

successfully in Manitoba. All the correspondents of the Bureau are agreed that it cannot be grown on the open prairie. But where the land is more wooded or sheltered spots can be obtained, the prevailing opinion is that the grain can be grown. Six instances only are given in which the experiment was tried, last Fall, and only one of these, at Brandon, proved successful. Of the remaining five tests made one, at Shoal Lake, is described [as "very poor;"] another, near Brandon was sown too late and therefore an unfair trial; two fields at Shoal Lake and Rock Lake respectively were killed by frost, the others failed from causes unknown. The prevalence of prairie fires and the greater certainty and yield of spring wheat are the reasons given that a larger area has not been attempted than the thirty odd acres reported.

With very few exceptions, says the report, referring to the growing spring wheat, "reports speak flatteringly of the wheat crop. The experience of last year gave farmers to understand that more attention must be paid to fall ploughing and early seeding, and as a result the wheat crop has been put in from seven to ten days earlier than in 1883." A noteworthy circumstance is the proportion of frozen wheat sown. In 197 townships the average so sown was fifty per cent. of the whole. Still more important is it to notice that, "at the time the reports were sent in (1st June) no difference was observed in the appearance of the fields where frozen and unfrozen seed had been sown side by side. From only one point, Township 2, Range 10, West, comes the report that the seed (No. 1 frozen) failed to germinate and had to be resown." This helps to settle the question, long and learnedly discussed, whether frozen wheat will germinate. It depends, of course on the degree of frost and the state of maturity of the grain when the frost comes.

"The average per centage of the 1883 wheat crop still in the hands of the farmers is thirty per cent. for the whole province. This is much larger than last year, and can be accounted for by the much larger yield, the quality being impaired by frost, and the want of railways and markets in several places. The total acreage made up from three hundred and twenty-three townships is 247,306 acres, an increase of nearly 40,000 acres over 1883. The average dates of the beginning and ending of seeding were April 24 and May 17 respectively. The average quantity sown per acre was 1.80 bushels. Of the several varieties, Red Fyfe has been sown in 242 townships; Fyfe in 36; Lost Nation in 3; Red Chaff in 2; Golden Drop in 20; White Fyfe in 34, and White Russian in 18."

Frozen oats, unlike frozen wheat, are unfit for seed; they have failed where tried. The oat crop has suffered somewhat from lack of rain but promises fairly well. The acreage under crop is smaller than last year because of unsatisfactory markets and the want of railway facilities in many localities. The acreage reported from 328 townships is 107,972 acres, being 40 per cent. less than last year. The per centage of 1883 crop still on hand at 1st June appeared to be 15 per cent.

Barley was backward, from the want of

rain, but a good deal of rain having fallen since the reports were sent in, the condition is probably improved. The total acreage reported from 299 townships is 32,968 acres, about 83 per cent. less than last year. The causes of this decline are similar to those given above with respect to oats.

The acreage of peas, though still small, is much increased: 3,194 acres against 1214 last year, mostly of the Crown and Golden Vine varieties. Flax shows a marked falling off: 4,180 acres compared with 10,817, sown mostly in middle of May. No explanation is given. Roots show also a falling off in quantity sown, whether of potatoes, turnips, beets or carrots. This is in part to be accounted for by the likelihood that potatoes would be planted in many localities after the reports were mailed. The area reported is 11,027 acres. No definite idea of the result of the timothy hay and clover crops was to be expected as early as June 1st, but the reports as to timothy meadows varied from "poor" or "promising" to "good" and "splendid." The cases where frost had destroyed the clover were few. From nearly every point a surplus of old hay is reported.

