

Linnæus. It was selected as the vehicle for the conveyance of that illustrious and honored name to posterity, by Dr. J. F. Gronovius, who obtained the sanction of the great botanist of Sweden for that purpose. Its colour, too—I have a sketch of it, drawn from nature, before the present moment—is scarcely correctly noted: instead of being “white tinted with pink on the inside,” its blossom may with greater propriety be called “flesh-colored;” or, according to Gray, “purple and whitish.” The hue, however, may vary with the situation.

Neither let it be imagined that its “habitat” is confined to the neighborhood of Rivière du Loup and Cacouna. It is a floral “citizen of the world,” found in various European and Asiatic countries, as Sweden, Lapland, Norway, Germany, Switzerland, Savoy, Siberia, Russia, Scotland, where toward the end of the last century it was discovered in the Highlands,—it may be gathered in abundance in this county, and if the ladies of Peterboro desire to deck their summer hats with its graceful, pendent, twin-blossoms, they have but to stroll to the cemetery on the margin of the “little lake,” where they may gratify their taste to any extent they please. Your obed^t. servant,

V. C.

Peterboro, C. W., Nov. 20, 1861.

Anacharis Canadensis.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE CANADIAN AGRICULTURIST: DEAR SIR,—In the *Agriculturist* of 16th June last, page 382 you notice an American weed in England under the name of *Anacharis Alsinastrum*, and in the last number of the *Agriculturist* the same plant is noticed under the name of *Elodea Canadensis*, and you ask if it is known in Canada.

The plant is known to Botanists under a variety of names, being called

Elodea Canadensis, by Michaux.

Udora Canadensis, by Nuttall.

Anacharis Canadensis, by Planchon.

Anacharis Alsinastrum, by Babington.

Serpicula Verticillata, by Muhlenberg.

Serpicula Occidentalis, by Pursh, and

Apalanthé Canadensis, by Planchon.

Professor Asa Gray in his Manual of the Botany of the Northern States, adopts the name of *Anacharis Canadensis*, and mentions it as being common. Mr. Billings, in his list of indigenous plants found growing in the neighborhood of Prescott, published in the *Canadian Naturalist*, vol. 5, page 19 mentions it under the same name *Anacharis Canadensis*, as being common in ponds and slow streams. I have not observed it in any other list of Canadian plants; it is, however, abundant in the Dundas Marsh and Burlington Bay, and I have no doubt it is common in the neighborhood of

Toronto about the mouths of the Don and Humber.

It is somewhat singular that a plant which has caused as much trouble and annoyance in England and Holland, by filling up watercourses and impeding the navigation of rivers and canals should be almost unknown, and should not have caused any sensible obstruction to the navigation of the canals and rivers of this country where it is indigenous. I am inclined to think that the accounts given of it in the English papers are a little exaggerated. That the plant is propagated with extraordinary rapidity, and that it may interfere with the flow of water in ditches and small watercourses is very probable but that it should interfere with the navigation of large rivers and canals seem to be extremely improvable and contrary to our experience in Canada. A plant that propagates itself with such ease and rapidity can be easily experimented upon, and its habits studied in a small aquarium, and perhaps some of your readers may be induced to try some experiments with it.

I am, yours &c.,

“CANADENSIS.”

Hamilton, Oct. 22, 1861.

On the Rearing of Calves.

BY MAJOR S. M'CLINTOCK.

These observations are offered to advocate the abandonment of the old system of raising calves for cue which shall insure a quicker return, and therefore, greater profit to the farmer—a change which the condition of our stock and markets, the state of our root crops, the rising prices of dairy produce, and the sounder view of economy now prevailing unite in enforcing.

Let us first cast a glance at what may be called the “old system,” or that according to which calves are kept on as *little* as will maintain them alive, turned out by day in all weather, indifferently housed at night, receiving a scanty supply of milk, and that, perhaps, skimmed so that to the pasture the calf must look for food all day—the half of which is spent by the unfortunate and neglected animal standing going and shivering at a gate, in anxious expectation of the herdsman to drive him to hovel. What is the appearance of this animal? Do not his lean, ridgy back, his bare points, shining coat, and distended belly show his pitiable condition? And whence this last feature? When the calf, with a keen appetite, leaves the hovel, supposing he has the benefit of such care, and proceeds to “blow himself out” with grass like a half-starved Caffre revelling on the carcase of an eland, the result will in either case be a distended abdomen, showing clearly the impotence of the “*large and seldom*” mode of feeding, as compared with that of *little and often*.