

the productive power of the country, who may complain? Great as has been the benefit resulting from our Agricultural Societies in all parts of the country, we have much work yet to do. So long as there is waste land to be reclaimed, or any portion of the country badly farmed, or there are neighbourhoods with poor, ill-provided stock—and how many such there are? we shall still have an unaccomplished mission. Besides, we need constantly the stimulus to continued improvement which these exhibitions afford; and we are all apt to have high notions of our doings and attainments. Contact with others at these exhibitions will have the effect of modifying them. Then, we must not flag in our progress; we must aspire to higher attainments. Love to our profession, and just views of its dignity and importance, are the basis of progress and success. The love of farming which prevails in many of the rural districts of France and Germany is due to the many agricultural schools and colleges which flourish there. Country life has real and substantial charms. There is in it a peacefulness and calm contentment which is welcome to every well-regulated mind. Horace, in one of his odes, says of it,

“Beatus ille, qui procul negotiis,
Ut prisca gens mortalium,
Paterna rura bobus exerceat suis,
Solutus omni penore.”

It does present the same attractions still; yes far greater are its allurements now. The Roman farmer groped in the dark; he had not the light of science to guide him, and his implements for tillage were of the rudest and most imperfect character. Above all he wanted the benign influences of Christianity to give him cheering promise of the life that now is and high hope for the future. His religion was such as lust makes welcome; of his religious services it is a shame even to speak. How elevating and ennobling are ours! There is too much reason to suspect that by many the life of a farmer is regarded as an unceasing round of dull toil, in its most repulsive forms, which must be endured, because it cannot be dispensed with. A great living philosopher, McCosh, eloquently gives the true estimate “When God gave the earth to the children of men, He meant it to be to them a source of something more than mere sustenance. There are scenes spread all over its surface, which have delighted or roused the soul of man, and helped to shape his character and his history. The fertile field the pleasant dale, the murmuring rill, the gently flowing stream the rugged mountain, the bold headland, the thundering cataracts, these have all been the means of soothing, of exciting or awing the spirit of man. The vegetable productions embrace and vary the effect by the lightness and gracefulness of their forms and harmony of their colors, by their tangled luxuriance in our meadows and by our rivers' banks, or by the sombreness of their hue and depth of shade which they furnish. These aspects of nature have all had their influence in raising up new ideas and fresh feelings in man's soul. The physical character of a region, the nature of its surface, whether flat or hilly, its soil and minerals, the size and flow of its rivers, the mountain chains which cross it, and the bays of the sea which indent it, the clearness or cloudiness of its atmosphere—all these have moulded to some extent the physical peculiarities of man and determined his tastes, his pursuits and his destiny.”

We ought never to forget that the advantages we

possess entail on us grave responsibility. Our responsibility keeps pace with our privileges. We must not be content with our present status. Every consideration of honor and duty demands that we should do all in our power to reclaim the waste places of our land, and to till better what we have under culture. There can be no limit to progress in agricultural science; finality is out of the question. How much has been done during this century in the elucidation of laws which were formerly hidden from man's observation, and how wonderful and varied their practical application has been! And who can estimate what will be the condition of our country and its people by the close of this century? Progression is geometrical; and we have the great part to play in the material development of the country. The requirements of the age, and above all our duty to God, demand that we shall go forward. The important question then is, do the majority of the farmers and mechanics of Canada really love their professions, or do they pursue them simply as furnishing means for subsistence? If the latter be the actuating motive, little progress will be made. Men do well what they take pleasure in doing; a man cannot be proficient in business which he does merely in a perfunctory manner. The supply of daily wants in America, as compared with the struggle for existence in many parts of the old world, is an easy task. Here nature is very bountiful in her gifts, in proportion to labor bestowed. Were our farms tilled and manured as they are in the best parts of Europe what would the products be? And, although in a new country, where there are many hardships to be encountered, it is a wise and beneficent provision of God that the means of subsistence should be easily procured, still it often proves one of the hindrances to agricultural improvement. When men get what they need easily, they are apt to aspire no higher. *Inciutem a men is*, as Quintillian says, are needed to lead to greater earnestness in the work of agricultural improvement. Much good has been done in Britain by meetings for discussion—chiefly by the instrumentality of Agricultural Societies and of Farmers' Clubs; during the last half-century, whole counties have been transformed. And even there, much yet remains to be done. Nothing, even in Yorkshire astonished me more than the large tracts of land still unreclaimed. It shows how slow is the march of improvement, even with all the skill and appliances of our times. Great Britain annually imports large quantities of food, yet much of the deficiency might be supplied by agricultural improvement. We do not need to import food, but by better tillage we could add very largely to our exports. My conviction is that we have lessened, *non t materialiter*, the *genus odium* power of the country, by the excessive drain which we have made on it for so many years. There can be no question that the most direct and economical recuperative process is in increasing the number of acres of grass and diminishing the number of acres of grain—in other words, by *more and better stock, and less grain*. After all, I should not say that the result will be *less grain*. The acres in grain would be fewer, but the gross product would be much larger, while we should have more beef, mutton, and pork, and of better quality. It is also of the greatest importance to economize food for stock as much as possible, because *labour is money*, and labour costs a good deal of money in Canada. There are *two* ways of doing this—by improving the quality of the stock, and by economy