

I regret that the present position of the farm, and the parties who superintend it, prevents the publication at present of data, whereby a truthful representation of its management and profits might be derived. If, in any farming establishment, the expenditure exceeds the returns; dependence of others on the system pursued is fallacious; and if its recommendations for practice are inapplicable with the great body of farmers, it can never be viewed as a model.

I am,
Respectfully yours,
A. KIRKWOOD.

Quebec, 21st June, 1852.

EFFECTS OF CHARCOAL—REMARKS ON
CATTLE, &c.

Piffardinia, Livingston Co.,
New York, June 21, 1852.

DEAR SIR,—My time is now so much occupied that I cannot find enough to answer Mr. Croft as I would wish, but I will state what has come under my observation for his consideration and study for the present.

Some time since, I found charcoal left from an old pit about twelve inches in thickness. The blacksmith who made the coal told me that it had laid there thirteen years, and he left it about in the same state as when I found it. It was exposed to alternate rain and sunshine, snow and frost, for that length of time, without any sign of decay.

I made a compact heap of slaughter house manure, night soil, barnyard and street manure. I drew this charcoal, and spread it over the top, probably from an inch, to an inch and a half thick, and when put on it was in as dry a state as when first made, although thirteen years old. In less than a month it began gradually to decay, and all of it was changed in appearance to something like black salt, when worked with a shovel. This was one point, with some others, that convinced me that charcoal was an absorbent of the stench that evaporates; for there was none of it floating in the atmosphere as previously and which I think was the cause of its decay. Had it been put on the manure heap the first day it was made it would have had the same effect. I turned over this Composition, and mixed the various kinds of manure together, and when drawn out on the land the charcoal was scarcely perceptible; it would spit out with a spade or shovel and had scarcely any smell to it.

I put this mine on a piece of impoverished clay soil—grass land, in the following manner, as top dressing: first from eight to ten loads per acre. Secondly, from sixteen to eighteen. Thirdly from twenty-eight to thirty. The first was exhausted after two years mowing, and became as much impoverished as formerly. The second proved the benefit for years, and returned to its impoverished condition. The third was not exhausted in seven years. This convinced me in my own mind that there was no loss from evaporation, and that the stench that escaped from the manure into the charcoal, decayed that also, or why was

it not decayed by the rains, sun, and atmosphere, in its previous situation; it might have laid there thirteen years longer, had it not come in contact with this stench (I will not call it ammonia, as there seems to be some *mystery* about the term.) By this *proof* satisfactory to me, I thought the sooner I put my manure on, or into the soil, the better, if in a situation where the rains could not wash it away. I highly approve of manure being put on the soil from the stables in its green state, and when long, if ploughed in it will very soon decay, and the nearer you get it to the surface the better.

Yours sincerely,
WM. HY. SOTHAM.

P. S.—I do not consider Professor Low any authority on cattle, nor any other Professor, who professes to write a book, for the sake of the money he can gain by it; that is the object, not the truth about the cattle; for such writers will praise that breed the most, whose breeders pay the most for it. If the large sums of money that have been given to authors, by short horn breeders, was to be brought before the public, for puffing that particular breed, it would astonish those who know nothing about it. I can do it if you think it worth noticing in your paper. Professor Low would not escape this censure, and I will give you one sentence from "Yonatt" the celebrated text-book, which is sufficiently to show he knew nothing of the qualities of cattle. In page 11 he says speaking of Devons, "They have been long celebrated as a breed of cattle, beautiful in the highest degree, and in activity at work, and aptness to fatten, unrivalled." In speaking of Herefords, page 32. "They are even more kindly feeders than the Devons, and will live and grow fat when a Devon will cease to live." And further in the same page. "The Devon will acquire bulk and hardihood, and the Herefords a finer form and activity." We know that Yonatt "wrote a book," but do these conflicting statements make any sense of it. I can show you statements of Professor Low much in the same style, which it may suit my purpose to do at some future day.

I think breeders ought to give their own statements, and if they do not tell the truth, they will soon with meet opposition; and then the public will be able to judge which differs from it. The columns of agricultural papers should always be open to these discussions with a fair and liberal view to both parties, and without fear or favour. Yours is the best paper I have ever dealt with for this purpose. The Editors on this side the lake are partial, or are afraid of giving offence to part of their correspondents. Others get up a paper purposely to puff the commodity they sell, and make that the first object.

Let us hear what more Mr. Parsons has to say on Short Horns, and when the discussion is ended let the public judge between us.

HEREFORDS *versus* SHORT HORNS.

By Mr. Sotham's request we insert the following letter from the pen of the late Rev. J. E. Smythies