

regarded with aversion. Even those who boast that they live by straight-forward hard work are almost uniformly seeking to escape from their condition. Even the substantial, thrifty farmer, whose life is or might be among the happiest, is apt to train his darling son for a profession, or put him in a store. He laudably wishes to put him forward in the world, but he does not think that half the time and expense bestowed in making him an average lawyer or doctor would suffice to make him an eminently intelligent and scientific farmer—a model and blessing to the whole country. Why will not our thrifty farmers think of this? The world is surfeited with middling lawyers and doctors—the gorge even of Iowa rises at the prospect of a new batch of either; of tolerable clergymen there is certainly no lack, as the multitude without societies bears witness, and yet here is the oldest, the most essential and noblest of employments on which the full blaze of science has hardly yet poured, and which is to-day making more rapid strides, and affords a more promising field for intellectual power than any other, comparatively shunned and neglected. Of good thoroughly educated, at once scientific and practical farmers, there is nowhere a superabundance. Everywhere there is a need of this class, to introduce new processes and improve old ones, to naturalize and bring to perfection the grains, fruit, &c. we still import from abroad when we might better produce them at home—to introduce a proper rotation and diversification of crops—to prove and teach how to produce profitably the most grain to the acre—in short to make agriculture the pleasing, attractive, ennobling pursuit it was originally intended to be. There is no broader field of usefulness—no surer road to honorable eminence—The time will come when, of the men of the last generation, Arthur Young will be more widely honored than Napoleon. But while the true farmer should be the most thoroughly educated and best informed man in the country, there are many of our old farmers, even, who will cheerfully spend a thousand dollars to qualify one son for a profession, yet grudge a hundred each to educate the three or four less favoured who are to be farmers. There are farmers who cultivate hundreds of acres and never look into a book on agriculture, though they would not countenance a doctor or clergyman who studied no works on medicine or theology. What a world of mistakes and inconsistencies is displayed all around us!

There are thousands in all our cities who are well employed and in good circumstances; we say, let these continue, if they are content, and feel certain that the world is better in their daily doing. There are other tens of thousands who must stay here, as things are; having no means to get elsewhere, no skill in any arts but these peculiar to city life, and a very limited knowledge; these must stay, unless something should transpire out of the common course of events. There are other tens of thousands annually arriving from Europe, who, however valuable acquisitions to the country, must contribute to glut market and depress the price of labour of all kinds in our city—some of these must remain here till they can obtain means and knowledge to go elsewhere. But for young men of our own happier agricultural districts to crowd into the great cities or into villages, in search of clerkships and that like, is madness—inhumanity to the destitute—moral suicide.—While nine tenths of the states are a waste wilderness, and all our marts of trade overflow with eager seekers for employment, let all escape from cities who can, and all who have opportunities to labour and live in the country resolve to stay there.—Genesee Farmer.

WHAT CAN FARMERS DO?

A great many things that they do not do now, they can raise greater crops, and make more money. They can improve their stock and save money, and they can be every way more independent and work no harder. But will they? I think so. One great thing in the way of many a farmer's improvement is that he never begins. Talk to him about improving his farm and he tells you it's all very well, but he is too poor to undertake it. And one great defect in Agricultural publications is the fact that they do not often point out the way whereby a poor man or a farmer in slender circumstances can be benefited. We read of what is done and doing in England, but there is but little of English agriculture that could be adopted with profit or advantage in this country. We now and then get glimpses of German and French farming, still there is but a small portion that can be

of use to us in a new country where produce is low and labor high. Whatever is done abroad that is of any service to us we can do here, and that being so little it is easily known.

As a general rule, the land in this country does not produce one half so much of any crop *except* weeds, as it is capable of doing, and it will require not a third more labor, to get double the amount. The great secret of large crops both at home and abroad, lies in the judicious application of manure. And the saving and applying manure is about the only thing that we can imitate to advantage, in foreign agriculture. There are but few farmers who cannot double, in one way or other, the manure now applied to their land—and that is the way for them to increase their crops. On wheat farms, for instance, always plow in a good quantity of clover. I contend that wheat land may be made to yield a good crop and be cultivated for fifty years to that crop alone, and constantly improve. I know this is against theory, but I also know that it is not contrary to practice. Sow clover every spring upon the wheat, and apply plaster, then sow upon the young wheat plant, in the fall or spring, from five to ten bushels of air slacked lime. This is contrary to all theory and practice, but then it is not contrary to common sense. I know that we are told to put on an acre 50 to 500 bushels, but still that does not prove but what a less quantity would answer. Lime is applied either as a kind of manure which is to benefit directly the growing crop, or else it is applied upon a stiff clay soil to ameliorate its texture, and make it more mellow. In the latter case a large quantity may be usefully applied. But as we have few farmers whose land needs such a quantity, I shall confine myself to the smaller number of bushels, and an annual application. Lime is an important constituent of wheat, and it should therefore be abundant in the soil to mature a good crop. The utmost that could be taken up by a growing crop would exceed probably one hundred pounds to the acre, or less than two bushels. The balance would remain in the soil in some shape. The tendency of all mineral manures is to sink in the soil. A large application, will in time, be washed down so as to be beyond the reach of the growing plant. Now then would it not be better to make a small application and make it oftener. Or to use the words of a friend with whom I was conversing the other day, "I shall apply lime to my land as I apply grease to my boots, little and often." But it may be said that so small a quantity can do no good. We see in the case of gypsum, that so small a quantity as one bushel to the acre has doubled the product of the crop. Why shall not lime, if the land or crop need it, have equally as good an effect if applied in as small a quantity as I have recommended?

