

ion shown a desire to indulge in a little ill-natured sarcasm which might as well perhaps have been omitted, and has attempted to draw conclusions from my letter which its language does not warrant; while the over-weening pedantry, and spirit of dictation displayed throughout his whole communication is quite in keeping with the well-known character of its author. Witness, for instance, his *excessive modesty* when he says that *he* did not, after reading Professor Buckland's letter, consider farther notice of the subject necessary.

It may have been an act of presumption on my part to write, and of you to publish anything on the subject of Entomology without B.A.'s consent, but a long indulged habit of seeing, *thinking and forming opinions for myself* has become so strongly engrafted upon my nature that it is more than probable I shall continue to do so, regardless of whether such opinions are in unison with those of B. A. or not.

B. A. commences by saying, that "he had read the communications of Professor Buckland and myself, respecting the appearance, this year, of an insect with whose antecedents *but few agriculturists in Canada seem to be familiar*, and whose advent has, in consequence, produced a more or less inconsiderable amount of alarm," and proceeds to say that Professor Buckland's letter was so satisfactory to him, as emanating from such a source, that he scarcely thought further notice of it necessary. Why this change of mind? Let us, however, before we proceed further, examine the letter of Professor Buckland, and ascertain what those opinions were which gave to this distinguished author and critic, such unqualified satisfaction as to induce him to offer them with *his endorsement* to the farmers of Peterborough in opposition to mine, and see in what particular they differ from those I have ventured to express.

"In hops," says Professor Buckland, "the Aphis is often very destructive, but among grain its devastations are seldom of an alarming character, although in appearance the vast numbers seem *exceedingly formidable*. I have often seen fields of the horse bean in England," says Professor B. "very much affected by the Aphis, and yet a pretty good crop has been obtained,—*no doubt their presence* is generally *more or less injurious*, but nothing like Midge or Hessian-fly. *I am in hopes* that you and your neighbours will not find it *this year* so injurious in the result as present appearance may seem to indicate; as to remedy we are almost powerless, the insect appears to be a *new comer* in your part of the country."

So much for Professor Buckland's letter and opinions. In my letter I spoke of the insect as a "new and formidable *looking* depredator," and in my concluding paragraph said: "*what amount of damage this heretofore unknown foe may do is at this moment impossible to determine*, that it will be serious I have little

doubt."—And pray how much less has Professor Buckland said? Has he not also declared 'insects to be *destructive, formidable* in their appearance, and beyond doubt, *injurious*. Yet, notwithstanding the great similarity of opinion expressed in the letters of Professor Buckland and myself, B. A., with his usual regard for truth and fairness, approves of the one and condemns the other.

But suppose for a moment that Professor Buckland's opinions—which were given on 20th of July, before the insect had shown itself in any great force—had in some measure differed from those I ventured to express: the result of an examination made by Mr. Ivey and myself, on the 11th of August at a time when these insects were most numerous. Would it in any way have affected my statement? were we not at that time in a better position to judge of the probable effect they would produce upon the crops than those whose examinations were made three or four weeks before at a time when the insect first made its appearance?

B. A. also questions the correctness of my description,—though he does not venture to say in what particular I have erred. In reply to this I may simply state that while I make no pretensions to the science of Entomology, I challenge B. A. or any one else who has made similar examinations, to show wherein I am wrong. My description of the insect and its operations upon the fields of grain we visited, was given precisely as we saw it, and as it then appeared, omitting entirely to notice any of the fine details of theories of Naturalists as to its nature and habits. Leaving such of your readers as are desirous of obtaining more minute information to consult the writings of Reaumer, Kirby, Curtis, Fitch or Professor Hind, where they could find all they desired quite as well as if reproduced by B. A. or myself. It is true I did not fill my communication with high sounding words selected from works upon the science of Entomology. But I believe I made myself understood by a class of your readers who are most interested in the matter. And although on the occasion which I speak of, I had not the assistance of the brilliant eyes which B. A. says "assisted him in watching the operations of his diminutive *grubber*," yet I had the assistance of two excellent and highly intelligent farmers, quite able to judge of what they saw, and who were tempted to describe, as Professor Buckland says, and who fully concurred in the views expressed.

In conclusion I will give you for B.A.'s special benefit, the following opinions of Professor Hind, whose essay on the Weevil and other grain destroyers obtained the first prize in 1841.

Professor Hind in his admirable essay on the Aphis, says: "The wonderful fertility of this tribe of insects exceeds that of any other species, and elevates them to a position in the scale of pests and plagues which scarcely