

Agriculture.

For the Christian Messenger.

Thoughts on the Times.

MR. EDITOR,

There has been considerable said from time to time through the columns of the Messenger, and other periodicals, on the subject of Agriculture. Improvements, suggestions, experiments, and instructions of various kinds are given, doubtless by those who mean well, and would like to see the system of farming attain a higher state of perfection than it has yet arrived at in nine-tenths of the rural districts of the province. But unfortunately those persons, in their attempts to instruct the farming community, and to a large extent, deceiving themselves, and others, from the fact that they have altogether overlooked, and innocently neglected to show, the one grand error in farming; which error I shall presently notice, and endeavour to show.

And now, believing that you, and many of the readers of the Messenger, look with approval on any endeavours, tending toward the advancement, or improvement of a system in which we all have, or should have, a deep interest—I offer a few suggestions, on some glaring and self-evident evils that exist in connection with farming, as conducted—and if you think them worthy, please give them a place in your valuable paper.

It is a world-wide admitted fact, and principle, that there is but one true system to be governed by in reckoning the real cost, (consequently worth,) of an article—viz., counting the labor and capital judiciously employed in the manufacture of that article. That this is the only true system that will insure success in any legitimate occupation, misfortune &c., excepted, none I think will attempt to gainsay. Admitting this principle to be correct, we find farming almost an isolated exception to the rule. Should it be so? Could I have the combined voice of Acadia's intelligence, methinks it would be decidedly negative. If so, then there is a wrong; and a wrong of no small magnitude. It is conveying an untold amount of annoyance to those who have to do the labor. And if there is a wrong, should not the very best means be employed to arrest the evil? Yet strange to say, a large majority who feel there is an evil somewhere, cannot fully see where it is, or realize the nature of it. And until it can be shown where the wrong is, and in what it consists a little farther,—it would be folly to urge another basis of operation.

And now to bring it to view, I must again refer to the fact that farmers as a class, toil on from year to year without respect to the principle of reckoning cost, and consequently at a loss. They are thereby necessitated to exercise economy, and self-denial of many of the comforts, necessities, and enjoyments; not to say luxuries of life generally unknown, and unpracticed in other pursuits; and few who have seen "country living, and country thinking," as we have seen and heard it, would attempt to frame a denial to this fact. There are many who talk about farming, who so mystify the system, by running loss into profit, or making it appear so, that it is difficult for all to see it in its true light. There is no small amount of error entertained on this point, by many who believe, and try to make others do so, that farming, as conducted is profitable. To a man of this stamp, not a great while ago; I asked the question. Do you really believe that farming is a profitable business? His emphatic answer was,—“I do.” “And I don't know how you would undertake to show it is not.” Well said I, do you, or do you not believe that farmers generally, get good wages, (at least \$1 per day) for time employed, and money invested, in farms? “Well, I don't know as they do,” was his rather faltering reply. “We don't count that way.” I then intimated to him, that he ought not to be too confident, until he had taken more care in counting. This is just the trouble with farmers, they don't figure enough. They entirely neglect this point, and do not appear to realize that farming is the most important occupation engaged in by man, that all are dependent on the fruits of the soil. Therefore all engaged in it should be well paid. Why is it some one may ask that they submit, or remain apparently so easy?

Of course to a considerable extent it is their own fault; but not altogether. There are in different places, men who appear to be interested in Agricultural affairs, and seem to think that by introducing, or organizing Agricultural Societies they will accomplish a great object for the farming community. But in this they are doomed to be mistaken, if the idea is entertained, that by that means they are going to

work a "cure all" for the farmers. That there is a benefit derived from Agricultural Societies is certainly true, but that the farmers receive that benefit, except to a limited extent, I have yet to learn.

I know there are many who oppose this view, and are ready to say—I hope you are not going to find fault with or condemn the Agricultural Societies that are productive of such an amount of good. But let us stop first a little and examine, and whatever beauty or benefit there is we will be happy to see it. That there is more beauty than benefit, I am willing to admit. But "it won't pay at the price" it costs.

Now we'll suppose for instance, that an Agricultural Society, by expending fifty, or one hundred dollars, succeed in obtaining an improved breed of stock, say horned cattle. Then by particular attention and care in rearing, feeding, &c., we are fortunate enough to turn out what may be termed a fair specimen of "fancy oxen." They look well, and are doubtless a great improvement on the balky stock generally seen. But how is it, when the improved beef is driven into the market? We learn that it is overstocked, and the highest price to be got, will not exceed five, or six dollars, after all; until within the last year or so. Suppose the buyer is told that the beef is of superior quality; of a much improved stock; that extra care and attention were taken in fattening, &c., how much will it avail with him, whose policy it is to make a good bargain? He may admit the cattle are good; but that beef is coming in plenty, and can be got for so much, and that generally settles the matter. The sale may produce a snug sum; but having not counted the outlay there is nothing to show that a profit has been made. Hence the misery of the system; if system it can be called.