In the paragraphs describing oats and barley very significant reference is made to the want of markets, and the lack of railway facilities, as reasons for the decline in area sown. We have heard the same complaint made with respect to wheat-growing in superior districts of southern Manitoba, and the grievance is a real one. A private letter from the Souris district, dated the second week of June, states that: "I see that there is hardly any prospect of our getting a railway out here this year, so that I do not know what we shall do with this year's crop. The most of us still hold over a half of last year's crop, and cannot dispose of any of it. It is a great shame, the way we are being used. The Canadian Pacific people will not build our South-western railway, and the Dominion government will not grant to any other company a charter. It simply amounts to this, that the settlers will stagnate or starve on their farms until next summer, when they can get their patents and their leave, most likely for the neighboring territory of Uncle Sam, Dakota. I know that I shall not stay if a railway does not come. Brandon is seventy-five miles from us and Virden fifty miles, and they are our nearest markets. These distances are too great to team grain. The weather at present is very hot, the thermometer registering ninety in the shade yesterday."

The argument of farmers in this district very naturally is: "What encouragement is it for me to remain here, year after year, giving wheat or grain in profusion, if I am to lose the bulk of its price in costly cartage to a market? I can live, it is true; but how can I get ahead, under such circumstances, and how can I pay for my farm and provide for the enlargement of my operations if my wheat yields me only thirty to forty cents per bushel?"

What the Report has to say on this point is this, and we commend it to the attention of the C. P. R. authorities:

"In the Counties of Turtle Mountain, Russell, Shoal Lake, Souris River, and a portion of Norfolk and Rock Lake, the want of railway facilities is complained of. The distance to the nearest markets for the farmers in the majority of these

places is so great that farming cannot be made to pay satisfactorily. The small prices attainable last year for grain after drawing it in many cases long distances, have so far discouraged many settlers that a much smaller acreage of crop is reported from those counties, particularly the western part of Turtle Mountain, Souris River, Rock Lake and Russell. Last season the bulk of the wheat and oat crops was damaged and in consequence the market prices were low and unsatisfactory."

RECIPROCITY WITH THE UNITED STATES.

Unless we get a new Reciprocity Treaty with the United States, the old fishery dispute will be re-kindled. It must be an object of both countries to prevent so unpleasant a revival. If anything should come out of the movement at Washington, in favour of a new treaty, an arrangement about the shore fisheries of Canada and Newfoundland should form part of the bargain. The fisheries are outside of the trade question; something that would entitle Canada to more than an equivalent in the objects to be comprised in the schedule. The money bargain which the Americans made, under the treaty of Washington, for access to our shore fisheries was not popular in the States; rightly or wrongly the price which the arbitrators awarded was thought to be excessive, and it is almost certain that a new arrangement for a money payment could not be made.

Opinion in Canada, when the treaty of 1854 was negotiated, was almost unanimous; objectors to the treaty were difficult to find. There is no longer to be found the same unanimity which then existed. This is shown by the evidence taken before the Select Committee of the House of Commons, which, in 1883, enquired into the effect of the tariff on the agricultural interests of Canada. Part of the evidence was obtained by circular, and part *via voce*. To the Reeves of the various municipalities and the presidents of the agricultural societies circulars were sent. Besides each member of the House got seven copies, which he was at liberty to distribute to persons, in his judgment, most capable of giving correct answers. Many of the replies are of no value; they contain internal evidence that the persons interrogated were incompetent to speak on the subject. Several of the questions to which answers were sought, had more or less reference to a Reciprocity treaty with the United States. One of them goes directly to the point: "Would the Canadian farmer be benefitted by a Reciprocity Treaty with the United States?" The replies express every shade of opinion; some doubtful, some positive one way, and some another. Many contain special qualifications relating to the character of the Treaty, opportuneness or the want of it, local interests and local considerations. We condense many of the replies, preserving the general sense:

"Yes," and "No," are often pronounced with emphasis. One says: "A Reciprocity Treaty would benefit our farmers a great deal." Another: "I do not think Reciprocity would benefit our condition." "I think they would, as the duty on barley alone would counter-balance most other things, not to speak of horses, cattle, and sheep." "Leave them alone." "I think we are better without