

of emigrant labourers is, *to get them absorbed amongst the farmers, and their labour expended in increasing the quantity of productive land.*

The great question is, how is this to be effected. And here again, does not the question present itself,—Have not the inhabitants of Canada looked rather to the aid of Government and the parent country, than to the energies of their own minds, and the employment of their own resources ?

We are told, though we decline to admit the truth of it, that agriculture in Upper Canada is in a depressed, and, if we are to believe some of our public prints, in a declining state. Surely the simple fact, if it be admitted to be one, (and it cannot be denied) namely, that thousands of families are annually supported upon from 20 to 50 acres of land in plenty and comparative luxury, is an answer to such mischievous libels upon the agriculture of the Province, more especially when it is remembered that the only capital possessed by these settlers is the labour of the farmer and his family. Imagine, for a moment, that these people had to pay money for the comforts they enjoy, would their labour if employed in any other way than farming procure these for them ?

But it is said that Farmers with capital do not make farming profitable. There are very many exceptions even to this assertion, and probably the exceptions prove the fallacy of the remark. To put the matter in its proper light, take a good practical farmer from England or Scotland, with a competent capital, and place him here on the same quantity of equally productive land which he occupied there, say 2, 3, or 400 acres, and let the result determine whether he gets a better return for his capital here or there—not forgetting that there, the value of his property was stationary, or perhaps diminishing, whilst here it is sure to be yearly increasing in value. Every thriving farmer in Canada (and there are thousands of them) who has had the experience, will give his testimony on the side of the question favourable to Canada. It is said that agricultural produce is low. It is universally admitted that five shillings per bushel is a remunerating price for wheat. The price of wheat will fluctuate here as well as elsewhere, and if farmers some years get six shillings per bushel for wheat, they must at other seasons expect to sell for four shillings. The average produce of wheat for the last six

years, has, however, been about five shillings per bushel.

The reputation of Canadian agriculture has laboured under the disadvantages of "*being conducted on a small scale,*" "*with insufficient capital,*" and by "*inexperienced persons.*"—Had those persons who complain of want of success as farmers, under similar circumstances been placed in any other country, or in any other line of business, the result would have been the same, namely, disappointment and poverty. How many gentlemen, some from the army, some from the navy, and others from the more private walks of life, have mistakenly expected to live (and still like gentlemen) upon the produce of 20 or 30 acres of cleared land, whilst the capital employed amounted to probably only £300 or £400, out of which a house was to be built, furniture purchased, and a year or two of subsistence abstracted ? The thing is impossible, and a little deliberation would induce a full conviction of the unreasonableness of such expectations.

We are, however, expecting to see our shores crowded with emigrants, and we must take farming as it is, and farmers as they are. It appears to us to be certain that the prosperity of the country demands that not an agricultural labourer should be employed on our public works whilst a vacant space remains to be filled up in the ranks of the farmer.

How can this be best effected ? It is assumed that *the bulk of our agricultural population would gladly, and could profitably, employ additional labourers, if they had the means of paying them.*

If this be not so, what can be said for the enterprize of Canadian farmers ? Is it intended to assert that they will prefer vegetating upon 20 acres of land, when they could get rich by cultivating 100 acres ? If this be so, Government has made a fatal mistake in dividing the country into allotments of 200 acres each ;—the quantity ought rather to have been 50 acres. But the fact is not so. There may be a few men so destitute of energy and enterprize, but the great majority feel differently. They well know that so small a *MODICUM OF LAND*, though it may supply their present wants, will not provide for the future exigencies of a large family, and decrepid old age.

Estimating our whole population at 450,000 souls, we can have but little short of 100,000