Against the idea of improving different breeds of stock, I have nothing to say. But the idea of an improvement that will not yield adequate recompense to those who labor, and produce that improvement, is contrary to the best laws of nature and art.

An extract from a New York paper lies before me which so immediately corroborates my sentiments that I cannot forbear to copy it:—

“The Farm is a manufactory,—it ought to be so regarded. The soil should be looked upon as bearing the same relation to the agriculturist, that any raw material does to the manufacturer of that specific raw material.

It is the stock from which is to be wrought out the marketable product. That which is put on the soil in the shape of seed, fertilizers, labor, &c., should always be charged or regarded, together with the interest on the money invested in land, as going to make up the cost of the product of the article manufactured from the soil; and the farmer should know precisely what this cost is; and it should govern the price at which he sells his produce.

Now this is a very simple and self-evident proposition. It has often been repeated; and yet it has got to be told a great many thousand times more before the mass of farmers will appreciate its importance, judging from the ratio of their progress in this matter through the past.

We refer to it now, and so often, because we believe it is as emphatically the basis in agriculture as in manufactures. And we intend to repeat it until our readers who do business haphazard and fail, shall understand how to go to work to find the leak that is sinking the ship.” —Rural New Yorker.

Now this is just what I want to see done; the farmers wake up to a thorough investigation of everything relating to their rights, and yielding to nothing that is wrong in this matter. And to meet this fully farmers must be better educated to the duties of their office and made to realize the fact, that it requires a thorough apprenticeship to learn how to farm and rightly to attend to the thousand and one things about a farm.

How long would a merchant, mechanic, tradesman, or manufacturer of any kind, continue to succeed in their business if they were to yield to the haphazard principle the farmers do? I presume any one can answer this. But we hear the question asked; if farming is such a losing business, how is it that so many farmers continue to live by labouring at it? There are many that cannot see how to solve this question,—I suppose for the reason that they do not think enough about it. But I'll endeavour to do so, and will have your readers to judge as to its correctness. I will answer it by asking; cannot the solution be seen to a large extent, by looking over the hundreds of exhausted oat fields and farm lots throughout the country? Yes! that is where it lies, in a worn out and exhausted soil, of which there is a large amount in many parts; and which is generally left to pasture, and new lands are brought in and treated the same way, thus, virtually living on their capital, as well as of their labor.

This evil system has got so thoroughly implanted with the mass of farmers, (having been

brought up to it) that it will of course take time to work a change. But many appear to think, or believe that there is no way of effecting a different course of procedure; telling us that "there is no help for it," yet after admitting that they labor at a great disadvantage, and loss on account of it. That they individually have no power to assist in resisting the evil, forgetting that the world is made up of individuals, and that each one doing their duty, all would be right. Now it is just in proportion to the number who know their duty, and are posted up in the rules and regulations that are calculated to benefit mankind, that proper instruction will be attained, and the fact brought more clearly to appear, that "knowledge is power."

Now if farmers would like to know something more on this matter; some rule whereby to govern themselves. They must learn that there is a limit to the demand for agricultural products, and that raising large crops, thus overstocking the market, and reducing prices is not profitable. What then ought to be done, we are asked?

Why, you must be governed by the demand for farm produce; and let that demand be such, that those engaging in farming may have good reason to believe that they can realize at least one dollar per day for wages, and six per cent on capital instead. And if it won't yield this it is not worth working at! For what is worth doing is worth being paid for! If all would bear this in mind, and act up to it, the advantages and benefits of the true system would at once be revealed; and the fact more forcibly appear, that so far as light excelleth darkness, so far doth truth surpass error!

I hope you will not think that I am indulging too far, or taking extra space in your columns. I feel that the subject demands much attention; and that too much can hardly be said upon it; and I hope more able exertions will yet be made to investigate a better state of affairs in this matter.

That truth and equality, may predominate in place of error, and want as the earnest desire of a

RURAL PATRIOT.

Onslow, Nov. 2nd 1866.

Correspondence.

For the Christian Messenger

HENTHADA, Aug. 28th 1866.

Dear Messenger,—

Every thing from Burmah must be of interest to very many of your readers. It can not but be that they pray much for the prosperity of a mission to which they give so much. Though I have, therefore, nothing particularly important or encouraging to tell of this time, yet I write in the confidence that my brief letter will find many attentive and interested readers.

