

## WORKING EXPENSES.

Interest on Capital.  
 Cost of labor.  
 Allowance to farmer for personal superintendence.  
 Allowance for wear and tear.  
 Manure.  
 Seed.  
 Taxes.  
 Insurance.  
 Sundries.

The total sales, plus the increase in value, if any, of the stock, and minus the total working expenses, would give the net profit upon the whole.

A similar statement might be framed of each separate department upon the farm, whether dairying, cattle raising, grain growing, or other forms of agriculture, showing the items composing the cost price of the products, and these would be of especial interest, both for comparison between different sections of the country, and as showing to which department the farmer might most profitably direct his attention. No inducement would be one-half so effectual as indubitable proof that there is money to be made in the occupation, and if this were once satisfactorily determined by a number of such statements, both capital and labor would flow into this channel (11).

If, in addition to this, some means could be devised for instructing, in at least the rudiments of agricultural knowledge, that unfortunate class who are now earning a precarious existence in situations in the larger towns, a service of national importance would be rendered, the value of which it is impossible to over-estimate (12). Hundreds of young men who now only realize Lord Palmerston's definition of dirt—matter in the wrong place—would each add something annually to the material wealth of the country as a producer, instead of subtracting from it as a non-producer, and Canada would welcome an era of real progress and solid prosperity such as she has never yet known. Who will begin the work?

We have numbered the principal questions, raised by our correspondent. Many of these might very well form the heading of a separate editorial. Want of space, however, forces us to answer in a few words only the various points in the above suggestive article.—1, 2, 3. We beg to differ. farms in Manitoba, when stocked and improved, will cost about as much, per 100 acres, as they should here, —whilst produce, when harvested, will not be worth, on the spot and on an average, more than 30 or 40 0/0 of its value here. Then, there is no such thing as permanent fertility, this, the western farmers of the United States have long ago learned, to their cost. Again, as to immediate readiness for cultivation in Manitoba, we are reminded of a recent case in point, when buildings had to be erected in Ottawa, taken to pieces, loaded on the cars and sent to Manitoba, for economy's sake. For the same reason, stock, farm implements, and the whole "plenishing" of a homestead besides, were sent by the cars for more than a thousand miles. Finally, after digging three wells over eighty feet deep, water for the whole of the stock had to be carted five miles! — If this be still called *immediate readiness*, we have no more to say.

In our opinion, ninety nine out of every hundred British farmers, who emigrate with *experience and capital*—and all others in similar circumstances—ought to find it to their advantage to settle down in the older provinces of the Dominion; they have no business in Manitoba, where their experience of improved farming would be of very little use, and their capital would be in great danger of being irretrievably lost. However, we do not, by any means, deprecate emigration to Manitoba—in the case of those thousands of industrious and hardy foreigners with very limited means, whose main object is to raise food for themselves, and to secure a home for their growing sons and daughters. All such, however, must expect to *rough it*, for many years to come—but, they need not want for food—if they will only work for it, and this is certainly an object, now a days, with a great

many. But, those having experience in improved farming, and capital to pay for the needed improvements, would do infinitely better by purchasing, or leasing, a farm here, even if such farm be considerably run out.

4. What is perfectly certain is that farming has paid, and is still paying, thousands, aye, and a hundred thousand farmers, who, in most cases, started without any other capital than their strong arms, and their determination to conquer a living by farming. These men now own their farms and all belonging to them, they have lived comfortably, for many years, according to their station, they have gained advantages for their children; and, at their death, they leave several thousand dollars worth of accumulated property. Can the same be said for the same number of persons in similar circumstances, but who have chosen the various callings in a city?

5. Whether farming pays 7, or 8, or 12 0/0, for the capital invested, over and above wages and other expenses, depends on so many circumstances that it would be useless for us to attempt giving here the solution asked for. To make farming pay at all, the farmer must understand his business thoroughly. This is self evident. And yet, what a number of successful business men,—who have become rich by following business principles,—rush into farming without any practical knowledge of their new occupation. They lose their money,—of course;—but why should they swear that farming never did, never will, and never can pay?

6. Not exactly.—The writer, for many years a farmer, but originally in business in the city, would rather earn \$300 as wages, on his farm, than \$1000, for no harder work, in a city occupation. This, however, is a matter of inclination only. Very possibly, the thin skinned inhabitant of the city would rather reverse the proposition. There is also the question of ability. Many a man can make \$10 a day in town who would not earn his salt in the country, by manual labour only. Of course, brain work is indispensable on the farm, as well as in town. But farming generally, requires more than brain work. There must be, in this country at least, hard labour,—back breaking work too,—now and then, no matter how much capital a farmer may possess.

7 and 8. We know of several active professional men in the country, acquainted with farming, who, with an occasional superintendence only, of their farms, manage to obtain an average return of between 7 and 8 0/0 on all the capital therein invested. We also know of some invalid farmers, men unable to work and who have to pay for all the labour done on their farm, who, yet, secure an average net return of from 9 to 12 0/0 on their farming capital. These men, of course, know their business and look after it closely, altho' incapable of any other labour. We admit willingly that these are the exception. We will go further, and state that even the majority of farmers in this country, do not get an adequate return for their labour and for the capital invested in their farms. But we affirm, at the same time, that such farmers do not farm as they ought to farm. We feel convinced that most farmers in this country could double, at least, the net returns from their farms, merely by stopping the leaks, all round, and then stirring the soil as they should. We say it advisedly,—taken as a whole in this province, our farming is disreputable. This is not saying however, that it is much worse here than in many other parts of America. Is it surprising herefore, that our Canadian farmers have but a modest *retiring competency*? Is it not more surprising that, even with their prior farming, most of them should secure this modest retiring competency? And as much be said of a similar number of old, worn out, business men in the city?

9. Quite right; and if *outsiders* be wise they will continue to let agriculture alone.—Not so, however, with men of ca-