

fect confidence in the gentleman who related it to us. There is not a party in Canada, who knows anything of the careful cultivation required in the old countries for producing wheat, who could expect a good crop of wheat here, from the manner of cultivating the soil for it with Canadian farmers generally—by simply once ploughing (and that not in the most perfect manner.) land that has been lying under natural grasses, and weeds the previous Summer. If our soil was not naturally of superior quality, and our climate good, we would not raise as much as the seed sown, by such management. If we prepared the soil by summer fallowing, executed properly, we might expect to have a good crop. We have seen a report in a late exchange paper, that better crops of wheat had been raised in England after summer fallow without any manure, than on manured land of the same quality where potatoes or turnips had been grown. This we had experience of ourselves, in the old country. We have no doubt whatever, if the lands of Lower Canada, were even summer fallowed, as in Upper Canada and the United States, we should raise a much larger average produce of *all crops*, than in either of these countries. Our soil and climate, are unquestionably superior for raising oats, barley, peas—flax, hemp, hay, and all descriptions of root crops, and vegetables, to either Upper Canada or the United States. The character of Lower Canada has been most unjustly depreciated, by parties who were not qualified to form a correct estimate of the country. What matter is it that our winters should be colder and longer, than in parts of Upper Canada and the United States, if 100 acres of our land can be made to yield as large an annual produce, as 100 acres would do in either of these countries, which we are certain it can. We go further and say, that 100 acres of our land will produce as much food for the support of domestic animals in a year as either of the other countries. The difference then in the

expense of keeping cattle with us can only be in providing, perhaps, better shelter and a longer attendance upon them in this shelter, than would be required for cattle on pasture. But when it is recommended to keep cattle in the yard or stalls the whole year in the temperate climate of England as being more profitable than keeping them on pasture, what difference should it make with us to keep them half the year in the stables, if our land can produce as much food for them in summer, acre for acre, as the land of any other country in North America? The present state of our cattle may be urged as an objection to what we say—but this is not a proof of any incorrectness in what we advance. Our cattle have not been attended to in breeding, nor provided with suitable or sufficient food in either winter or summer. Let them have the produce of the land in good pasture, and in hay, and not be chiefly fed on straw that should only go to make manure, and on pastures that have no grass, because they were under crop the year previous and left for pasture for one year without any grass seeds sown. Our horses by a little care in breeding and feeding, might as well be worth 50 per cent more, and with scarcely any increase of expense to the farmer. Horses might form a large item in our Agricultural produce that we would have to dispose of. Milch cows have brought a good price this Fall and if farmers would manage to have a good milch cow to dispose of in the Fall or Winter, it would be sure to bring a remunerating price, as there is always a demand for fresh calved cows in Fall or Winter, in large towns. We have not seen the market better supplied with fowls of every description than this year. We do not believe there is a market on this Continent that has a better supply of fowls than Montreal, and we might add butchers' meat generally. When we have this to boast of now under an admitted defective system of husbandry, what would it be under an improved and more perfect system of Agriculture?