

pounds sterling, or five million dollars annually, besides what they might have brought out in specie. This is not a chimerical flight of the imagination, but a fact that is perfectly easy of demonstration. Let us suppose a single case. A merchant builds or purchases a ship, in the expectation that the freight, &c., carried by the ship, over and above the cost of navigating and maintaining her, would pay the interest, and refund the principal employed in her purchase.—But if the ship was lost at sea on her first voyage, both principal and interest were gone. In raising human beings from infancy to the period they are able to work for their living, a considerable expenditure must necessarily be incurred, for their food, clothes, and education; and if men, remove themselves to a foreign country, when they are capable of working, and rendering back to their parents and their country, the amount expended upon them in infancy and childhood, the country of their birth loses all this expenditure as completely, and to all intents and purposes, as the merchant loses his capital invested in building or the purchase of a ship, that was lost on her first voyage. By the same rule, the country who receive this working population, gain all these advantages, and they are more valuable to them, considering the circumstances of that country, than a money capital of the amount we have stated, would be. What does all the wealth of the world consist in, but in the surplus produce of the earth and water, created by the labour of man expended in its cultivation, and in fishing its waters, over what man has consumed for his food and clothing? What constitutes the riches of a country, but the wealth and possessions of each individual inhabitant? What prevents us in British America from offering as much encouragement to our fellow-country men to emigrate to these Provinces instead of a foreign state?—We lose fully a million pounds sterling annually, that emigrants coming to North America from the British Isles do not settle in British America. Have we not abundance of fertile land to give settlement to all the emigrants that would come to us for one hundred years? Are not these lands now being waste, not yielding any return whatever? If the country is habitable for the present population, and capable of profitable cultivation, it must be equally so, and much more so, for a population twenty-fold as great, speaking moderately. If we can live and prosper in it, thirty millions of human beings would have a much better chance to do so.

We appeal to the present inhabitants of British America, whether they like the country, and think it capable of a prosperous agriculture, so far as the production of good crops would make it so. If we are answered in the affirmative, the country must be capable of supporting a full population, which may, perhaps, be fifty times as numerous as that which we have at present.—For ourselves, we never would have urged so strenuously the encouragement of agricultural improvement, if we thought it would ultimately produce only loss and disappointment to those who would so employ their capital and labour. We have, and do praise and recommend the country, because, after a long residence in it, we are practically convinced that we are justified in doing so. Let others who praise the country, act ingeniously and consistently, and prove to the world that they believe their recommendation of it is just and proper, by applying all their energies, and whatever power and influence their

situation and circumstances may give them, to improve their own country, in preference to a foreign state. By acting thus, we may expect to see a numerous emigration directed to, and successfully settled in these Provinces, and British America soon become productive in corn, and cattle, and one of the most populous and prosperous colonies that belongs to the British Empire. Let self-interest, and the interest of a few, give way to the general interests of the country, whatever that may be, and let all unite, with hearty good will, in promoting the prosperity of the land we live in.

Size of Cattle.

At an Agricultural Show, at Netherby, in England, two or three years ago, the Right Hon'ble Sir James Graham, is reported to have said:—

"I take blame to myself for having endeavoured to introduce with considerable tenacity, the short-horned breed of cattle, which I am now thoroughly convinced is not so well adapted to thrive in the climate of this part of the country. But having now taken the Galloway breed, as decidedly the best and most profitable, it has been my earnest endeavour to obtain from Galloway the best breed of cattle in order to introduce them among the tenants on my estates."

