

The Canadian Spectator.

VOL. III.—NO. 13.

MONTREAL, SATURDAY, MARCH 27, 1880.

\$2.00 PER ANNUM.

CONTENTS:

THE TIMES.	THINGS IN GENERAL.
THE BUDGET DEBATE.	POETRY.
DOES DENIS KEARNEY FOUND THE EMPIRE?	DOMESTIC ECONOMY.
BRAIN-POWER AND THE IRISH.	CORRESPONDENCE.
THE APOTHEOSIS OF PALAVER.	TRADE, FINANCE, STATISTICS.
LUTHER H. HOLTON, a discourse by Rev. A. J. BRAY.	CHESS.
	MUSICAL.
	&c. &c. &c.

THE TIMES.

SIR,—In the matter of your anticipations as to progress, permit me to observe that the French Canadian people have multiplied their numbers seventeen times in one hundred years from the conquest,—a rate to which there are few parallels. The natural result of this great and honorable increase has been a certain reduction of individual stature. Though we could hardly expect anything of this kind to be perpetuated, the people of the whole Dominion would be doing but poorly, with a great new country to fill up, if they only a little more than doubled their numbers in fifty years, by birth and immigration combined. The population of the United States rose from four to nearly forty millions within a century from the foundation of this new state,—say ten fold in a rough estimate. It is not to be supposed that we can calculate with accuracy all the contingencies of a distant future—but your estimate of a population of ten millions for the Dominion in fifty years from now must be a very safe one, especially when the speedy complete occupation of the available lands of our neighbours is taken into the account. If the race maintains and improves its standard of health, morals and vitality—our progress will probably depend, beyond the elements enumerated, more upon good organization and efficient means of travel with a continuance of internal and external peace, than upon other social and material considerations.

SIR,—Of course the *Saturday Review* might urge in reply to your critical remarks of last week—that if protection by import duties were granted to those classes of manufacture which could be equally well produced abroad and at home—there would still be no justification for imposing it upon such goods as could be produced more easily abroad. But there is a word to be said even on that point. We ought to take a little more trouble in our investigation of processes and means than the free traders, pure and simple, are generally willing to do; and then we might discover that what tends more than anything—granted a market—to weaken a manufacture and to make it difficult to produce cheaply is, first, want of capital and, second, want of skill, in those who undertake it. Relative density of population, climatic conditions and habitat of raw materials may be all elements conducing to success, but these are really less important, probably, than the two first named. The last of these elementary differences we find to have been so effectually overcome by British manufacturers, that cotton cloth instead of being the production of the Southern States has been a staple industry of England and Scotland. The physical and industrial conditions for manufacture in the case of cotton, in Britain, are found in a trained population—in perfection of machinery, and in scientific applications, as for one example, methods of regulating temperature and moisture—and it were to be desired, by the way, that those methods were always scientific enough to conduce to the preservation of the valuable lives of the workers. As to the important constituent of density of population, the free-traders' own rule of demand and supply should be found somewhat available. When workers are really wanted for any great enterprise, the manufacturers will by degrees bring them on to the ground, sometimes as many as they require at a single coup. But the capital needed is the attribute of a wealthy people, or of a country where moderate savings are so to say, universal—and the skill will only grow up by degrees. After all is said, social order and a moral and steady population, adding to these abundance of motive power, either in fuel or water or both—with accessibility of good supplies, are the conditions which it would be the hardest to improvise if they were absent, and we may certainly felicitate ourselves upon their presence in the Dominion—once establish the rule that when the will to do so is locally manifested, it is possible within pretty wide limits to manufacture what you require—elegant specialities being left out of the question—and it will be found that reciprocity

in markets, or protective legislation sufficient to compensate for the want of it,—will be the rule of success, after the new manufactures have obtained some headway. Until that time arrives, reciprocity cannot benefit them; for they are really in no condition to compete with others—at that early stage protection, pure and simple, will suit them best.

Ontario is to be congratulated on its School of Agriculture, or as it is now called, the "Ontario Agricultural College and Experimental Farm." Here are the subjects embraced in its educational course:—

1. The theory and practice of agriculture.
2. The theory and practice of horticulture.
3. The theory and practice of arboriculture.
4. The elements of the various sciences, especially chemistry (theoretical and practical), applicable to agriculture and horticulture.
5. The technical English and mathematical branches requisite for an intelligent and successful performance of the business of agriculture and horticulture.
6. The anatomy, physiology, and pathology of the ordinary farm animals; with the characteristics of the different varieties of each kind; with the management thereof in the breeding, raising, fattening, and marketing of each, and with a knowledge of the cheese and butter factory systems.
7. The principles of construction and skilful use of the different varieties of buildings, fences, drainage systems, and other permanent improvements, machinery, implements, tools, and appliances necessary in agricultural and horticultural pursuits.
8. And such other subjects as will promote a knowledge of the theory and practice of agriculture, horticulture, and arboriculture.

Education in these matters is to be theoretical and practical. The student will first learn what to do, and then do what he has learnt under critical eyes and guiding hands. Nothing could be better in a country like this. If parents would send their boys there as preliminary to life on a farm, it would be much better than sending them to those colleges where they learn just enough to unfit them for everything that is practical and bread-winning. All the professions are crowded, every branch of business is done to death—everything but farming. I would say to young Montreal and young Toronto, by all means go to College, but go to the "Ontario Agricultural College," and then—take a farm.

It is not often that Mr. Mackenzie makes himself ridiculous, but on Tuesday he succeeded in doing it thoroughly. There was much Opposition indignation over a pamphlet written by the Hon. Peter Mitchell some months ago. Mr. Mitchell had gone through the North-West with Mr. D. A. Smith, which in a free country like this he had a perfect right to do; he described the districts through which he passed in a series of letters to the *Montreal Herald*; they were well written letters, giving just the kind of information needed. The travellers passed over the St. Paul, Minneapolis and Manitoba Railway, in which Mr. D. A. Smith has a large interest, and Mr. Mitchell, quite naturally, described what kind of country it passes through. Then the letters were published in pamphlet form with a very useful map showing the route to Manitoba. Why not? They were freely circulated—as they deserved to be—there were a few advertisements put in to make it pay. Why not? Even if they had happened to be Government advertisements? But, said the Opposition, there are advertisements for a foreign country in it—"fertile lands for sale in the Red River Valley," &c.—and it is a crime against Canada for Government to circulate such a pamphlet. As it turns out Government did nothing of the sort; did not pay for a pamphlet, and did not authorise an advertisement in it, and when the matter was brought up in the House with such a liberal fanfaronade, the Ministers had a little harmless fun at the expense of Mr. Mackenzie. For my own part, I think the Government might very well have circulated Mr. Mitchell's pamphlet,