.

If we call the corn worth 25 cents per husked bushel and the fodder worth \$5.00 per ton, we can find the value of the increased product, and, calling the manure worth \$15.00 per acre, and all other plots \$10.00 per acre, which is what the fertilizers would cost in any market, we can draw up the following exhibit of cost and income :

Corn	Cost of plant food per acre.	Value of increased yield	Value of increase per \$1 invested in plant food
Manure	\$15.00	\$16.00	\$1.07
Chemicals	10,00	17.08	т.7 т
Ashes	10.00	7.15	.7 I 1/2
Prepared fertiliz	er 10.00	7.37	.74
Chemicals	10.00	30.28	3.03
Ashes	10.00	24.35	2.43 <sup>1</sup> /2
Prepared fertiliz Potatoes	er 10.00	29.15	2.9 t ½
Manure	15.00	30.50	2.03
Chemicals	10.00	42.00	4.20
Ashes	10.00	Loss	
Prepared fertiliz	er 10.00	20.75	2.07 1/2

#### CONCLUSIONS.

st. Chemicals when properly mixed can fully take the place of farm yard manure as a source of plant food, this is shown by the averages of the best plots in each set (see table 3)

2nd. Chemicals when properly mixed can and do give greater increase of crop than Commercial fertilizers (see table 3 and page 7.

4th. The average chemical composition of fertilizers for New Hampshire should be *Phosphoric acid*, 0 to 11 per cent., *Potash*, 0 to 15 per cent., *Nitrogen* 2 to 4 per cent., whereas the fertilizers offered to us in the market average *Phosphoric acid*, 11%, *Potash* 2.5%, *Nitrogen*, 2.5%

To get such a fertilizer as the soil and plant demand farmers must buy crude chemicals and mix them in proportions which prove best by trial, until such time as the fertilizer manufacturers discard the present stereotyped 12-3-3 formula which does not and never did rest upon any basis either of theory or practice.

With increased confidence in their value and adaptation to New Hampshire conditions, I reprint a few of the combinations given in Bulletin No 6. The amounts are for one acre where no manure is used, and in all cases, with hoed crops, two-thirds of the mixture is to be sown broadcast and harrowed in, the remaining third to be put in the hill or drill.

FOR CORN AND W	HEA	т.	
Dissolved Bone black		325 ll	bs.
Muriate of Potash		100 ll	os.
Sulphate of Ammonia		75 ll	os.
17		500	
۷.			
OATS.			
Dissolved Bone black		330	
Muriate of Potash		105	
Sulphate of Ammonia		65	
		500	
VII.		5	
HAV			
Dissolved Perc black			
Muriate of Potach		225	
Sulphate of Ammonia		254	
ourphate of Annionia			
		500	
IX.			
POTATOES.			
Disselved Dana black	(a)	or	(b)
Juriate of Potech	340		300
Sulphate of Ammonia	100		150
		_	50
	500		500

I.

It is hoped that this Bulletin will lead some of our farmers to test these combinations, using them side by side with Prepared fertilizers.

G. H. WHITCHER, Director.

The Bulletins of this Station are free to all farmers in the State who send a request for them to the Director.

•

## 0

.

\*

.

.



639.73 Nor3 100pt The Hampshire Bulletins 1-48



