

great Exhibition of the Society at Brockville, last September. Indeed, the Journal altogether is highly creditable to our respected friend, George Buckland, Esq., the editor, and we are convinced that under his management it will be a most useful publication to agriculturists, as well in Lower as in Upper Canada. It would afford us great satisfaction that the Canadian Agriculturist should circulate in Lower Canada, and that this Journal should not be shut out from Upper Canada. By these means, as Mr. Buckland observes, we would become better acquainted with the progress of agriculture in both sections of the Province, and with the steps taken for its amelioration. The Board of Agriculture in Upper Canada and the Lower Canada Agricultural Society, have the same objects, and were incorporated to promote by every possible means in their power the improvement of agriculture, and the general prosperity of the rural population. It will greatly tend to the success of any measures these Societies may adopt, that they should act in concert, and maintain between them the most friendly understanding. Whenever the members of the two Societies meet at their Exhibitions or elsewhere on the business of Agriculture, it should be as members of one Canadian Society, acting for the public good. There should not be any exclusiveness between the Societies, who each obtain Grants of the public revenue for the accomplishment of the same object. There should not be anything like the feeling entertained, that "you are not of us, because you are not residing in this section of the province, and are not a subscribing member of this Society." The two Provincial Societies should act in perfect harmony in everything that relates to the duties they assumed when the Societies were organized. The improvement of agriculture will be more certainly promoted by the most friendly union and harmony between the two Provincial Societies, although, perhaps, the means necessary to be adopted for effecting this object in Lower Canada may not be ex-

actly the same as those that would be suitable for Upper Canada.

CAPITAL.

We give in this number an extract from a Lecture on "What is Capital," delivered some time ago by Mr. Porter, of statistical notoriety. We do not object to his reasoning so far as it goes, but we are surprised that Mr. Porter seems to lose sight altogether of the real source of all capital, the produce of the Earth. It is absurd to talk of exchangeable values, without mentioning the first production that ever had any value. What would be the value of gold, silver, or precious stones, if it was not for the fruits and products of the soil, that may be given in exchange for them? In Mr. Porter's lecture on "What is Capital," we have not perceived any reference to agriculture, without which there could not be any such commodity in the world as Capital. Mr. Alison, in his excellent work, "The Principles of Population," says:—"What is capital but substance stored up, and what is the whole wealth of the world but the accumulation of the surplus produce of the labor of the cultivators of the earth in different ages, above what was requisite for their own support?" This has been the real source of capital, and those who now have capital, never could have had any, only for the surplus products of agriculture. Labor is capital under present circumstances, but there could not be either laborers or labor, if it were not for the products of agriculture. It is the products of the Earth that must give life and activity to all things, and produce the capital that supports labor, manufactures, and commerce.

We know that it is quite a common mistake for many who are in possession of wealth to imagine that they have been the creators of capital, when probably they never created one penny in their whole lives. It is a different thing to *accumulate* capital created by others, and create it ourselves. No doubt the laborer or manufacturer who increases the value of raw materials by giving them new forms