At the present time in England, with all their advantages of climate, good farming, and abundant keep, they do not appear to be very anxious for over large cattle. According to the dead weights of some of the prize animals, exhibited at the Smithfield Cattle Show, in December last, we find the weights varied from seven cwt. to near twelve cwt.—but none exceeded the latter weight. The dead weight of the sheep exhibited at the same Show, varied from six stone to ten stone, of fourteen pounds to the stone. In British America, we have no doubt, that a moderately sized description of neat cattle would be much the most suitable and profitable. These cattle should be carefully bred from good selections, both bull and cow. Whatever be the description of stock desired, it is considered by the best judges, to be imprudent to breed from the largest bulls. The size of a bull ought to be of secondary consideration, in judging of him as a breeding animal. Short legs are generally indicative of fine qualities. The stock of the most celebrated breeders, consisted of bulls of small size. Those of Mr. Collings' were so. His bull Diamond was particularly so. This bull obtained the first prize at the Coldstream Cattle Show. The get of this bull were remarkable for the good qualities of their beef. In Smithfield as much can be had for 80 stone of beef, as for a beast weighing a 100 stone. Generally small sized beef, if well fattened, sells for one penny per pound more than large beef, and this makes a difference in the value of an animal of six or seven cwt. weight of about from £3 to £4—a very material consideration to the farmer. The property of the breeding least in reference to Smithfield is perfectly just—"Small in size and great in value." The famous bull Comet, was a very short legged animal. Indeed in our own experience, we have never seen short legged animals that were not easy to keep in condition, and to fatten. The good quality of the flesh is a property that is very generally associated with a small size, and particularly with the shortness of the legs. We have seen a small breed of cattle in the old country, known as the Kerry breed, and in proportion to their size, they were better for milk and butter,

than any other breed with which we were acquainted. This breed were equally remarkable for their fattening qualities, and for the sweetness and excellence of their beef. The good description of Canadian cattle, have properties very similar to the Kerry breed, but are rather of a larger size generally. Short legged compact animals will always be found best, and most profitable for fattening. A thick soft covering of hair is a good quality in cattle—and this is a quality that is peculiar to the improved long horned breed.—We do not mean to recommend a very small breed of cattle as the best in every situation, and upon every soil; but we say they are the best, where the keep is not abundant both in summer and winter. And we further add, that it is our decided opinion, that in the most favourable situations in British America, carefully selected, moderate sized animals, of good shape, will be found the best and most profitable for those who keep them, either for the dairy or for the shambles, and for both. We know that this opinion will be at variance with the opinions of highly respectable farmers; but conscientiously entertaining them as we do, we conceive we should not be doing justice to our Subscribers, if we did not submit them. It is only by the most careful experiments made with each kind of cattle, that their relative value, and the profit derived from each, can be truly ascertained. We have seen in a late number of the Mark Lane Express, an extract from a communication addressed to the President of the Council of the Royal English Agricultural Society, by a Mr. J. Oakley, which we think well deserving of the consideration of Canadian farmers. This gentleman says:—

"The following remarks will directly apply to sheep, but the principle will embrace all animals that convert vegetable into animal food.

"You are well aware that every farmer has his own opinion, as to which description of sheep will produce the greatest profit, which must be interpreted here as the sum of money left after the sheep have paid for their food consumed, out of the amount produced by their wool and mutton. In every county, the farmers using short or long wooled sheep, as the case may be, are divided in their opinion as to which are the best kinds of their respective sorts, and they look to you to determine the question for them.

"It would be presumptuous in me to mark out any course for your guidance, but I feel I shall stand excused for going so far into detail, in the endeavour to explain my views, as will not allow you to suppose I wish to lay down any specific plan.

"Different soils require different descriptions of animals, and on different soils, does this experiment require a trial; also on different soils in different climates. And as some animals of the same age and kind, consume more food than others of the same age and kind, the value of the food consumed tested by weight, compared with the value of the produce realized tested by the same power, would produce results, if conducted under your management, that might be depended on by all, and which would enable the best sort for the different districts, to be satisfied without fear of contradiction, and to the satisfaction of the most prejudiced.

"As this experiment would necessarily embrace numerous lots of sheep and other animals, in many different situations, the attendant expenses could be met by no agricultural associations, but the Royal Agricultural Society of England; and therefore I address you on the subject."

We do not wish to forego this opportunity to copy another article from the same paper, addressed to the same party as the above, on the "COMPARATIVE VALUE OF ANIMALS," by Mr. T. Umbers, of Warwickshire:—

"I feel convinced that the subjects of discussion