

lauer, as any one in the land. It is not, therefore, the right of farmers' sons to leave off tilling the soil and betake themselves to other callings, that I would call in question, but the expediency of their doing so.

When we see hundreds of young men, dressed in holiday suits, going about seeking light, genteel employment but finding none—when we see every branch of business overdone to bankruptcy and starvation points—and when we see the professions overcrowded to an alarming extent, it is high time to inquire into the cause or causes of a condition of things so manifestly inimical to individual happiness and national prosperity.

The first question which naturally suggests itself is, whence come these young men? Are they for the most part the sons of our merchants? or are they the sons of our professional men? A few of them undoubtedly are, but the great mass of them come not from these classes; they are the sons of farmers—young men who, under some fatal delusion, left the farm and the paternal roof to seek their fortunes in new spheres of life. For this unfortunate condition of things the teachers of our youth are undoubtedly much to blame; in fact they must be held mainly responsible for the evil complained of. It is only under a false system of tuition that such a condition of things could exist. Did the science of agriculture occupy that place in the schools of our country which it should occupy, and did teachers impress upon the boys under their charge, that honest toil on the farm brings the blessed rewards of peace, plenty, and happiness, with a consciousness of independence that is supremely grand, and nowhere else to be found, we should not to-day have to lament over so many squandered homesteads and broken fortunes, as are to be witnessed on every hand throughout the land. Hitherto, the opposite of this has apparently been the province of the teacher. Every-

thing calculated to raise agriculture in the estimation of the boys, and make farm life attractive, has been systematically excluded from the school-room, while biographical sketches of this great man and the other great man, (but none of them farmers) have been almost the daily food of our boys. In most cases, the characters thus presented had been poor farm boys, or at all events country boys, who "had risen" by abandoning the farm and betaking themselves to books. The boys are thus taught that farming is not a respectable calling, that the social position of even a common school teacher, holding a second class certificate, is incomparably higher than that of the best farmer in his school section—that if they wish to become educated, respectable and great in the world, they must forever abandon the farm and farm labor. Every boy exhibiting an aptness in arithmetic is told nature designed him for the medical or legal profession, while scarcely one is considered too stupid to "learn the mercantile business." Farmers themselves caught the infection, and eagerly sought for opportunities to send their sons from the paternal roof, and give them a start on the high road to wealth, honor and fame. Nor has the delusion been confined to the teachers and farmers. I remember well about the time this pestilential fever was at the crisis, as the doctors say, it was announced that a young lawyer from London would hold forth to the natives on a certain night. His subject was to be, Self Made Men, or Men who have Risen, I don't remember which, nor does it matter much. Much to my chagrin and disappointment, it was the old story over again—poor boys becoming great and honored in the world. A whole regiment of bare-footed boys were passed in review, of all sizes and colors, with tattered garments, haggard countenances, and a general woe-begone appearance. The description of Daniel Webster with his father in the hay