

**EATING AND DRINKING.**—It will rather take the reader by surprise to be told, that in a life of 65 years duration, with a moderate daily allowance of mutton, for instance, he will have consumed a flock of 350 sheep, and that altogether for dinner alone; adding to his mutton a reasonable allowance of potatoes and vegetables, with a pint of wine daily, for thirty years of this period, above thirty tons of solids and liquids must have passed through his stomach.



## THE CULTIVATOR.

"Agriculture is the great art which every government ought to protect, every proprietor of lands to practice, and every inquirer into nature to improve."—Dr. Johnson.

Toronto, July, 1842.

By the last Mail from England, we find that the new Tariff of Sir Robert Peel has not yet become law, but very little doubt existed that it would be adopted by the Imperial Parliament, notwithstanding the great opposition offered to it by the English agriculturists.

We could not expect that the great interests of the British Isles, would be sacrificed for the particular benefit of this or any other of the British colonies, but we humbly conceive, nevertheless, that some consideration is due to the interests of the colonies, and that their industry and trade should be *decidedly* encouraged in preference to all foreigners. When British born subjects, now inhabitants of British America, emigrated from their dear father-land to settle in this country, they considered they would be as much the objects of the fostering care and encouragement of the British Government and Imperial Parliament, as if they had remained in the land of their birth. We have so many difficulties to contend with here, that do not appear to be perfectly understood at home, and we are at so great a distance from the mother country, that we cannot compete with the inhabitants of the North of Europe, or of the United States, unless we have decided encouragement and preference secured to us in the British markets. The advocates of free trade may say it would be better to part with the colonies altogether, than give them any such encouragement and protection, as would cause the inhabitants of Britain to pay more for their produce, than they would have to pay to foreigners for the same description of produce. Free trade advocates forget, that whatever is received by the inhabitants of British colonies from their fellow-subjects of the British Isles, finds its way back to them by some direct or indirect channel; and this would not be always the case in trading with foreigners. Does not every shilling we can spare go to the purchase of British manufactures, or brought to us by British ships and sailors? The most prejudiced advocate for free trade, must know that it is very favourable for the country that can exchange goods manufactured by machinery chiefly; for the raw products of other countries, that can be only raised by the labour of men, horses, and cattle. We may be answered that we do not contribute to the British revenue in due proportion, and therefore that we

are not entitled to the same privileges as those who do pay this revenue. We have repeatedly endeavoured to show that we do *indirectly* contribute to the British revenue, in as much as we are the purchasers and consumers of British goods, that come to us charged with all the cost of production, including the revenue paid by those who produced them, and a profit. This must be manifestly the case, or goods would not be sent to this country to be sold. It should also be remembered, that it is in the British Isles the revenue is principally expended, and also, that it is there all the immense profits of trade, manufactures, and commerce are chiefly expended, in the encouragement of British industry and production. It would be ungenerous to tax poor colonists equally with the inhabitants of the British Isles, under so very different circumstances and means of paying taxes. It may readily be supposed, that a want of sufficient capital must be injuriously felt here, when it is known that a large proportion of emigrants settling in this country, come here in consequence of having lost their capital in the old country; and it was not by the destructive agents of fire and water that they lost their capital, but by entering into engagements and speculations, that transferred their capital into other and more fortunate hands. Very few of the emigrants who become settlers in British colonies, belong to the class who spend their fortunes in luxuries and extravagance, on the contrary, they almost all belong to the classes of farmers, tradesmen, and labourers who left most of the capital they ever did possess, after them in the land of their birth. What can be done here without capital, where the land is all either in a wild state of nature, or exhausted by constant croppings, and in want of draining and manuring? To a moderate extent, capital is more necessary here than in England. It may not require that a farmer should have from seven to ten pounds per acre capital for all the land he occupies, but the nearer it is to that amount, the better chance he will have of successful and profitable farming. Farmers coming from the old country, are surprised to see a stone or a stump in a field where they ought not to be, and a drain wanted where it was necessary it should be cut, but they do not consider that, perhaps, these farms were a few years back covered with a thick forest and abundance of staves; that the country is new, labour dear, capital insufficient, and the price of agricultural produce much lower than in England. From all these causes, it is no wonder that the inhabitants of British colonies should expect favour from the parent state, that would protect and encourage them in preference to foreigners. All the favour they could expect, or that is possible to extend to them, will be only making them more useful and profitable subjects and customers. It is not a small advantage to the British Isles, circumstanced as they are with regard to population, that they should have a country such as British America, to receive their surplus and unemployed population; and every class in Britain are interested in the prosperous condition of this country, because if it is prosperous, the surplus population that are burdensome to them in Britain, may, by coming here, be in a condition to become profitable customers for British goods, and loyal subjects to the British Crown and Government, neither of which they could be

if they remained in distress and poverty in the old countries. What do foreign nations understand by reciprocity treaties? Our neighbours of the United States might be induced to consent to establish a reciprocity treaty on the principle of allowing a free trade in agricultural produce,—that is to say, they might admit, (though they do not at present), our wheat, flour, barley, rye, oats, Indian corn, peas, beef, mutton, pork, &c. &c., on the same terms as we would admit the same description of articles from them. But as the people of the United States are perfectly aware, that if we had this produce to dispose of, we could not find a profitable market in their country; would they be willing to admit British produce and manufactures without duty, in consideration of their agricultural produce being admitted into this colony free of duty, or at the same rate of duty that our Tariff would establish? This would be the only *equitable* reciprocity treaty that could be established between this country, as a part of the British Empire, and the United States. It could not be any benefit to us that a foreign nation could concede the privilege to us, of admitting duty free, such articles only as we would never have to export, or find customers to purchase if we did export. Let them admit, duty free, what we can export, and they may reasonably call upon us to admit, duty free, what they can export. Such a treaty as this, might not be very favourable to Canadian farmers, but it would be one that they could scarcely object to, forming as they do, a portion of the great British family. Were all protective duties established by nations to be abolished, Canadian farmers would not ask for protection; but *and* this is generally the case all over the world, they would ask the same encouragement and protection that others think necessary to secure the industry from undue foreign competition. A neighbouring nation may say to Britain and her colonies, "we have abundance of produce in our land that abounds in corn, cattle, and other agricultural products for which we have not sufficient consumption, we would, therefore, ask you to admit, duty free, all we could spare of these products. We cannot, however, admit your manufactures on the same terms, because we are desirous to encourage and protect our own industry and manufactures, in order that we may not require any foreign manufactures in future; but we will consent to admit, duty free, your agricultural produce, if you have any to spare, and can find customers amongst us to purchase." This is what is understood by a reciprocity treaty, and there would be as reasonable a prospect of doing a profitable business by sending coals to Newcastle, or tea to China for sale, as by sending agricultural produce to the United States to be disposed of there. Our Subscribers may not think it necessary that we should constantly refer to this subject, but we do so from a sense of duty to them, pledged as we feel ourselves, to discuss measures which we are firmly persuaded will deeply interest them, and have a powerful influence upon their future prospects. If British America is capable of having a prosperous agriculture, under the free trade system in agricultural produce with the United States, we confess that we are not competent to form a correct opinion on the subject. We are anxious to see the beautiful provinces of British America with a full population, and abounding in corn and cattle.