

excellent quality for fuel, and very lasting. We believe our moss is quite capable of being converted into a good material for fuel, particularly in grates. There is no fire more pleasant than one made of good peat; it has no unpleasant smell, and is not so soiling as coal. Larger grates would be necessary than those made use for coal.

We have been told by a gentleman, a subscriber to this Journal, that several farmers objected to subscribe to it, on the grounds that we endeavour to make it appear, that there were not any good farmers in Canada. If any farmer, who may have seen the Journal, has given this interpretation to any remarks we may have submitted, we can assure them we never wished or intended to be so understood. Very much the contrary—we have constantly stated, that because we had many good farmers who raised good crops, and products of every description, other farmers might do likewise, by adopting the same good system of husbandry. We brought it forward as a proof, that it was not the soil or climate that prevent better farming generally, but because bad farmers did not follow the example of good ones. We have stated further, that the Journal was not written or published for good farmers, that were perfectly satisfied with their own system and the results obtained from it, but for the instruction and encouragement of farmers that were less fortunate, and did not understand or practice a good system of husbandry, or have good crops or cattle. The good farmers, however, might be so generous as to subscribe to the Journal, if only for the pride and satisfaction of knowing how superior their system of Agriculture was in its practice and results, to any proposed in this Journal. This gratification would be cheaply purchased at five shillings annually, although the Journal would be useless to them for any other purpose. The excuse given for not subscribing the small amount of five shillings annually towards the support of the only agricul-

tural periodical published in Lower Canada, is by no means satisfactory to us, as a just or well founded one, and we submit it to the friends and supporters of the Journal, if we have ever given any just cause for the objection. We have undoubtedly said that the very best system of agriculture, practiced in Canada, was far behind in its practice and results, the best system in the British Isles. Who that knows both countries will dispute this? A field may occasionally be seen here exceedingly well cultivated in every respect for this country, but where is our thorough-draining, and drilled grain crops, as in England, and 50 or 60 bushels of wheat to the acre produce from it? There are very few farms in Canada sufficiently drained, and that do not require many improvements to make them equal to an English farm. We do not say that it would be prudent to make so large an expenditure in this country where produce is so low, we only speak as to the fact—that we are far behind the best British farming. What are our pastures here compared to those of the British Isles? And with the exception of our cultivation for green crops, what cultivation do we give for wheat compared to what land receives in the old country for this grain. How few farmers in this country keep their cattle and sheep of different ages separated as in the old countries. This may appear of little consequence, but we know it has considerable influence on the thriving and profit of stock, although we have not been able to have them separated always. We do not say but many farmers may keep their stock properly separated, but we have not seen many do so. The strictest attention to all these matters is essentially necessary in a well conducted farming establishment, in the old countries, and without the same attention in this, we cannot pretend to carry on a perfect system of husbandry. The stock upon a farm should be of equal value to the tillage, and unless properly managed in every respect, they cannot be profitable; and this good management includes the