The practice in France of liming once in about ten years, and applying but some 20 bushels to the acre, is decidedly more worthy of your adoption than that of the English.

I have no great faith in many of those new notions about manure, nor of those patent, and other wonderful manures. I believe generally there is a good deal more humbug than humus in them. If the farmer will endeavor to put back upon his land as much and a little more than he takes off, his farm will constantly improve. If otherwise he will exhaust the fertility of the soil. Less will produce less, till he sells out and goes to a new country.

For a wealthy farmer it is easy to apply his 50 bushels of charcoal, his 100 bushels of lime, and his salt, and plaster, and all that to the acre, and get large crops, when the application is properly made. But for the small farmer who has no surplus capital, it is all moonshine to suppose that he can go into these improvements. Still the small farmer can make a great deal more manure than he does, without any extra expense if he will only husband his resources, and he will do so as soon as he finds it for his interest.

Make all the manure you can, and if possible apply it to a spring crop. Put your ashes on your corn, potatoes, and grass lands, and not into the ash pedler's cart.

Closely connected with the subject of manure in the management of our stock. There is no excuse in this country, for a man who has a farm, to be without good warm shelter for his stock,—and no man can thrive who allows his stock to stand shivering through the cold days, and colder nights of our bleak winters, with no other protection than the broad canopy of heaven. It is a species of cruelty and inhumanity that gets its deserts here,—and I hope is not forgotten

hereafter. There is no man, I don't care who he is, that has stock, but can provide them a comfortable shelter.—Genesee Farmer.

TAKE CARE!

Should be the watch word of every farmer. There is no time to dispense with it from the first day of January, to the last day of December. And yet, some would judge from appearances about the premises of some farmers, that they hardly knew that those two words belong to the English language. To take care of anything, whether it be buildings, fences, crops or animals seems never to have entered their minds as a thing of any importance. And even among those who would probably like to be called pretty good farmers, there is too often a manifest disinclination to take care. But, although they are two small words and quickly told the good or ill success of every farmer depends in a great measure upon the observance or neglect of them. No great number of acres, nor any amount of hard labor will enable any man to dispense with them. If you would even raise a flock of chickens you must take care of them. But little time is required to raise a hundred, provided you have the necessary conveniences for taking care of them.

If you wish to raise a litter of fine, thrifty pigs, take care of them. While they run with their mother, she must have enough to eat, of something; when you take them off, they must be fed not once or twice a day only, but five times at least—not twice as much as they can eat at a time, but just as much as they can eat, and no more.

If it is your intention to raise two or three or half a dozen calves, you may as well have good ones, only take care of them. In the first place, breed from the best stock you have, or can produce, and then feed regularly with a sufficient quantity of something, not so much matter what, they will readily learn to eat almost any thing—sour milk, or whey, with a trifle of meal, answers a good purpose, only let it be regular as to time and quantity. "This pampering and stuffing and overfeeding," as Mr. Bement says, is not the thing, it is not necessary. Good stock can be raised without it, even from gurnative breed. But a little care, especially the first summer and first winter, they must have.

If you wish to have your cattle in high order in the spring, take care of them. Have every animal in the stable if possible, not only nights, but cold stormy and windy days—feed little at a time and often, not only night and morning but through the day.

