One plantation, belonging to a widow, and which was valued at $6,000, was purchased by the company mentioned for $45,000, and by them valued at $500,000. The best beds are considered worth $1,000 or more per acre.

POULTRY DEPARTMENT.

Enclosures for a Poultry Yard.

COUNTRY GENTLEMAN—A good fence for a poultry yard may be made of poles or pickets, and should be in sections, that it may be moveable whenever occasion requires. A very good enclosure may also be made of lath, which is comparatively cheap, and still durable if rightly built. If the fence is intended to be permanent, chesnut or locust posts should be set firmly in the ground about six feet apart, and of the height required for the fence. The bottom boards, thirteen feet long and ten inches wide, may be either of hemlock or spruce, undressed. They should be nailed on the posts on the inside of the yard, leaving the rough unhewn posts on the outside. All the material must be thirteen feet long The first board should be placed close to the ground and all uneven surfaces leveled off or filled in. Fowls are prone to scratch in the shady moist places close to the fence, therefore escape must be guarded against in that direction There may be a space between the two boards at the bottom of a couple of inches, not more. In putting up a permanent fence it is better to suit it to the small breeds at once and future difficulty is avoided, while large breeds may be kept in it equally well.

After the bottom boards are secured, nail strips on the inside of the posts, at the distance from the bottom board of the length of a lath, allowing an inch on the board and an inch on the strip for nailing. Use shingle nails for the laths, putting two in each lath at top and at bottom. Place the laths just their width apart. This is for the first tier and makes the fence six feet high. On the top of this put another tier of lath in the interstices of the first tier. If the yard be in a windy locality there might be an extra strip or rail half way of the length of a lath to hold them firmly in place. All the fencing should be nailed on the inside of the posts. This leaves no chance for small fowls to scale the enclosure.

I have used such a fence for years and find it cheap and durable. My fowls are accustomed to confinement and are much better than at large, rarely trying any method of escape if offered. They are thoroughly at home, but if a stranger comes among them they are wild and restive and the ten feet fence will barely restrain them. For this reason I usually lock up the buildings and yards night and day. For the heavy breeds, which are not prone to fly, a lower fence would answer. I am an advocate of the confinement of fowls at all seasons of the year. They are more comfortable, less trouble and more profitable. All varieties will accommodate themselves to it and may be made profitable or not, according to the expenditure of care and feeding. C. B. *Duchess Co, N. Y.*

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE AND PUBLIC WORKS.

QUEBEC. March 17th, 1884.

To the Honorable The Chairman, Committee on Agricultural Industries.

HOUSE OF COMMONS, Ottawa, Ont.

SIR,—At your request, I beg leave to forward my answers to the queries of your committee.

If all right thinking men admit that the basis of a truly national policy consists in securing, for the whole country, the most profitable agriculture, as the surest, and in fact the only mode of rendering all other national industries permanently successful, your committee will, I trust, see how truly statesmanlike was its organization, and how useful the work in hand.

My answers are numbered and refer to the same numbers in your queries.

First Question.—Under what difficulties does the present system of agriculture labor, and in what respect is the Canadian farmer placed at a disadvantage when competing in foreign markets?

First Answer.—Principally, from want of knowledge of his trade, and, of the requirements of local as well as of foreign markets. The loss thereby occasioned to the Dominion, as well as to the farmers themselves, is stupendous, and equals annually the whole agricultural production of Canada, a loss amounting to over two hundred millions of dollars every year! In other words, our farmers, in the aggregate, do not produce even one half of what they might and should.

Our wheat production in Canada (see census of 1881), taking in our North West and the large proportion of new lands still being reclaimed from the original soil, and put into wheat in all the older provinces, only averages 13¾ bushels per acre, whilst that of Great Britain and other equally well farmed European countries exceeds 28 bushels, after centuries of productiveness! Our production of coarse grains is in a still smaller proportion. And yet all agriculturists, who know Canada, agree that our soil and our climate favor the highest agricultural production in the world, under a proper system of tillage.

There is certainly a remedy to this deplorable state of things. The most flourishing countries have suffered as we do now. But this remedy, to be more or less complete, lies in the power of the State alone. What is imperatively wanted is practical instruction in agriculture in general. Such instruction should be carried to the Canadian farmer, as it has been, so successfully, to the Danish, the Belgian, the French, and to the peasantry of so many other countries In my opinion, even one hundred thousand dollars carefully expended annually, for the purpose of such technical instruction, would certainly, and even very soon, be returned to the Federal treasury many-fold, after producing to the country at large at least one hundred-fold!

Total *estimated* annual value of agricultural produce (see table of agricultural statistics annexed).

Total, $\frac{1}{10}$ of total value of stock	$5,951,420
Cattle, killed or sold only	16 442,025
Sheep, " "	7,482,325
Swine, " "	19,537,545
Wool and honey	3,012,758
Total annual produce mentioned in the census (1)	52,426,073
Dairy produce	21.442,507
Hay	30.334,860
Grain and hay-seeds	92,016,212
Roots	22 324,841
Grand total (*at a low estimate*)	$218,794,528

Second Question.—What deficiencies have come under your notice in the cultivation of cereals, cultivation of roots and grasses, raising of stock and wool growing, production of butter and cheese, culture of fruit, fertilizers in ordinary use?

Second Answer.—They are, generally, out of all proportion in good farming, and without anything like sufficient recupera-

(1) Many items of agricultural production are not even mentioned in the census. Poultry and eggs, for example. Yet this item cannot be less than *ten millions of dollars* We have also no statistics showing what grain and hay, etc, are used on the farm to support both the farmer's family, his stock, etc. All these and more are needed.