

the heavy grain feeding of cattle, believing it to be attended with more waste than profit. This opinion has been corroborated by the careful experiments of a number of farmers, and among others, an accurate and enterprising neighbour, who weighs all his animals weekly, informs us that a fine steer, when fed regularly each day with four quarts of barley meal, gained eighteen pounds per week; being urged "to push" this animal, he increased his feed to eight quarts daily with a diminution in his growth; the feed was then increased to twelve quarts, when he scarcely gained at all. Another, and an extensive cattle-fattener, informed us that he and a neighbour commenced fattening each a fine steer at the same time; the neighbour's being the heaviest on the start. Our informant fed four quarts of meal daily; his neighbour, twelve quarts. When they were slaughtered, the latter was the inferior animal of the two in weight.

Another instance has recently occurred to our observation, illustrating the position here taken. An old cow, naturally raw-boned, was fed by the owner with the view of converting her into beef. Commencing about the middle of autumn, or as soon as the corn was ripe, with the hope of turning her off to the butcher about the first of winter, she was stuffed with all she could eat, and by the end of the year had scarcely gained in weight. The owner concluded that she did not take on flesh naturally, and that there was no use in trying to fatten her, and she passed into other hands and different treatment. Before winter was over, a regular system of feeding with barley meal was commenced, first with only a pint each night and morning, which was afterwards gradually increased to a quart. In a few weeks the improved appearance of the animal was quite visible; she was placed in good pasture, and by the middle of summer her feed had been gradually increased to two quarts each night and morning. By the first of autumn she had become fat, sleek, and beautiful, and was sold for a good price to the butcher.

Intelligent farmers differ as to the propriety of feeding meal at all to pastured cattle; some insisting that it only destroys their appetite for the grass, and that if fed on the latter alone, they will improve in condition more rapidly and steadily than in any other way. This is certainly not true with all animals, as, for example with the ease just mentioned; but there are others which have a natural propensity to flesh,

that seem to improve best on rich pasturage alone, doubtless partly in consequence of the long continued and regular supply of good food, which they thus receive, as contrasted with sudden and irregular grain feedings. We should be glad to receive the results of every carefully tried experiment in relation to this point from our correspondents.

What we wish to urge more particularly at the present time is a caution against the common error of attempting to fatten suddenly by over dosing with grain and meal as a sort of compensation for the previous starvation and raw-boned system of treatment. Instead of beginning to fatten just at the last stages of an animal's life, the work should be commenced as soon as it is born, at least so far as preserving a good growing, healthy condition right onward, without any interruption through winter and summer. Farmers who practice on this plan make the largest profits, and can dispose of their herds at any time at high prices for cash in hand. Their less successful neighbours term them "always lucky," but do not seem to be aware of the truth of the old saying, that "diligence is the mother of good luck."

BREEDING.

IN selecting animals for coupling, especial pains should be taken not to interbreed those possessing the same defect, because in that case, observation proves that the offspring inherit something like the aggregate of the defect of both parents—that is to say, if the ram is defective in the crops (in the proper fullness back of the shoulders,) to an extent expressed by 2, and the ewe to an extent expressed by 3, their offspring will possess the defect to something like the extent of 5. Of course, this rule is not invariable, and would not continue to apply to its full extent if breeding between the produce of these similarly defective animals was continued, for in that case they would soon have no crops at all. I like the arithmetical form of the statement, however, because it holds up before the mind in a tangible and impressive form the consequences of one of the worst errors of bad breeding.

A defect may be an individual or family one. The latter is far more likely to be transmitted to the progeny. The other sometimes appears to be accidental, and is not forcibly transmitted. I would rather