

TO DESTROY BARK LICE.

Take strong lye, and put in it as much salt as will dissolve, and wash the bark of the trees with it by means of a brush or swab. It will kill the lice, and they will soon rub off. The best time to apply it is in the spring before the buds start, as it will kill the young leaves. It will answer any time, if kept from the leaves.

[Another way is to scrape the bark, then wash with lime, and dig in around the roots a quantity of well rotted manure, to give a vigorous growth. We have found this treatment capable of reviving trees apparently nearly dead from the spread of the bark lice.]

NEW ENGLAND FARMERS' WIVES.

Perhaps the following lesson may not be useless in Canada:—

Thrifty beings they are, and in their anxiety to do their whole duty by hard-working husbands, with a self-denial too little appreciated even by its objects, they wear their lives away in endless and pitiless drudgery. Pride is nearly as much concerned in the matter, as affection. The pride of the housekeeper—which in this overflowing land loves to provide an actually wasteful profusion of substantial and “good things” for a family of children and farm-assistants. And the pride of bearing on one pair of shoulders the burden of two or three, and at the same time, of doing everything a little better than anybody else *could* do it. This is the peculiar pride of an American, whether man or woman—to *do, keep doing, and do well*. Under its pressure many a Yankee mother, amidst the rugged hills of her native land, many a country house-wife in the fertile districts of the middle States, the wife of many a sickly pioneer in the western country, has consumed her best years, bearing all things and complaining never. There is something noble in the self-sacrifice. We would not discourage economy nor decried labour. But let the mother of a family remember the duties she owes herself and her children, as well as the tasks expected at her hands. Let the husband be careful to lighten and alleviate them. Let him not compel her to find the straw, as well as fill to full tale of brick.

Agriculture in Lower Canada.

If any proof was required to convince us that Lower Canada was capable of producing excellent wheat, barley, oats, peas, beans, timothy seed, &c., the Exhibition of these grains on the 25th of March, in the Bonsecours Market, at the instance of the County of Montreal Agricultural Society, would demonstrate the fact in the most satisfactory manner. The samples, which, I believe, consisted of about 20 bushels each, were numerous, and I may confidently say, there never has been a better show of these grains

in this country, than upon that occasion. There was no wheat exhibited except spring three months' wheat, of the variety Fife and Black Sea, all of which were of very superior quality, clean and unmixed. Of course, spring wheat could not be expected to compete in appearance with choice samples of fall wheat; but with this exception, I have no hesitation in stating that the grain of every description exhibited on the occasion alluded to, would compete favorably, and, I have no doubt, successfully, with any samples of the same varieties that could be produced in Canada West, or in the United States. I have had opportunities of seeing exhibitions of grain in both countries, and, as I have stated, with the exception of fall wheat, I have no doubt Lower Canada can compete successfully with any part of North America in the production of any other grain, and also in hay, and every variety of root crops. I admired particularly the samples exhibited, for their perfect cleanness, and appearance of being unmixed. The Montreal Agricultural Society are entitled to the thanks of the agriculturists for this judicious move, and I hope they will have an annual exhibition. The premiums paid were very liberal, and amounted to about £45. The greater part of the grain was the production of the Island of Montreal, though the first prize wheat was from the Isle Jesus. I allude to this exhibition of grain as an encouragement to agriculturists to introduce improvements in their system of husbandry, where it may be required, as it must be in every instance where there is not favourable and remunerating results obtained from farming. We may be assured, if we take the trouble to enquire, that the excellent samples of grain exhibited at Montreal on the 25th of March, was not produced by chance, but that in every instance, good samples resulted from skillful and judicious cultivation and management; and any farmer who desires to produce similar samples of good grain, will be certain to succeed, provided he adopts the same skillful and judicious cultivation and management of his land. These are evident facts that cannot be controverted. The successful agriculturist has the same climate, and generally no better soil than the most unsuccessful agriculturist, and, therefore, the very different results obtained by each from their land and labour, results solely from the cultivation and management of the soil. Farmers need not expect to excuse their want of success, by complaining of insufficient capital, &c. I have known many persons here, who, with scarcely any capital to commence with, have succeeded in making themselves very comfortable, if not independent, and altogether by their skill, industry, and good management in agriculture. Any excuses for bad management in the practice of agriculture should not be admissible, while better management is possible. It is quite absurd for a farmer, when he witnesses the successful practice of another farmer, to suppose that he could not

adopt the same practice. The feeling that should animate and predominate with every agriculturist ought to be a desire to equal, if not excel, those farmers who practice a judicious and successful system amongst them. I cannot understand why any farmer should rest contented with raising only one-third or one-half the produce, which he sees another farmer can raise with the same climate, and on soil that is not naturally better than his own. If I see my neighbour's land well drained, well ploughed, sufficiently manured, good crops growing upon it, free from all weeds, live stock of fair quality, provided with sufficient pasture—while my own land is not well drained, is not ploughed in the best manner, has not an adequate and regular supply of manure judiciously applied, my crops not very abundant or clean of weeds, my live stock not of good quality, or sufficient pasturage, surely I cannot be at any loss to account for the different results obtained by my neighbour and myself. Hence it would appear, that there is not in reality any excuse that our system of agriculture is not generally better than it is. I am sorry to be obliged to admit, that what we should understand as good farming, is the exception, and not the rule in Lower Canada; nevertheless, there are sufficient specimens or examples of good farming in every district, to show what it is, for our instruction, and this removes all ground for excuse for continuing a defective system of husbandry, because we can see before us continually, the practice, and the results obtained from good husbandry to encourage us to follow the example. It may probably surprise farmers, when I tell them, that the productions which are obtained from the most defective system of husbandry, and the least expenditure of labour and capital, costs the farmer more per bushel, than the production which results from the most perfect system of agriculture, and the ample but necessary, and judicious expenditure of capital and labour, practised in Canada. The farmer who is able to raise a produce of 30 bushels of wheat per acre, and of other crops in the same proportion, can do this at less expense per bushel, than it will cost the farmer per bushel, that will only raise 8 or 10 bushels of wheat per acre, and of other crops in proportion. If we compare the average produce obtained per acre by one of our best farmers, with the average per acre obtained by the great bulk of Canadian agriculturists, who practice a defective system, we shall be able to form some estimate of the great advantage of a good system, and the very great loss to the country generally, which results from a defective system of agriculture. I would be the last who would recommend a large and extravagant expenditure of labour and capital in agriculture, because I know that beyond a certain limit it would not be expedient or profitable to do so. In fact, capital should only be applied as far as its employment *lowers the cost* of agricultural production. This is the grand