

ploughing and exposure, but the improvement depends upon the frequent stirring of the soil. It is said that by taking a portion of the poorest soil that can be found, and stirring and exposing it constantly for a year, it will become so fertile as to grow tropical plants. By loosening and opening soil to the sun and air, it must imbibe fertility from the atmosphere, and certainly does do so, however incredible it may be to some parties. A poor miserable pasture, kept as bare as possible during summer, is not good for either the cattle or the soil, and cannot be profitable for the farmer. We submit these observations for the consideration of farmers, and if what we state is correct, it may be imagined how greatly improvement is required in Canadian agriculture. There is one circumstance in our favour that we may improve to a considerable extent, without incurring any great expense, so far as regards our pastures and stock, and by this means the lands will be sure to be gaining fertility every day, if covered with a good coat of grass. Every farmer in the country might introduce this improvement, by sowing grass-seed, and not over-stocking; and as trees are of such rapid growth, there might soon be shade provided, by planting a few in convenient places on every farm that requires them. We put off improvements that might be very easily made, from indolence or neglect, or because we have inherited the farm from our fathers in this state, we do not see any necessity for change. We had an opportunity lately of seeing a gentleman from the United States, who had made a short tour in Lower Canada, and he expressed great surprise at the state of our agriculture, considering the fine land we have, and he particularly mentioned our bad pastures and inferior stock. Our stock certainly must appear to great disadvantage to a stranger, mixed, as they are, of all ages and sizes, and half starved as they frequently are upon our wretched pastures.

We copy the following extract from a very sensible letter which appeared in the May

number of the "American Agriculturist." We agree *in general* with the writer, in regard to moderate-sized, well-shaped cattle, being much the most profitable for almost every purpose of the farmer. Very large cattle, standing high on their limbs, are difficult to keep; and we are certain that their bones and offal form a large portion of their entire weight. It is never profitable to feed animals with highly-nutritive food while young, and not keep up their condition subsequently with equally nutritive food. We, however, have no fault to find with those who constantly feed highly, and keep their animals, of whatever size, continually improving. Those who do this, should, by all means, have their animals as large as they think proper, and find profitable to them. All we desire to do, is to warn the inexperienced, not to enlarge the size of their animals beyond their means of feeding them, until they have proved, by experiment, that the largest-sized animals are the best and most profitable for a farmer to keep, under any, and every circumstance:—

REARING CALVES.

In noticing the remarks of Reviewer, at p. 246, in your seventh volume, on an article previously written by me, on the "Management of Calves," I have been led to address you again on the subject. Notwithstanding his general display of good sense, I am still of the opinion that the smallest calves invariably grow up to the finest animals; and I venture to say, that, what he would call "a runt of a calf," when fully grown, would far exceed one of the same breed, that was the largest and the finest looking when first dropped from the cow.

I am also convinced that raising calves on the richest food, neither improves their symmetry nor their quality, only to the eye of an inexperienced person. No reasonable man expects to see a lot of store cattle fit for the butcher. Still, I am willing to admit that an animal forced from its birth until five years old, will add much to its size, and excite the wonder and admiration of judges and spectators on show grounds; but I cannot admit that such an animal is a profitable one. I am certain that many a breeder, by adopting this *forcing system*, has not only ruined his reputation, as a breeder, but has actually lost money, even when his animals have been sold at high prices. The kind of food consumed, and the time and care required for such an animal to develop itself, costs far more than such a