

throned or murdered in our day. We should feel grateful for the power that has prevailed, and long for its continuance. Time will not permit us to wander all over our Queen's domains, therefore I will briefly touch on this continent.

Thirty years ago I was attracted to Kansas by the glaring accounts given of that country. We went with a view of securing a better home. Health in that country was in no way to be compared to that of Canada. I returned, having seen something of our neighbors and their country, having visited Maine, New Hampshire, Vermont, New York, Pennsylvania, Tennessee, Missouri, Illinois, Nebraska, Delaware, New Jersey and Michigan, and the cities of Washington and New Orleans, always with an eye for the bettering of my condition, and that of my family, should any inducements offer; and believing that I know a little about the fertility of land, its products and profits, I have seen no place either on this continent or on Europe, any place where the farmers on an average are near as well off, or have such an opportunity of prospering, or are as peaceful and contented, as in Ontario. If any of you have any idea of thinking that you are going to better yourselves by selling your farms and going to any other part, just consider your position well before you do it. My advice is, stay where you are, do your duty where you are, do not be led away by any boom, and before changing consult with your most truthful and honorable neighboring men that cannot be bought to mislead you.

Under the British flag the oppressed of every nation find a shelter and a home; under this flag our Queen's subjects find a greater amount of security and liberty than under any other. Long may it wave—that flag that has "braved a thousand years, the battle and the breeze."

A correspondent of the *Horticultural Times* writes:—Any man who values health will make a point to eat fruit daily, and even on occasion to make a meal entirely of it. One cause why ripe and wholesome fruits are given a bad name is because they are eaten at the wrong end of a meal. After many courses of heavy foods and strong drinks, a few harmless strawberries are indulged in; and then, when these rich foods and stimulating drinks upset the stomach, the blame is put on the innocent strawberry. The real place for fruit is at the beginning of a feast, and not at the end. A better plan still is to make a meal of bread and ripe fruit. The best meals to make thus are breakfast, lunch, or early tea. The bread should be brown and dry, and the fruit ripe and raw. Dry brown bread cleans the tongue, and brings out the flavor of the fruit. Butter on the bread would give its own flavor, or even the salt in the butter would destroy the pure taste of the fruit.

Mr. Carman, in sowing grass seed on a lawn, neglected to roll a portion. When the ground was compacted a velvety covering of young grass soon appeared, but on the unrolled portion no grass was seen. If grass seed fails in this way, he asks, on a finely raked seed bed, how much seed must be lost in the coarser and looser soil of our fields, when the roller or some other implement is not used to press the soil closely against the seed?

The luxuriant foliage of our Cumberland strawberries were attacked by thrips, but we shot the insects flying, having a boy to stir them up with a long handled brush in advance of the bucket of diluted soap and kerosene emulsion and the corn-broom whisk with which we sprinkle it on and through the startled marauders.—[Tribune.

Farmers' Clubs.

Dominion Farmers' Council.

The regular monthly meeting of the Dominion Farmers' Council was held on the 16th ult., President Leitch in the chair.

COMMUNICATIONS.

A letter was read from Mr. W. H. Phillips, Secretary of the Stockdale Farmers' Club, inclosing 33 names of members, and asking to be amalgamated with the Council.

Moved by W. Weld, and seconded by John Kennedy, that the Stockdale Farmers' Club be amalgamated with this Council. Carried.

A letter was read from Mr. John Waters, M.P. P., stating that in compliance with the expressed desire of the Council, he would take great pleasure in preparing a paper on "Commercial Union." He referred to the subject as being a very comprehensive and intricate one, but also as being very important to the farmers of Canada. After the reading of several other communications, the question of

COMMERCIAL UNION,

which was the programme of the day, was taken up. The Secretary stated that he had not received Mr. Waters' paper or any intimation from him as to why he did not prepare the same, as promised. Several members expressed their great disappointment, as they expected the paper to contain a great deal of useful information and an impartial treatment of the subject.

