

CLOVER.

No Competitors.

FLAX.

Mr. John Prenner, Lachine; Mr. Desjardins, River des Prairies.

CARROTS.

Mr. Peel, Montreal; Mr. Brodie, Cote St. Pierre; Mr. Quinn, Long Point.

MANGEL WURZEL.

Mr. Headly, River St. Pierre; Mr. Peel, Montreal; Mr. Joseph Leport, Long Point.

TURNIPS.

Mr. Loghead, Currant St. Marry; Mr. Allen, Bout de l'Isle; Mr. Hugh Campbell, Petite Cote.

BEST MANAGED FARMS.

Mr. John Drummond, Petite Cote; Mr. Penner, Lachine; Mr. James Sommerville, do; Mr. Lanouette, River St. Pierre.

The Inspectors of Crops respectfully recommended Antoine Seurs, of Lachine, and Wm. Lenney of Long Point, for premiums for summer follow. Also, Louis Dajenais, of Point Claire, for great exertions in the improvement of his farm, which he is carrying out with great judgment, and in the best manner. Further, they beg to mention Mr. Crevier, of St. Laurent, for his excellent improvements. All which is submitted.

ALPHEUS KINGTON,

WM. EVANS,

J. B. QUESNEL,

A. MONTREUIL,

Secretary.

1st August, 1851.

WOOL.—We were under the impression, that there was not a certain or favorable market in Lower Canada for wool, but we have been told by a gentleman lately, that the proprietors of the woolen manufactory at Chambly alone, had to import last year 20,000 lbs. of wool from England for their manufactory. We suppose the very least amount which this wool would have cost when at Chambly, would be from £1,500 to £2,000. It is certainly an extraordinary circumstance that this quantity of wool could not have been supplied by Canadian farmers, or five times the quantity if required—unless the wool imported was coarse Highland wool that sells at a very low price. The price which ordinary English wool would have cost when

landed here, would be a very good price for the Canadian farmer to obtain for his wool. There must be something wrong in the matter; it appears like “sending coals to Newcastle,” to import wool from England to manufacture in Canada. We have land in abundance, and the country is not by any means unfavorable for sheep, and therefore we do not see why we should not be able to supply our manufacturers with all the wool they may require.

GARDENS.—We insert, with pleasure, the communication of “Observer” on the subject of gardens. There is, undoubtedly, a general want of good kitchen-gardens throughout the country, whatever may be the cause, and as our correspondent observes, a good garden might produce a considerable portion of the support of the family during the summer season. There are some handsome gardens in the country, and well stocked with flowers, but they are small and deficient in many things necessary for a good kitchen-garden. Farmers that are not very wealthy, cannot of course employ a regular gardener, or spend a large portion of their time in the garden, but, nevertheless, a useful garden might be an appendage of every farm-house, and both soil and climate are favorable for them. One acre of garden-ground has been frequently known to yield a produce in a year that sells for from £200 to £300 in the London markets. It is incredible what one acre of well cultivated land would be made to produce in a year.

*To the Editor of the Agricultural Journal.*

DEAR SIR,—It has often been a matter of surprise to me, that on large farms such small, and very often miserably poor, kitchen-gardens are seen. This appears to me rather an anomaly, for I had always conceived that they had advantages and facilities for keeping good gardens which no others were possessed of. There is no doubt it proceeds from neglect and carelessness, but I cannot help thinking that neglect and carelessness grow, and strongly against their own interests—not to say anything of the