If you wish to increase your quantity of manure, take care of it. Keep your cattle close in the yard, and put up eave-troughs to carry off the water, so that there may be as little wash as possible. If there is a drain at one side of your yard where all the moisture runs off, try and prevent it. A speaker in a late agricultural address says, "you may as well have a hole in your pocket, as a drain from your barn yard." If you would raise good crops, take care of them. They must be fed as well as your cattle, or they will not grow. Plough thoroughly; to cut and cover won't do, neither will you have a great crop of grain, and a very great crop of weeds at the same time. Have an eye to your fences—if a board gets loose, or a rail is ready to tumble off, try to find it out before your cattle do.—If you have a family of children growing up; to take your place in this busy scene of things, when your race is run—you would probably be glad to have them become wiser and better men and women, than their father and mother were before them—then take care of them. Feed and clothe their bodies decently, but don't forget to feed their minds. Give them all the opportunities of a good and substantial education in your power. And whether they be male or female, and whether you expect to leave them rich or poor, learn them to take care.—Central New York Farmer.

MANUFACTURE OF CHARCOAL.—A new process commended in the Journal des Forets, for this purpose, is to fill all the interstices in the heap of wood to be charred with powdered charcoal. The product obtained is equal in every respect to cylinder charcoal; and independent of its quality is much greater than that obtained by the ordinary method. The charcoal used to fill the interstices is that left on the earth after a previous burning. The effect is produced by preventing much of the access of air which occurs in the ordinary method. The volume of charcoal is increased a tenth, and the weight a fifth.

The Politician.

The British Press:

From the London Times.

PROJECT OF A FEDERAL UNION BETWEEN GREAT-BRITAIN AND IRELAND.

Mr. Porter's project of a "federal" union between Great Britain and Ireland has met with considerable favour from two very numerous classes of men—those who aim at a distincter nationality for the latter island, and those who feel rather distressingly the predominance of Irish subjects and Irish speeches in the imperial legislature. A purely Irish parliament in St. Stephen's green and an equally expurgated British parliament in ideas in their several quarters. Mr. Porter, moreover, writes with all the boldness of a man who feels no particular anxiety for the welfare of any existing interest or institution, and with all the candour that arises from the absence of political or religious prejudices. It might be expected that on a question involving the welfare of so many millions, and the integrity of a mighty empire, we should express some opinion as to the prudence of the writer. But it is difficult to say what is prudent when there is no general agreement as to what should be desired; and Mr. Porter evidently regards as rather desirable than otherwise consummations which some of our readers would think it the very test of prudence to avoid.

Mr. Porter recommends a repeal of the existing union of 1801, and a restoration of the two distinct parliaments. So far he goes along with Mr. O'Connell. Besides this, and upon this, he specifies what the latter gentleman, to the best of our belief, has not yet thought it necessary to express himself clearly upon—the particular tie which is to remain between the two countries. Mr. O'Connell contents himself with the mere name of one Sovereign, who is to be the whole and sole isthmus between the two communities, and through whose absolute, individuality, counsel and strength, and every needful reciprocity, are to flow from realm to realm, from shore to shore. As far as he has condescended to explicate his views, her most puissant Majesty is to achieve the feat of a coachman, who should undertake with his one unassisted body, one pair of hands, and one whip, to drive at the same time an omnibus and a cab, sitting on the box of each, and not only so, but with the further condition that the two vehicles shall at the time be proceeding diametrically and rapidly in opposite directions. In only one way that we are aware of is it possible to accomplish even the semblance of two such contrary movements, and that is by running tilt at a looking-glass—a career which it is evident must speedily end in the reality smashing the illusion. Mr. Porter is more tender of possibilities, or at least of the infirmities of human understanding. He explains, "We are to have a federal union, after the example and pattern of the United States; a British parliament for British purposes, and an Irish parliament for Irish purposes; while for the general purposes of the empire we are to have a Congress constituted distinctly from the other two, and held every third year in Dublin."

The idea of a Congress has occurred to other minds before this, as a solution of many existing difficulties. We are becoming less of a nation and more of an empire. The conduct of an empire and the government of one's own people seem quite different and incongruous operations. The very ethical qualities necessary perhaps for keeping a barbaric continent in subjection don't do at home. One is shocked to see either Irish peasants or English labourers with the same rod of iron as Mahrattas and Beloches—with the same suspicious discipline as a mutinous man-of-war crew, or a black regiment at the Cape. There is, too, something absolutely ridiculous in the present mixture of parliamentary subjects. An hour's talk on the balance of power between the continental empires is followed by three days animated discussion on a personal squabble. The annexation of a great territory is passed over almost *sub silentio* in a storm of talk about some third-class official appointments. While Lord-Lieutenants are called to speedy account, Governor-Generals quietly accumulate transgression. Parliament has too many irons in the fire. It is doing the work of master and man as well. Like the Grecian deities, it is always coming down to see whether its orders work well and are obeyed, and thereupon making hasty and partial interference. Then it stays so long in that lower sphere as to forget the higher. Having taken charge of the Church, the corporations, and a hundred other local responsi-