

because they do not exercise any injurious influence on *corn*, which is cultivated immediately after them; they do not extract the alkalies of the soil, and only a very small quantity of phosphates. Leibig supposes that the small value of beans and peas as articles of nourishment is owing to the small quantity of phosphates which they contain, and "as the component parts of bones, viz, phosphate of lime and magnesia, are absent, they satisfy the appetite without increasing the strength." It is evident from what has been shewn, that two plants, growing beside each other and requiring the same food from the soil, must naturally injure one another. This is exemplified in the growth of certain weeds with wheat, as the wild chamomile and flea-bane, and in proportion as these weeds flourish, the grain is impoverished. Plants on the contrary, requiring different constituents, may flourish on the same soil at the same time, or in succession; thus on a soil containing potash, wheat and tobacco may be reared in succession, because the tobacco does not require phosphates, salts which are invariably present in wheat, but requires only alkalies, and food containing nitrogen.

---

WE insert with much pleasure the following communication, respecting "*Banking accommodation for Farmers*," confessing at the same time our incompetency to venture at present any decided opinion upon the subject. We are willing however to encourage temperate discussions upon all subjects, intended and calculated to promote the agricultural interests of the country, and we therefore invite further information upon this important question. The communication contains many excellent observations, and as we know the writer of it to be an experienced, intelligent and respectable farmer, we recommend his suggestions to the deliberate consideration of agriculturists. We may here observe that a very imperfect experi-

ment was tried in Nova Scotia in the shape of a Provincial loan for the relief of farmers. But as the amount appropriated for this purpose was very inadequate, the means proved insufficient, and like all half-way measures, they were found to do harm; and in the following manner: a farmer owed several persons to the amount of fifty pounds, but he could obtain at the loan office only a proportional part of the general amount in it, say £10 or £15. His creditors knew that money was within his reach by giving security on his farm, they fell upon him, and he was compelled to give it.—The sum thus obtained would not satisfy all the demands upon him, some were liquidated, and those persons who received nothing, in the plenitude of their disappointment, poured out their wrath from the phials of the law, and increased the unfortunate man's perplexities and debts with costs of court. The consequence was that farms were immediately sold, to satisfy the small securities that were upon them. We do not however consider that the foregoing can be adduced as a fair argument against Banking accommodation upon proper principles, and the judicious employment of it. The utility of banks has afforded matter for a contrariety of opinions. We can readily believe that the assistance, which they could afford to the enterprising and industrious farmer, would contribute to his own gain and the improvement of the country, and that although some individuals might make an injudicious use of the facility, still that the general benefits would more than counterbalance the particular objections. We are unwilling to express any decided sentiment, as we have not given the subject full consideration, nor viewed it in all its bearings.

We thank the writer of the article for the flattering expression of his sentiments in favour of the "*New-Brunswick Agriculturist*," and as the introductory paragraph referred exclusively to the editor of it, we have taken