

face, instead of being black and horned. The third year (1846) they were again served by a superior ram of their own breed, and again the lambs were mongrels.

A sow of the black and white breed became pregnant by a boar of the wild breed of a deep chestnut color. The pigs produced were duly mixed, the color of the boar being in some very predominant. The sow being afterwards put to a boar of the same breed as herself, some of the produce was still stained or marked with a chestnut color which prevailed in the first litter and the same occurred after a third impregnation, the boar being then of the same kind as herself. What adds to the force of this case is that in the course of many years' observation the breed in question was never known to produce progeny having the slightest tinge of chestnut color.

A young woman residing in Edinburgh, and born of white parents, but whose mother previous to her marriage bore a mulatto child by a negro man servant, exhibits distinct traces of the negro.

It is by no means an infrequent occurrence for a widow who has married again to bear children resembling her first husband.

A very striking fact may be related in this connection, which while it may or may not have practical bearing on the breeding of domestic animals, shows forcibly how mysterious are some of the laws of reproduction. It is stated by the celebrated traveler, Court de Strzelecki, in his physical Description of New South Wales and an Dieman's Land. "Whenever," he says, "a fruitful intercourse has taken place between an aboriginal woman and an European male, that aboriginal woman is forever after incapable of being impregnated by a male of her own nation, though she may again be fertile with a Euro-
pean."

A reliable farmer related to us a remarkable instance within his own observation in proof of the influence of a first impregnation, we repeat in language, "For many years my father was possessed of a breed of cattle which he called the *belly stripe*—the cattle were black with the exception of a stripe of white around her body.—When the first Durham bull was introduced into our own one of the belly stripe cows was put to him, with the expectation of obtaining a calf resembling the bull, but to our great disappointment the calf, a heifer, was a *belly stripe*. I raised the calf—when two years old she was mated by a Durham bull and produced a calf resembling the likeness of the bull. She was afterwards served by a belly stripe bull *but the calf was a Durham.*"

Such instances as those already given which might be multiplied to an indefinite number cannot be the result of impracticable vagaries or of fanciful imagination—but are of so marked a character as to deserve and demand a candid and thorough investigation.—*Eastern Farmer* (June.)

Agriculture: Its Past, Present, and Future.

(Continued from page 202.)

What Modern Agricultural Progress owes to Manufactures.—Let us ask how it is that within the last seventy years agriculture has made such enormous strides as compared with its former history? The answer is ready and simple. We have become the workshop of the world; nearly nine-tenths of our population are engaged in, or dependent upon, manufactures, commerce, trade, and other occupations, non-agricultural; whilst this once purely agricultural people represent now only one-tenth of the national population. Agriculture owes nearly its all to the spinning-jenny, the power-loom, the mule, and the thousands of new inventions and new occupations of modern times. Mighty steam pours into the national lap the estimated labours of a supposed population equal to that of the whole world. The well-to-do and multiplied millions—under ground, above ground, on the broad waters, and on the busy rail, make greedy and unsatisfied demands on the British farmer, who, shame to say, helpless and powerless, is unable, because unwilling, to respond to the call. Like a negligent shopkeeper, he compels his best customers to deal with and strengthen his competitors' hands over the water. Is there one agriculturist who can still harbor in his mind a lurking belief that his own interest is opposed to that of trade, commerce, and manufactures? If so, let him sweep away, in his imagination, the towns, and cities, and factories, the iron and coal mines, the railways, and mercantile fleets; and let him fancy himself, like the ancient Briton, a producer with no other customer than himself, his lord, his warriors, and his governors.

There was a time when Agriculture cast a jealous and disapproving eye on Manufacturers, but I trust intelligence has removed it. It is precisely because the British farmers have their customers—the British manufacturers—almost at their doors, and that other corn-producing countries have not any manufacturers, that British agriculture is more rich and thriving. The larger the population employed in manufacturing for foreigners, the better for the English farmer and the English landlord; for no doubt the latter will always participate largely in the farmers' well-doing. Farmers and country gentlemen sometimes look with an unkindly eye on apron-string farmers or cotton lords; but this should not be.

How the Commerce of Towns contributed to the Improvement of the Country.—The increase and riches of commercial and manufac-