

extraordinary progress, furnishing an example of unequalled prosperity; gradually lessening its public debt of \$1,000,000,000, without being arrested in its march of improvement, while we see our Government increasing the debt \$100,000,000 in ten years, and the Province of Quebec handicapped with a debt of \$17,000,000, and an annual deficit of \$800,000.

Further, £100,000,000 sterling of British capital is invested in mortgages in Canada, the interest thereof, \$25,000,000, being annually taken from the country. It is an important matter for us to decide how to render our national debt more in accordance with our resources; we must also notice closely the striking contrast existing between the condition of the two countries, which enjoy the same *natural* advantages. The American market is very large and offers to capital, agriculture and manufactures an ample return; while on the other hand, Canadian products and manufactures are limited to a population of 4,000,000, spread over a vast extent of country, and have been obliged until the present to compete with foreign manufactures, for the reason that Canada, as a colony, could not or did not make commercial treaties with foreign countries. Obligated as sellers to pay either high duties on our products (when sold in the United States), or freight charges, &c. (when sold in England), our importing powers were lessened. Our woollen, cotton and leather manufactures cannot be exported to France and our ships are obliged to pay a duty of \$8—while British vessels pay only forty-cents, and the same prohibition exists as regards others of our exports.

All intelligent men are of the opinion that our politico-economical position is very serious, and that in spite of our magnificent resources, both natural, agricultural and industrial, we will rapidly become bankrupt, if foreign markets, and especially that of the United States, are not opened to us. There is only one opinion amongst all classes as to the advisability of effecting a commercial treaty with the United States.

Sir A. T. Galt was the first to demonstrate to us the advantages of the American market in 1862,—in a report to the House of Commons which showed that in six years, thanks to the Treaty of Reciprocity, our exports reached the sum of 168 million dollars, of which 97 millions were paid us by the United States and showing that our exports to all other countries combined were 26 million dollars less. In 1870, Sir A. T. Galt said, in the course of his remarks upon the Hon. L. S. Huntington's motion for an American Zollverein, that he believed every person of intelligence was aware that the more free our transactions with the U. S. were, the better it would be, and that it was extremely desirable that commercial intercourse between the two countries should be unrestricted. Hon. Mr. Mackenzie said that the United States were necessary to us both as a market for our products and to obtain therefrom the necessary capital to develop our natural resources. Canadian manufacturers are of the opinion that commercial union with the United States should be beneficial to them, as it would give them a market of fifty million consumers. "We ask for protection because we cannot sell in the United States" said Mr. Wm. Spratt to the government in 1870 as the leader of a deputation of Ontario manufacturers, and in 1874, manufacturers from all parts of Canada stated to the committee of inquiry that all industrial pursuits would be benefitted by a commercial union with the United States. In these days of grand manufacturing processes and large producing powers of machinery, an extensive market is absolutely necessary. Our government have frequently attempted to renew the Treaty of 1854 but until now, the United States met our attempts with propositions of annexation, pure and simple; at present Mr. Wharton Baker, speaking as the representative of the American Manufacturer's Association, supported both by the Press and leading merchants, proposes to us a Commercial Union which will give us the benefits above enumerated.

Believing that it is our duty to secure a national prominence, we ask our Government and public leaders to take the necessary steps to secure us the right to make commercial treaties with foreign countries ourselves, and we also ask them to open to us the American market by effecting a Commercial Union with the United States.

CLERKS AS FARMERS.

Commercial callings have been long overcrowded and in consequence of the long-continued hard times and depression, clerks and young men have been forced to seriously consider whether it has not become necessary for them to find occupation and a means of livelihood in other channels, more particularly in agriculture. The commonly received opinion is that agriculture is a calling which can be taken up at hap-hazard, for want of a better, and which requires no particular ability or application in order to succeed therein; it is only necessary, so it is vaguely supposed, to put the seed in the ground and in some easy-going way, the crop is sold in the fall and all the money goes into the farmer's pocket. Very comfortable and very easy, and "while you are sleeping, your bread is growing" is a very pleasant proverb but only partially true.

