

bushels each, exhibited for the Canada Company's prize of £25, (say nothing of all other samples in other classes) were produced by mere accident, or without the skill and energy which must have been applied to produce, not only such *quality* of grain, but such *quantities* of it, exclusive of the many thousands of bushels, equally good, that were kept at home!

Can therefore, anything, I would ask, be more fallacious, or unjust towards us as an agricultural community? Never shall I forget the admiration and surprise expressed on more than one occasion, by the more prominent and practical agriculturists across the lines, at the numerous, and to them, extraordinarily beautiful samples of wheat, as well as of other grain at those times exhibited, when they honored us with their company, and the conclusion, (natural enough) drawn and expressed by them, was, "that there had been some extremely good culture, as well as good soil, where such prolific and splendid samples of grain could be produced!"

I cannot but think this conclusion a much more natural, as well as a more just one, than the one arrived at by the writer before alluded to.

Why, Sir, I dare answer for it, that there was not one exhibitor of those samples of wheat, but had carefully and skilfully prepared his soil by fallow for the growth of that crop, or it had been taken after a thorough preparation for a green crop the year before. Does this, and the fact also, that there are thousands of acres yearly in this country, highly and well prepared for roots, and afterwards put to spring wheat and barley, sown with clover and timothy, and in a favourable season producing abundantly, prove that our crops are produced by accident, or at most that the production is a *casualty*?

Nevertheless, I do not mean to say that a season will not occur that a tolerably fair crop of grain, of any kind, may not be grown with but little or no skill in its culture.

But, let me add, such occurrences are rather the exception than the rule, and are something like the angels' visits, few and far between! I think twice only have I had the pleasure, to my surprise, of witnessing such a novelty in the course of seventeen years. How much too, is the opinion of the writer I have alluded to at variance, regarding our agriculture, with a recently expressed opinion of the Hon. Geo. Brown, who, a few evenings ago, was speaking at a church meeting in Guelph, when in allusion to the great pleasure his recent tour had given him in the rural districts of his native country, and in England, said, "that he did not think that agriculture had made much more progress in England than in Canada; there were some highly cultivated lands, and much but middling, and that England was by no means the garden that some supposed

it to be. He saw many enclosures and farms that would have suffered greatly in comparison with the fields and homesteads in a number of places in Scotland and in Upper Canada." Again, in speaking of the display at the great exhibition of Canada's products, he adds, "There was an immense display of machinery, but in agricultural implements, *Canada* was held to *excel* the mother country!" and thus corroborating to a great extent what I have advanced. Will Sir, any one believe after such a declaration from an eye witness, (so recently returned from the old country) of the results of the great efforts which we all know have been made there of late years to improve agriculture, that *we can possibly be the drones* that deserve to be deprived of our agricultural chair, or be denied that succour from the Government grants that have of late years been so liberally allowed. Nor can I be induced to believe that because there are not at the present time, the number of pupils attending the worthy Professor's lectures on agriculture, which we would all wish to see, that that chair should cease to exist!

In a few years, it is possible that the reverse may be the case: at any rate, the subject is fraught with such vast importance to the present and future interests of the agriculturists of this country, that it ought to be approached with the greatest caution and consideration so grave a subject demands. And most sincerely do I agree with the writer of the article I have so often alluded to, when he says, "before we abolish the chair of agriculture, *let us be sure that we get something more effective in exchange!*" In that same article, the writer in endeavouring to show the inutility of fattening animals to the extent that is sometimes practiced, quotes, *as he imagines*, very high authority on that subject, to support him in said opinion, which is no less a personage than the lamented and talented Lord Macaulay, who says: "a prize poem is like a prize sheep. The object of the competition of the agricultural premium is to produce an animal fit, not to be eaten, but to be weighed. Accordingly he pampers his victim into morbid and unnatural fatness; and when it is in such a state that it would be sent away in disgust from the table, he offers it to the judges. In general, prize sheep are good for nothing but to make tallow candles; and prize poems are good for nothing but to light them."

The late respected Lord Macaulay, was undoubtedly, a highly talented and clever man. No one will dispute that, but in this respect, his ideas of the value of a fat sheep cannot be our guide star, and he evidently was much more at home in Literature and History, than in agriculture. We all well know, who know anything about the matter, that a sheep or any other animal, is not made unseemly fat, especially for the table, but for the purpose of