

tem. In our Canadian exhibitions a great deal is done for effect, and much money is spent in decorations to please the eye, while in Scotland it would be considered *infra dig.* to embellish the ground otherwise than by a fine display of live stock, showing the nearest approach to perfection in breeding, and of agricultural products of extraordinary excellence. A Canadian visiting the show grounds of the Highland Society, might first very naturally enquire and look for the "Ladies' Department," but he would look in vain, and say, Mr. President, what would *your* show have been to-day without the ladies' department?

Well might his Excellency the Governor General say, on visiting the Upper Canada show, that there was little to choose between it and the great national show of Britain. Indeed to the casual observer the Canadian Provincial Exhibitions are more attractive, and while there are many points in which we fall short, there are minor points, to us important ones, in which we even excel. I have particular reference to dege tools and the smaller kinds of farming implements, many of which, as made in Canada, are decidedly better adapted to our use than the corresponding English implements.

But there is another point of difference between our Canadian agricultural societies and those of Britain, more remarkable than any that has been noticed. Not only the national societies of Scotland and England, but all the county and branch societies are SELF-SUPPORTING. They do not receive—they do not ask from Government one farthing for their support. How do they raise their funds? The Highland Society its \$20,000 per annum; the English society, more than double that amount, by voluntary contributions. The benefits accruing to the country from their operations are so self-apparent that it needs no *bribe* to induce the farmers to become members; neither do they require, like some of our members, even with the bribe, to be dragged into the Society; on the contrary it is considered an honour to be admitted a member; so much so that a candidate for membership must be proposed and seconded, and thereafter elected by ballot at some one of the monthly meetings of the society. Does any one tell me that such a result, though attainable in "the old country," cannot be looked for in a new country like Canada? Let me point him to our neighbours across the St. Lawrence. I am not aware that the inhabitants of St. Lawrence county receive one cent from their State Government in support of agricultural societies, and yet, from all I can learn, agricultural societies not only exist there, but are supported with a spirit worthy of our imitation. Looking at the matter in this light, I have often been led to doubt whether our local agricultural Societies are really standing upon the firmest foundation. The fact that we find an agricultural society in almost every township of Upper Canada, does evidence solicitude on the part of our govern-

ment to advance agricultural interests, but does not afford evidence to my mind that the people we are above all others interested in agricultural improvement. It *may* be so, as it *may* be that we are influenced by a much less worthy motive—to secure an equal distribution of the dollars and cents. Why, sir, I firmly believe that if the Canadian Government could be induced to sanction a still further—more in infinitesimal subdivision of the public grants to agriculture, that we would, ere long, have an agricultural society in every school division of the Province. I do not make the sweeping assertion that improvement is incompatible with township societies. Some of them I am glad to know are doing good; I merely give it as my matured opinion that more good would result to the agriculture of Canada were a larger proportion of the public appropriation placed at the disposal of county societies.

All civilized nations have, in all ages, fostered agriculture as an honourable and indispensable employment of man, and the position which the Government of Canada has thus early assumed in relation to agriculture, is an indication that our rulers are alive to the vast benefits which an enlightened system of husbandry, together with a general diffusion of sound agricultural knowledge, must confer upon the country; and it is a just matter of pride for Canadians that they can boast of such an organization as takes the oversight of the agricultural interests of the Province. In connection with the Government, Canada possesses a special bureau of agriculture, provides for a professor of agriculture in the Provincial University, and expends annually from the public chest, \$111,000 in aid of agricultural societies.

In the United States, up to the present time the Agricultural Division of U. S. Patent Office has been the only visible or appreciable agency of this great and essential interest. This agency comprises as its personnel, a Superintendent, four Clerks, and a Curator or Gardener, and its average annual expense has been the paltry sum of \$53,000. In other words, Canada gives every man, woman and child of her population the annual sum of 4½ cents; the United States gives the sixth part of one cent to each individual of her population, towards developing the resources of that country.*

In justice to the Superintendent, however, must be stated that he remonstrates loudly against the inconsiderate and miserly policy of his government, and urges them to liberality commensurate with the importance of the purpose aimed at. In respect to the *mode* in which the American Government encourages agriculture, "the report" tell us that "from the 31st of December, 1860, to the same date 1861, 2,474,380 parcels of garden and flower seeds have been distributed of doubtful value; several varieties of flower seed were procured which have not been distributed, but destroyed because of their objectionable qualities, some of the

* There are also the separate State appropriations.—[H.]