The question, however, was discussed, some members having presented both sides of the case without discussing the merits or demerits of the issue, and several extracts were read from reports and discussions in the press. The proceedings were then brought to a focus by the following resolution, moved by J. W. Bartlett, and seconded by J. K. Little:

"Resolved, that a commercial union with the United States would be beneficial to the farmers of Canada."

PRESIDENT LEITCH—I desire to introduce to you Mr. W. de H. Washington, American Consul in this city, whom we should all welcome to take part in the discussion, and whose views I am sure will be entitled to our consideration and respect.

MR. WASHINGTON—I thank you for your courtesy, but as my position in Canada is diplomatic, I am debarred from taking part in the discussion. I should not like to be falsely reported, or that the citizens of my country should entertain the impression that I speak in my official capacity. I have prepared official statistics as to the exports from this section of Canada, which may be of some service to you, but I am not yet at liberty to divulge them. Commercial union is not yet a party question in the United States, but the Butterworth Bill, which is yet in embryo, is favorable to the project, and it may be a party question in the near future.

HENRY ANDERSON read facts and figures from various sources, chiefly from Mr. Mathews, a noted commercial authority, to show that our trade with Great Britain was greater than that with the United States, so that from a commercial standpoint our first object was to ally ourselves as closely as possible with the mother country, and he believed that sentimental considerations would be in sympathy with our trade relations. He pointed out that our population was only about one-twelfth of that of the United

States, and that under a commercial union our share of the joint customs revenue would therefore be about 8 percent. He then pointed out that in the years '83, '84 and '85, our customs yielded \$62,162,000 from imports of \$357,000,000, thus showing an average import of 17 percent. During the same year the U. S. customs yielded \$591,245,000 on imports of \$1,968,000,000, or a rate of 30 percent. He regarded it as self-evident that, in case of a commercial union, our tariff would have to correspond with that of the United States—that is, it must be raised from 17 to 30 percent on an average. Now, by adding together the imports of Canada and the United States, the sum would be \$2,325,000,000; but \$273,000,000 should be subtracted, being the trade between us and the U. S., the revenue of which would be lost under a commercial union, leaving a balance of \$2,052,000,000 from which a revenue could be derived. Of this sum, \$205,000,000 represented the importations into Canada, or almost exactly 10 percent of the whole, so that we would have to pay 10 percent on the joint imports, and all we would receive back according to our population would be 8 percent—a two percent loss, clearly showing that we would have to pay \$12,300,000 into the joint commercial union fund more than would be returned to us. To put the matter in another shape, our taxes would be increased 75 percent, and we would also be compelled to raise enormous sums by direct taxation. Another proof that Canada would lose by the speculation was the fact that the trade of Canada in proportion to our population was over 75 percent greater than that of the United States, one-twelfth of the trade of that country being \$118,000,000, while our trade amounted to \$208,000,000. He did not believe in this sort of speculation, and could not understand how the prices of the bulk of our farm products could be enhanced in the United States so long as Britain ruled the markets. He believed in reciprocity, but he could not understand why we should throw our financial affairs into the hands of the Americans. Our farmers had already been almost completely ruined by the National Policy, and this should be a lesson to them not to incur further obligations without well considering the consequences. He did not believe that John Bull's patience was inexhaustible; and if we went on suing for commercial union, that gentleman might feel quite justified in erecting barriers against Canadian and American exports; and as we would be compelled to put our surplus products into the British markets, we would have to accept any price we could get. We were not yet prepared for direct taxation.

JAS. K. LITTLE—That's so; but I believe our farmers would be greatly benefited by commercial union.

Several members and non-members spoke in favor of commercial union, but none were prepared with arguments to support their statements. Some referred to the prevailing feeling amongst members of Farmers' Institutes in support of the project, the general impression being that the prices of horses, lambs, barley and eggs would be increased.

In reply to a question from a farmer as to Canada being used as a slaughter-house by the Americans,

MR. WASHINGTON replied that the U. S. manufacturers agree amongst themselves not to undersell one another in their own markets; they