The statement is made that young men should engage in farming—this is true but requires explanation. The proper time to engage in farming is at the age of fifteen just as is done in commercial affairs: not ten clerks in a hundred

who are more than twenty-five years old and who engage in farming, will succeed therein. It is a laborious calling and requires as much ability as any other; besides, a person who has been accustomed to the excitement and hurry and sham of city life is very apt to be discontented with the comparatively monotonous life on a farm. Clerks who have visited fine farms find everything *coulour de rose*, and that no especial ability or amount of capital is required to make a successful farmer. Then again they always calculate the amount of their crops in somewhat the same way as the sugar-beet *doctrinaires* do: to mention one instance, it was computed that the average crop per acre of sugar-beets would be twenty tons, *on paper*, and *on the barn floor* the crop was eight tons. A clerk who has gone to Manitoba told me that he would have thirty bushels of wheat per acre and have an average of three hundred, giving him a gross return of nine thousand bushels which at one dollar a bushel would give him nine thousand dollars—deducting from this fifty per cent. for expenses, he would have a net profit of four thousand five hundred dollars and this at the end of two years. He tried and "rushed things" and found himself in debt to the extent of three hundred dollars, besides being fifteen hundred dollars out of pocket—he had also to dig sixty feet for water, so he said, and came back to get thawed out: he said Manitoba was a very good place for those who liked it, but it was not the garden of Eden.

It is a common-place remark made by superficial observers, that a farmer cannot succeed in Lower Canada; this is attributed to the sterility or rather worn-out character of the soil. The English delegates were also of the same opinion and merely showed how erroneously persons may judge, when only a cursory examination is made. They showed the fallacy of their opinion—when they said that the farmers in the county of Compton were excellent. And, why is this? It is not difficult to answer, the mode of cultivation pursued in Compton is a proper one, whereas in other counties, as a rule, the mode of cultivation might almost be called degrading, if we can call it "cultivation" at all. I maintain and assert positively that capital either in large or small amounts can be as profitably used, (invested agriculturally) in Lower Canada as in Manitoba. Manitoba attracts persons more as a novelty than for any other reason; except perhaps the chimerical idea that wheat can be grown without labour.

A young clerk who wishes to engage in agriculture, should attend for a year or two a *good* agricultural college. I emphasize good—as I do not wish to be understood as referring to those miserable apologies for agricultural colleges at Richmond and L'Assomption. By attending a college he will soon learn whether he is likely to succeed as a farmer—but if he is unable to attend a college, let him engage for a year or two with an intelligent farmer, and work for small wages and his board. If he has no capital, it will not prevent him in the least from getting a farm—he can get land in certain districts for nothing or he can buy on long credit, or he can rent a farm for next to nothing. There is one thing to which he will have to make up his mind from the beginning and that is, to work both with his hands and his head. There are instances of farmers succeeding in Lower Canada while their neighbours have failed—the land was the same in both cases and the success depends therefore upon the farmer himself. The reason of the poor farming in Lower Canada is to be found in the fact that the land is in the hands of stupid, ignorant and lazy habitants. Their wants are few—they are possessed of no ambition—think the *cure* an infallible guide—and make no effort to rouse themselves from their lethargy. The Roman Catholic church is responsible for the ignorance of the agricultural class, and it may be asserted without fear of contradiction that were the farms in the hands of intelligent farmers, the financial condition of the Province would soon be altered for the better. The reason therefore that the agricultural interest is neglected in Lower Canada is not on account of the poorness of the soil, but on account of the mental poverty of the *habitants*.

A young clerk can do fully as well in Lower Canada on a farm, with or without capital, as he can in Manitoba. I will not say that he can do far better, but he can *live* far better. There is one fact which applies to agriculturists all over the Dominion, namely—that few farms are gold mines, but they produce men and not consumptive clerks. *George Rothwell.*

BEET ROOT SUGAR.

No. V.

We have to dwell in brief on the farmer's position as regards this momentous question, and in conclusion to show its politico-economical bearing. We have shown that a farmer with moderate good culture will realize \$100 from an acre (20 tons at \$5 per ton.) To equal this it would be necessary to raise 400 bush. potatoes at 25c. per bush., or 250 bush. corn at 40c. per bush., or 100 bush. wheat at \$1 per bush., or 125 bush. peas at 80c. per bush., or 330 bush. oats at 30c. per bush. This is problematical.

We will remark to those who see insurmountable difficulties in the undertaking in question, that we have in all respects an easier task than those who began the enterprise years ago in Europe. They had first to find out how to raise good sugar beets and how to extract in an economical way the sugar.