

early, we are sure of a fair yield, let the rest of the season be what it may. The light land requires good farming, and not too much cropping without intervening grass or pasture and fallow; but then our returns are certain. You know when I went on that place I occupy, about two years since, there was no manure on the farm, and nothing to make it of. The buildings were all gone to smash, so that they had to be repaired and almost rebuilt. The man who was on the place before I went there could not get a living, so he moved off to heavier land. Judging by his failure, I thought I should have great difficulty in doing any good with the farm; but I was so early with my spring crop and the preceding fall wheat, that the dry weather last year did not do much injury to my crops, although others suffered a good deal. I am so convinced of the advantages of this land, in comparison with heavy clay, that I would not exchange it for any other of that kind. I now believe I know what this land is, and I think I see my way clear to manage it to good advantage, and I certainly shall stick to it."

"How did the man prosper who was on your farm before you, after he got on the heavier land?"

"He did very badly. His crops did not pay his expenses. He is now quite out of heart, much more than he was when he occupied my place. The great fault about his farming was, he never was active enough in early spring; and if you do not get your crops in early on light land, the sun dries up the surface so much that they might as well be planted in a bed of ashes at midsummer. Where he now is the land is a very stiff clay, and bakes so hard in the summer that nothing can be done with it unless it is taken just at the right moment, and of course that depends greatly on the weather, and we all know how unreliable that is. Now, on light land you can work early and late; heavy rains do not hinder you, and very dry weather does not altogether stop you either, as it does if you have heavy clay land to work when it is baked hard."

"Do you find clover do better on light land than on heavy clay?"

"I certainly do. I always use plaster, and my crops of hay are very good, and I think the pasture afterwards much better."

"Do you find turnips do as well on your soil as on heavier?"

"Yes; I think a great deal better. There is more natural growth for young plants in light soils. Their tender roots must naturally have less to contend with than when forcing themselves into hard clay, and then all hoeing is so much easier done. It certainly is true that more weeds grow on light soils; but if that goes to prove anything, it proves also that young plants of any kind find it more congenial to their growth, and also that seeds are more likely to germinate in light than in heavy clay soils. Then as to teams—why, my light horses could do nothing with clay land, especially in dry weather. Then all hauling in late autumn

weather is so much more easily done. On heavy clay soils it is nearly impossible to haul off a root crop in November, especially if the autumn has been wet. Then again for pasture. On heavy, wet soils, cattle poach the land terribly; whereas, on my farm, I never see such injury done. I have no doubt that in some years wheat will be a much heavier crop on clay than on light soils; but take the average of ten years, and I question if it would beat it much. And for barley—why, we all know light soils do much better for it under all average seasons. So, take it altogether, I feel confident the light soil is more profitable, and I am sure it is much cleaner and more agreeable to live on than the clay.

VECTIS.

Cost of Exposure of Farm Implements.

A neighbour of mine was telling me, a few days since, about having just erected a shed to contain his farm implements, and, amongst other topics of conversation, we were calculating the loss he had sustained by not doing so some years sooner. It seems he had dispensed with such shelter for somewhat over eleven years, during the time he had been erecting his barns and clearing up his farm. He could not do all at once, he said, and hence was obliged to leave the driving-shed unbuild, and hoped to be able to do it next year, and so from time to time it had gone on. The shed was not built until the last autumn, and cost, without reckoning his own work or teams, somewhere about one hundred dollars. For this amount he had a large comfortable shed, partly open on one side, and so arranged that a waggon could be driven into it, or rather under it, the contents to be unloaded through a trap door in the floor above, which opened into a granary fitted up with bins for oats, barley, bran, shorts, chicken feed, flour, &c., with boxes with tight covers, to contain dried meal and protect it from flies in summer. Unloading was facilitated by the use of a "pulley block" and tackle attached to the rafters overhead, by means of which all such goods or household stores that came under it in a waggon, could readily be hoisted up to the next floor above through the trap door, which closed in two leaves, and fell of itself, the weight so lifted resting on the upper side of the fallen trap. This arrangement was found to work exceedingly well, and saved much labour in carrying bags of grain, flour, &c., up the stairs, in the corner of the shed. All family stores were thus put away quite safe from inroads of rats and destruction by damp, besides removing from the house a most objectionable mess and litter.

The comfort of this shed, and the economy connected with its use, was never appreciated until it was built and in use; and then the wonder was how on earth did we do without it so many years. Underneath were packed in waggons, ploughs, harness, thrashing machine, horse-power cultivator, cradles, rakes, forks, and, in fact, all the farm implements about the farm, were here gathered together

and arranged separately. The heavy portions, such as thrashing machine, horse-power and sawing machine, were arranged with rollers under them, so that they could be handled without difficulty, and loaded up when required, some help being obtained by the block and tackle above mentioned. My friend was so pleased with this convenient addition to his farm, (which was about 200 acres in extent), that amongst other things we determined to reckon the advantages and cost as compared with the losses hitherto sustained from not having such shelter, and all the implements being exposed so many years to the weather. We therefore commenced a regular inventory, charging each implement with its cost, and judging of its depreciation by weather and exposure alone, without including wear and tear, which really was nothing in comparison with the apparent loss and miserable appearance that every article presented. Numbers were partly rotten, all were badly sun-cracked, none were painted, and had an auction been called, and these tools and implements offered for sale, they would not have realized 15 per cent. on their cost. It really made such a formidable account of loss and depreciation in value as compared with the cost of the shed, that we made a tabular account of the cost, present value and loss by weather alone. All iron-work was of course but little hurt, but the wood-work and general appearance were "seury" in the extreme. We omitted all fair wear as useless or unnecessary for our purpose.

ARTICLES.	COST.	LOSS BY EXPOSURE
2 Waggons	\$ 40	\$50
3 Ploughs \$20, \$17, \$15	82	18
4 Harrows	42	20
2 Cultivators, \$30 and \$20	50	15
1 Buggy Waggon	60	20
1 Thrashing Machine	320	100
1 Wood Sawing Machine	55	15
1 Cutting Box	24	9
Small Articles—Cradles, Rakes, Forks, Spare Harness, &c.	75	15
Lot of Small things, tools, &c.	10	15
50 Bags	25	15
Reaping Machines	84	20
	\$947	\$305

The above table shows nearly 30 per cent. absolute loss by exposure, and in reality the loss was much more, as the articles had not been hired out, and were not at all worn to injure them; they were simply utterly destroyed by exposure, and had they been offered for sale a much worse statement would have been shown.

In addition, we reckoned a loss by rats and fowl, and want of storage, at least to the extent of \$30 annually, or \$330 for eleven years, so that the total loss was estimated at \$635 from the want of a shed that cost out of pocket cash about \$100. Of course the building would have cost twice that money, but so much was done at home and by themselves as reduced the amount greatly.

Into this amount we did not add a cow killed by breaking into the barn and eating too much wheat; nor a horse badly injured from the same cause, both of which accidents would have been avoided had there been a granary in which to store the surplus grain.

In conclusion, the amount seems so large that my friend had suffered, due altogether