

of a family of the average number of individuals; and we believe this proposition will not be disputed. It may be imagined then, that an ill-managed and badly stocked farm cannot do much for an ordinary family, in providing them with what is considered necessary to constitute the comforts and conveniences of life. It makes a vast difference whether a farm should produce annually what was worth one hundred pounds currency, or two or three times that amount. It not only would make a great difference to the farmer and his family, but to the whole country, because it augments the whole means of the country for expenditure. We are not an advocate for the extravagant expenditure of a family or of a country, particularly an agricultural one, but means of expenditure to a reasonable extent is necessary for our comfort and happiness, and should be the constant ambition of every man to attain. We would be very sorry by any remarks or suggestions of ours to cause farmers to be dissatisfied with their situation, except so far as to induce them to improve their condition if in their power, and to offer them our humble advice how this is to be accomplished. They may rest assured that the publication of this Journal has no other object than the improvement of agriculture, the prosperity of farmers and of the whole country. We may be mistaken in many of our propositions and suggestions, but there cannot be any mistake in stating that it would be advantageous for every farmer to have his lands produce good crops and have suitable and good horses, cattle, sheep and swine. These advantages can only be obtained by sufficiently draining the soil first—cultivating it properly—keeping down every species of weeds in the crops—not allowing any plant to come to seed, but what is produced from the seed sown—keeping the soil in a state of fertility fit to produce good crops—and disposing of the produce judiciously. The farm

stock should be carefully attended to, in breeding and feeding—no male animals kept entire more than to a few days old, except those required for breed—and having a good stock of agricultural implements for use.

At the great Smithfield Club Cattle Show held in December last, in London, it is said that the stock exhibited were generally superior to those of any previous Show. Although the cattle were not so *excessively* fat as at former Shows, they were considered better adapted for the food of man, and worth a higher price for the same weights. This was as it should be. The South Down sheep appear to have been the favourites. One lot was sold at the Christmas Market at £5 5s. sterling each. We have seen reports, that even the working men employed in Collieries of the North of England, who, heretofore, were accustomed to buy the fattest mutton of the Leicester sheep, reject this extremely fat mutton now, and buy in preference, meat that is of moderate fatness. Much money has been wasted in fattening cattle and sheep to excess. We do not say exactly by farmers, but by the public. Extreme fat in animals, may have cost at least one shilling the lb. weight, when if not made use of as food, it was only worth about three pence the lb. for making soap. In the Montreal Market, we have both beef, mutton, veal and lamb of sufficient fatness, and rarely too fat, and this will always be best for us. We do not pretend that the whole of these articles exposed for sale at our markets are of sufficient fatness, because they are not so; but there is constantly a good supply of good meat to be had in Montreal, and although some parties find fault with our beef and mutton as not being so well flavoured as that of the British Isles, we beg to differ with them. Our beef, mutton, lamb, and veal, when sufficiently fat, is exceedingly well flavoured, and seldom has that strong rank flavour, which these articles of food partake of so frequently in the British Isles from very