

try which led many to give it the preference at first; but even when wood can easily be procured, I am assured by an intelligent gentleman from Argenteuil that he considers the stone fence as the cheapest, where both wood and stone are equally at hand. But previous to entering on a comparison of the respective values of different kinds of fences, it will be proper to offer a few remarks upon the advantages of subdividing his farms to the agriculturalist as practised in different Countries.

Good fences are indispensibly necessary for the farmer, not only for the preservation of his crops but for the maintenance of friendship with his neighbours. "Good fences make good friends" is an old and established maxim which none will deny, and as a substitute for fencing it was formerly a practice to divide the lands among neighbours into what is termed "run ridge" in Scotland, by which every neighbour cropped the alternate ridge, and of course would guard the whole not only against the intrusion of his own cattle but also of the whole stock of his neighbours, well knowing that should the cattle break into a farm they would not be particular as to crossing a furrow, hence the ridge under crop by the owner of the cattle, might suffer in the general devastation. Inclosing and subdividing farms are absolutely indispensable for the successful operations of husbandry, for let the herds-men be ever so vigilant, the cattle pasturing on grass in an open space adjoining to a grainfield, will make irruptions on the latter to the injury of the farmer. Without inclosures therefore the farmer is subjected to a direct loss not only in having his crops destroyed by his own stock but also *par necessité* obliged to maintain and pay wages for persons to watch them. In the division of the Canadian farms the Norman method is evidently followed, for if a farm contains an hundred acres they rest satisfied with simply dividing it into two parts, the one to be cropped with grain, the other for pasture for the cattle. To such as have travelled in Normandy this opinion may appear incorrect for there the country is generally in what is called *Champêtre* and bears no marks of fences, but although not fenced in, it is divided in this way, by what they term land marks; and for fences they substitute herds-men to the serious loss above mentioned. This plan though now abolished in Canada was practiced till within a few years ago—and in many places is still followed. To demonstrate the imperfection of this system of husbandry it is only necessary to mention that according to it, the moment the crops are off the ground the fences are removed and each intrudes on his neighbour. It is not necessary to say how absurd and injurious this system is to farmers who wish to lay down grasses; I may only observe that it not only places their grain crops at a very great risk but also totally deprives the cultivating farmer of the means of pursuing that most valuable description of husbandry the rearing of grasses. This plan of throwing down the fences at a particular season of the year is not only injurious to the general agriculture of the country and destructive of grass cultivation but would also preclude the farmer from raising root crops. These do not come off the ground before the close of October—and who would raise them provided cattle were suffered to roam at large over all the fields at Michaelmas? The very glaring in-