The return of a missionary to America, about a year ago, threw upon me the care and responsibility of a large district, with two churches, four preachers, and a school-teacher, in addition to the superintendence of my own especial field. On a visit a few months since to that district, it appeared very desirable that one of the two churches should enjoy the labors of an ordained pastor. And finding, on consultation with the principal members, that they felt the need of a pastor, and that, moreover they were all united in the wish that Mong-tha-doon-bys, the preacher then stationed there, should be their pastor, I advised them to call a council to consider the propriety, etc. Accordingly on the 10th inst., a council, consisting of delegates from the Thong-zai, Rangoon, and Henthada churches met for consultation in the village of Letpidon. A protracted examination of the candidate resulted in a unanimous vote to proceed with his ordination. He was accordingly ordained on Sunday, Aug. 12th. The order of exercises was as follows:

- Sermon by Bro. Crawley.
- Prayer by Rev. The-t-nau, (Burman.)
- Charge to Candidate by Rev. Mr. Rose.
- Address to the Church by Rev. Ko Aing, (Burman.)
- Benediction by the Candidate.

About one hour after the conclusion of the above services, the new pastor administered baptism to two recent converts; and in the afternoon took part in administering the ordinance of the Lord's Supper.

Bro. Rose, of the Rangoon Mission, came back with me to Henthada, and then accompanied me to the large town of Opo, where we spent three days in constant and almost uninterrupted intercourse with numbers of the natives. Hour after hour passed away while the people listened with unwearied attention apparently, to the wonders of the Gospel, or propound-

ed for solution, the various difficulties which were suggested to their minds. On a former visit to this place, when still a mere tyro in knowledge of the language, I had met a man who was held in high repute for his learning. It was my happiness to meet the "great teacher" again this time, and I was enabled to show him, and the numerous "disciples" and admirers who came with him, the utter vanity of Buddhism, and the all-sufficiency of the Gospel. We were much gratified and encouraged by what we saw and heard during this visit to Opo. Tracts were sought with such avidity, that though we took a good supply, we should have found it easy to give away three times as many more.

There is startling news from Upper Burmah. Several of the king's sons have raised the standard of rebellion, murdered the heir-apparent, and are now marching on the Capital, Mandalay. Of course the whole country is in a state of the utmost anxiety. Speculation is rife, as to what the Indian Government will do, and ought to do in these premises. If a pretence for war is needed it is not far to seek, for the king seized a British Steamer, and fought the insurgents with her for hours. War with Burmah means simply annexation of course, a consummation devoutly wished by nearly all the Burmans, now under British rule.—My next letter may tell of British Burmah extended on to the frontiers of China.

Yours faithfully,  
ARTHUR R. R. CRAWLEY.

For the Christian Messenger.

Dissolution or Discipline?

DEAR BROTHER,—

I have every respect for Dr. Tupper's decision, and would not for a moment think of discussing with him a point of church order, and yet am not entirely satisfied with his "answer." I therefore beg the privilege of re-stating my difficulties, hoping that he will be able to shed some additional light upon this deeply interesting and important question.

1st. And in doing so, as I wish to look the matter fairly in the face, and go over the whole ground, I would propose at the outset this inquiry:—Has a church the power to dissolve by the mere consent of its members? Dr. Tupper assumes that since they voluntarily unite, they can as readily separate. But does this follow? The marriage contract is purely voluntary, but who can disannul it at pleasure? So of other unions. Church engagements are designed to be perpetual. The "solemn vow" of each member,—“a vow we dare not break”—is—

“That long as life itself shall last,  
Ourselves to Christ we yield;  
Nor from His cause will we depart,  
Or ever quit the field.”

It would seem then that we cannot "release each other" if we would, and this principle is always recognized in the individual, no one being permitted in any circumstance to withdraw from membership. And is it not a low view of church union to maintain that it can be dissolved at pleasure? And moreover, is it not the sole prerogative of the Head of the church to "remove the candlestick?" It then becomes a question, Whether He would at all recognize our attempt thus to destroy His body?

2nd. But admitting for the moment the power, can it be established that a church has the right to adopt this course? Allusion has been made to a building in danger of falling, and the prudent course in such a case, described, but is it not obvious that both prudence and right demand that before any action is taken the owner be consulted? "Whose house are we," says the Apostle, and where are we authorized to tear down what our Lord has built, and owns, and loves; or to separate what He "hath joined?" To justify such a course we must have a "scriptural warrant," but to what command, example, or even plain inference have we been directed? We have not even been shown what the "general principles" are that may be supposed to accord with it.

And here let me inquire what is Dissolution? Certainly it is either the exclusion of at least all who refuse or neglect to reunite, or it is not! If it is, is it the Scriptural method of dealing with offenders, or does it do justice to those who may be unwilling to enter into the arrangement? If it is not, does it not imply a direct refusal to comply with a divine requirement, and an unjustifiable neglect of an appointed means of grace? See 1 Cor. v. 5, together with 2 Cor. ii. 6—8.

3rd. But supposing it possible, and in extreme cases, justifiable, is it ever necessary or best? In order to consider this point, it is needful to examine the reason given for Dissolution, viz., the evils likely to result from Discipline. Now admitting the danger, I wish in