an average, ten tons of well-rotted manure every year to each acre, while the American farmer returns nothing."

Granting this to be a true statement of the present practice and future prospects of the farmers of this country, the question naturally arises to our minds, what is our best remedy to counteract as early and as effectually as possible, the evil. Even supposing the case to be rather highly coloured by the Professor, which is doubtful, *there is ample room for improvement, and there* is no danger of our overdoing in that direction.—We perceive in this quotation, that those celebrated farmers mentioned, who have heavy rents and taxes to pay, are in the habit of keeping up the condition of their land by the application of 10 tons of manure per acre annually—mismanagement on their part would soon involve them in ruin—attentive to their business, and determined on success, if at all attainable, they may safely get credit for having done all in their power to find out a cheap and easier practice. Their peculiar position near a large city enables them to procure manure in large quantities; near large cities in this country the same could be done, and *is* done by many, although not to the extent it ought to be. It is worthy of notice here that Professor Johnston, although of high standing in the great school of agricultural chemistry, approvingly points out the good old custom of manuring heavily, and that he has not informed the world that in his native country the light artificial fertilizers produced by the application of chemistry have done much for agriculture, although he is an advocate for their adoption.—What is the best remedy against the exhausting system of agriculture, prevalent in many parts of this continent? is a question of great national, as well as of individual importance especially to every farmer, and no doubt is a question often occurring to his mind. Many affect to know this remedy and favor the public with their opinions on paper; few give practical illustrations of their theory on the land. It is evident that when any improvement proposed for adoption, is so beset with difficulties in the execution, as to be beyond the reach of the majority of the practical farmers, *it is not likely to make much progress*; and however abundant in promise and in the flowers of rhetoric, until made easy of comprehension, and convenient of application, it is not destined to yield much fruit. As to simplicity and practicability, perhaps nothing can excel the remedy recommended in the "Country Gentleman," dated "Albany, N. Y., July 8, 1853:" to save time, part only of the article is quoted, that part, however, contains the desideratum, as follows:

"Manuring, for example, is a most powerful means for improvement; but both manures and their application, are expensive in proportion to the amount applied. Underdraining has wrought wonderful results, but the cost is always a large item, and the same may be said in some degree, of deep ploughing and sub-soiling. But in the arrangement of a rotation, no additional expenditure or labor is necessary; it costs no more to cultivate crops which are made to succeed each other judiciously, than to cultivate those arranged in the worst manner possible. The farmer may triple the successful results of the latter; not by the expenditure of five hundred days of drawing manure, or five hundred dollars worth of ditching; but simply by making a proper use of one's brains." The article then concludes as follows:—alluding to a farm on which the author had witnessed the rotation system carried into practice: "The culture of each successive crop constantly tended to the destruction of some weeds injurious to another, and thus all were destroyed in their respective turns, while at the same time, the fertility of the land was increased, and each crop fed with its own proper nutriment as its turn comes round."

Let us observe in this case; the fertility of the soil was increased by rotation of crops alone, without the aid of any fertilizer applied. Could we believe that this easily applied remedy would be efficacious generally all over the country, surely none of us would long hesitate as to its application. It seems that the celebrated Lothian farmers alluded to by Professor Johnston, are not of the same opinion as the writer in "The Country Gentleman," as they drain extensively, and regularly carry into effect the rotation system, at the same time they apply the ten tons of manure per acre yearly; this, however, may be owing to their ignorance; if equally profitable, there would hardly be two different opinions in a country, as to which of these two methods of fertilizing should have preference: the one is certainly a more *gentlemanly-looking* practice than the other.

In case that, after more fully perusing this excellent article, in the popular periodical above mentioned, some farmers should be of opinion, that the question, "which is the best remedy against the evil of exhausting our lands?" is not yet answered, *it may not be out of place to state* that the principle of farming on which the farfamed "Jethro Tull" proceeded, has recently been again brought under the notice of the public, with modifications in the practice; and is well explained in the eleventh edition of a well written pamphlet, styled "word in season, or how to grow wheat with profit." The author of this comes forward with the strongest of all recommendations, which is—that for several years he has been successful in the practice of the theory he recommends. Jethro Tull, too, in accordance with the above quotation, asserted that manure was not indispensible in good farming; professing that by a peculiar management of the *soil, a sufficient and endless supply of nourish*ment for wheat crops might be derived from the atmosphere, chiefly by the thorough pulverization of the soil. The author of the pamphlet, says—"The process by which I carry out my plan is a very simple one, and is given in detail, and at length in the following pages. Briefly, it is this; I divide my fields into lands five feet wide; in the centre of each land, I drop or drill my seed in triple rows one foot apart, thus leaving a fallow interval of three feet between each triple row. When the plant is up, I trench the intervals with the fork, easily taking my spits about three inches from the wheat, and at spring