

will back him against anybody. He will get better crops out of poorer land, with less labor, and worse implements, than any other farmer that I have ever heard of. This is in its way, a satisfactory species of farming accomplishment, and the French Canadian farmer prefers getting a very moderate result, with a slight expenditure of labor, and none at all of capital, from a rather considerable extent of land, to getting the same from a very limited extent of land, at the cost of very hard labor. The *habitant* often mortgages his farm, and though he may take a long time about it, generally succeeds in paying it off also, but this is generally done for the purpose of paying off some obligation, or for the purpose of providing for the cost of some very necessary farm building. I have never heard of one borrowing money in order to spend it on the farm he already owns in the way of the purchase of fertilizers, draining, the purchase of better stock, or to place it in a bank as a fund to draw against, according to the exigencies of his farming operations as an English farmer would do. His way of getting an increase in farming returns is to buy more land, and where land is very cheap, it is possible that this plan, is as good as the other.

The propositions, that capital is not very necessary in farming, and that, while capital invested in trade, or manufacturing, bring certain return- and profits, according to the increase of capital put in the business, are neither correct, nor fair to agriculture. Increased capital in trade, or manufacturing is squandered away every day, by incompetent traders or manufacturers, and a farmer who squandered his capital away on useless operations would not be a good farmer. But, to a good farmer, the possession of working capital is of inestimable service in farming operations, directly or indirectly, and enables him to farm at a much increased ratio of profit.

The percentage of profit obtained from a farm or from anything else, is only of importance when the sum total obtained is a sufficient one for the needs of the worker, \$200 from one acre of land would be a very handsome return, but \$1000 from even a badly worked farm of 200 acres, would be a much more desirable result. The ordinary 120 acre farm would have to be very bad land indeed, if it were not worth more, than an acre of the very best land, to be obtained anywhere in this province, and the possession of a certain extent of land, is worth something in itself, where taxes are low and land not difficult to hold.

All things considered, I think that there is no doubt whatever, that the French-Canadian farmer would get his \$1000 worth of crops from his 120 or 200 acre farm with much less exertion and comfort to himself, than he would from the intensively cultivated small patch of land, in the most favorable situation.

Intensive culture on a very small extent of land is really market gardening and that only pays in close proximity to Montreal. You must be close enough to drive your own stuff into town. The market gardeners around Montreal fully supply the market. Facility of carriage, by railway, does not make up for the lack of this proximity. Instances are numerous of people living at very moderate distances by rail from town, who have tried market gardening and who have all, one after another given it up. The markets here, are not good enough, land is too cheap, labour too dear, want of agriculture knowledge too prevalent for anything like an attempt at intensive farming on small tracts of land on a general scale in this country. Let us try and be fairly good farmers, before we attempt to become intensive ones.

C. F. BOUTHILLIER.

Bleury-Ste-Thérèse.

