

lor took the second prize. He is a deeply formed, handsome bull, but not large; of excellent quality; very cylindrical, or rather oval form; deep but not wide hips: narrow thighs; full fair rump; but flat ribs; good flank.

The show of Devons was small, only 23 animals, whereas the average of the past nine years was 51 and that of Shorthorns 98.

James Quartly's, 2 years and 3 months old bull "Napoleon," took the £30 prize in the first class. He is red, beautifully formed, symmetrical and compact, and of exceeding quality. Handsome head, "hips as usual, somewhat too narrow," flank and other lower parts fair, though rather defective. The same gentleman's bull, "Duke of Wellington," took the second prize. In the class, cows in calf or in milk, G. Turner's 6 year old cow "Lady," took the first prize, and his 5 year old cow, "Hawthorn," the second.

The show of horses was large and good, the Clydesdale predominating. In sheep, the Leicester were best represented, though the pure animals were principally from two flocks, those of Messrs. Landry and Pawlett. There was a short show of other longwools, but Messrs. Lane, Garne & Brown exhibited some of their Cotswolds, which, in the language of the *Express*, were, "extraordinary sheep, the size of some of them being really prodigious." The show of Southdowns was small, but included somewhat excellent animals from the flock of the Duke of Richmond, Lords Walsingham and Chichester, and Messrs. Rigden & Lugar. The pigs, it is said, "were chiefly remarkable for the immense size which some of them attained, and the absurd state in which they were exhibited. They were so fat, that had the weather been hot, 'the unhappy brutes could not have lived through the week.'" The small breeds, both black and white, had the preference. The poultry show, which is a new feature, was a failure.

CROPS IN NEW YORK.

The Rural N. Yorker the leading agricultural journal of western New York, makes the following reference to the grain crops of that State:

LOOKING AT WHEAT—or rather the weather-beaten straw which ought to contain wheat—we see little to cheer us. That which has been "put to question" of the threshing machine, has turned answer in a product of from five pecks to ten and even fifteen bushels per acre. In some localities very little of the Soule's or Hutchinson wheat—however promising it may have looked before the harvest—will replace the seed sown, in quantity; and as to the quality, the shrunk, grown, weevil-eaten kernels are such as would have been thrown to the pigs and chickens three years ago. The Mediterranean and Golden Drop do better, but they disappointed the farmer by the meagre product. The weather and Hessian fly injured them, while the weather and midge did their worst to later varieties. Here and there a region escaped with small damage from the latter, but it is nevertheless true that wheat may be put down as a failure, so far as any profit is concerned [even at \$2 a bushel,] in any of the best grain-growing districts of Western New York.

OF OATS there are enough in the country to furnish fuel to every equine locomotive on the track, or

off, either. Still thousands of acres were drowned out by the June rain, and other thousands injured more or less. Oats are plenty and they will be needed, for.

THE HAY crop has been got in—or left out—in miserable condition. There are meadows of greater or less extent, or many a farm, where the grass rotted—yes, *rotted*—in the swath or cock, and is entirely worthless except for manure. Many a musty mow of hay will be tramped into the dung heap next winter, or forced down the cattle by sheer starvation and the lack of decent straw as a substitute. Some good hay was secured—the second growth after the rain—and some snatched up between the showers—but hay and wheat this year cost the farmer higher prices than he will be likely to get for them.

BARLEY is a good crop. We have seen as fine fields of barley as ever ripened in Western New York. But it was not sown very extensively, at least we have noticed little.

WHY IS FARMING UNPROFITABLE?

Why is it that nine-tenths of our farmers find farming to be unprofitable? By *unprofitable*, I mean paying day-wages to the farmer, and but a very small per centage on the capital he has invested in land, stock, tools, &c. Now this is a serious question—a question often asked, and one to which every practical farmer ought to be able and willing to reply. Hundred of farmers, who own from one hundred and fifty to three hundred acres of good land, passably stocked, find themselves barely able to prove that they are as well off to-day as they were a year ago: and many declare that the laborer, who has nothing but his hands with which to get a living, lays up more money in a year, than they with all their broad acres and flocks of cattle and sheep. If this be true, and I have no doubt but in many instances it is, a farm managed as a large share of our farms are managed, is a clog to a young man, with a small family who is endeavouring to lay up something for those "rainy days" which are sure to fall to the lot of many, if not all of us, ere we reach the end of the journey of life.

Farming is *not* unprofitable because labor is high, because the seasons are unpropitious, or because farm produce brings a low price. The laborer is worthy of his hire; the harvests are bountiful, and the rapidly increasing number of consumers, renders the prices of provisions, to the producer especially, quite satisfactory. Such is the case, and still the question is asked, why is farming unprofitable?

We frequently read about, and sometimes even see, men who have supported families, on the produce of two, ten, fifteen or twenty acres of land, that was when they commenced, no better than the average, in good style,—given their children a good education, and laid by a few dollars in the bargain. Then why cannot men who own two hundred or one thousand acres of land, make farming profitable? The reason is, *they plant too much*, spreading their limited quantity of manure over too large a surface, thereby impoverishing their land and wasting their labor. Eighty bushels of corn, and other grains in proportion, may be raised on one acre of land much easier than on two, and where land is so cultivated as to produce such crops, it is constantly improving, and *vice versa*.

The farms of A. and B. join each other. A.'s consists of one hundred and fifty, and B.'s of forty acres. A. has forty acres of meadow, on which he annual-