

plains that they do not apply to the days of high farming. The question of unexhausted improvement is nothing to us, as we don't improve, only exhaust, both tenants and landlords, generally. This question is now being rapidly settled in Great Britain, and no doubt in a few years as little will be feared of this trouble as of the Irish Church story. I am finally convinced that the restrictions put on tenants has been a great blessing to England. Also I say, that a farmer by owning his own farm is generally so cramped for means, that he cannot develop the resources of the soil, the very reason that a farmer in this country requires all his means, is because the restrictions that Colonel Laurie complains of have not been put on; it must be plain to any man that when we read of the glorious crops that were formerly grown in this country, that any man having foresight enough to keep up his balance of fertility, or having been compelled to do so, would reap with our present prices great results. A great deal of sympathy has been shown for Mr. Hope, of Fenton Barns, and no doubt he deserves it, but does it not strike you as strange Mr. Editor that a rich man, as he is reputed to be, would run the risk of being turned out of his homestead sooner than purchase? No, he knew perfectly well that the money laid up to purchase a farm would be so much capital locked up, the interest of which could not be calculated to a man with his brains; he has reaped the benefit of his labors and courage, and lost it in another way, and any one who has read the papers through will see that no one has been more reticent about his wrongs than Mr. Hope, all he says is something to this effect, that he advises no farmer to invest heavily in another man's land until the law of remuneration for unexhausted improvement is perfected, but I believe he is the last man in the world who would recommend that a good farmer should own his land even if he could, for he knows that the combined interests of landlord, tenant, and laborer is necessary for any great results; this rule applies quite as much to many parts of America as to England, for the reasons above stated, and our cute Yankee friends are beginning to see it clearly. What does the Rev. Mr. Murray mean by his speech in Boston, in his inaugural address before the New England Agricultural Society, by the following remarks. I have to trust to my memory as I have not the papers by me just now, but it was something as follows:—"That the merchants of New England, who accumulated fortunes so easily could never stand by and see farming go down as rapidly as it was then going, that the farmers had not capital enough of themselves and that it is both the duty and interest of merchants to assist them." Are the merchants to give the farmers the full run

of their bankers' accounts simply for patriotism, I fancy not, it means that the system of landlord and tenant must be introduced, which is far more advantageous to the farmers than mortgaging. The landlord has to keep up the buildings, pay insurance, and, should any thing happen, any great changes occur, the farmer is not stuck for ever in one corner of the earth which circumstances may have made distasteful to him. I believe the most prosperous farmer I know is a tenant farmer, and he need not be, as he owns a farm of his own, but prefers renting one, and I believe a great deal of this prosperity could be traced to his being a tenant farmer. It appears to me about as sensible to insist that a farmer should own his farm, as that a young merchant should own his wharf and store. A few more remarks and I have done. I agree pretty much with the writer about growing or rather not growing wheat, and never grew a bushel in my life. As long as the Ontario farmers clear up virgin soils, and exhaust their own by selling wheat, let us buy from them, but I see no reason why any one preferring their own bread should not grow it provided they keep the elements of fertility in the soil, by any means that may be at command; but it appears to me that both theoretically and to a certain extent practically the writer is wrong in his ideas. The whole system of farming in England, and no one would be rash enough to say that she dare give up growing grain, is based on the idea of growing food for the people, and substituting other food for stock, but which contains all the elements which are required to reproduce what has been sold off for human food. For an instance, a ton of cotton cake consumed leaves enough value in the manure to produce four tons of wheat, consequently a farmer, (assuming this to be correct) can afford to sell three tons of wheat without deteriorating his farm; again an illustration which may come more home to us, a ton of grass and a ton of oats only reduce land equally, but in value one is worth \$12.00, the other \$35.00, allowing \$23.00 per ton for the difference in expense of cultivation, which I believe would be very small if done in a systematic way. Many farmers would say, but it is perfectly absurd to tell us that we can get a ton of oats where we can get a ton of hay; there is no doubt that all grain to be well filled requires a larger amount of phosphates than hay does, but I am only speaking of it strictly from a theoretical point of view as another illustration that can be given of the advantage of rented farm, with all the silly unreasoning prejudice there is against what is called scientific farming, which not one in ten who talk about it know whether it can really come under that denomination or not. I have never yet heard one word spoken against the advantages of underdraining, every one

appears to admit that it is exceedingly important, and in fact almost impliatively necessary. Now the writer has drained about fifty acres, from which he enjoys as great advantages as could reasonably be expected, but the capital locked up by owning the farm would have drained and furnished means of cultivating at least five hundred acres. So convinced I am that this is the only way that Nova Scotia can go ahead as a farming community, that I shall endeavor occasionally to bring my views before the public. Before closing this article, which is longer than I first intended it to be, I would like to refer to the question politically, and ask why are the farmers of the Maritime Provinces to be left to fight the battle of farming without any legislative assistance, not as in Ontario, where their path is easier or supposed to be. Will it be the old answer? That Nova Scotia is not a farming country? If so, for gracious sake, as honest consistent men let us do away with Agricultural Societies and Exhibitions, and establish Anti-agricultural Societies instead. As Mr. Longworth remarked, what have we gained by all the political money and energy that have been used? simply a government railway, and the least said about the location of a certain portion of it the better; or is it that we have no money, but surely our credit is good as part of the Dominion, and the security is ample, for no man would be foolish enough to make a farm perfectly dry by government loans simply to see his neighbor step into his shoes. I do not believe that any government can suffer serious loss by these allowances, and the advantage to the country at large would be enormous; at all events every farmer in the Province has a perfect right to ask to be placed on the same footing as the Ontario farmers, unless good reason can be shown that it cannot be done. As to the subject of tile draining, I have been requested to write on this subject, and my advice is constantly required, both by personal application and by letter. I would like to give all the advice I could but the outside questions to be considered, such as getting capital, right of outlet, economy of drainage on a large scale, legislation required in many cases, vested rights, of which there are as many in this country as in England, in spite of Mr. Jenkins, and other difficulties have to be overcome, before any practical results can be obtained, or in fact before any treatise on drainage could be of any great value, and also last, but not least, a tremendous amount of prejudice.

Yours truly,

ALFRED THOMAS.

MR. BLANCHARD'S Ayrshire bull "Monarch," recorded in the January number of the *Journal*, should be numbered CVII., instead of CVIII. as therein stated.