

trated in their application to agriculture as well as to other pursuits. The farmer's boy has been taught long enough how to figure out the gains and losses in mercantile transactions; let him now be taught, for example, how to calculate what percentage of nitrogen is in the carbonate of ammonia which is constantly escaping from the manure heap, and the enormous losses which farmers suffer by allowing the nitrate of lime to escape with the drainage water. Such are real practical questions which would tend to draw the boy's attention to the farm instead of to the counter.

I await with interest and curiosity the decision of our education authorities in important question. No credit is due to them for their skilful treatment of branches with which they are perfectly familiar; but with regard to the introduction of agricultural subjects into our public schools, I anticipate great bungling, in which the real interests of agriculture will be totally ignored.

Agricultural Education in the Maritime Provinces.

"H. F.," whose letter appears in our correspondence columns, says that our "criticism on the Guelph Institution has rather dampened the ardor for a similar Farm and School for the Maritime Provinces, which at one time seemed to be taking hold of the people."

It appears that we have been as much misunderstood in this question as we have been in our policy with reference to live stock. Some people do not want to understand us, and they attempt to twist the plainest Anglo-Saxon for the purpose of misrepresenting us. We are not against the establishment of agricultural schools and farms, providing they are conducted in the interest of agriculture and not for political purposes. The Guelph Farm is not only a political machine, but its experiments, with a few exceptions, are a fraud upon the farming community. If they are accurate, then those of hundreds of the best professional investigators must be regarded as fraudulent.

Individuals are, probably, not so much to blame as circumstances. We believe the Government is desirous of placing the institution on a sound foundation, but it does not know how, and must, therefore, be guided more by intriguers and speculators than by more honorable powers. It regards us as its enemy; it never asks us for suggestions, and if we make any it opposes them in the interests of our more avowed adversaries, who are the most intimate friends of the Government. It is quite possible that the Government has implicit confidence in these people. It can gain nothing by kicking against independent journals.

The staff of the Guelph Institution, already over-burdened with work, have undertaken the task of lecturing to the farmers. Farmers' Institutes are an American institution, and have been started for the purpose of booming up certain agricultural colleges and farms which could not otherwise command the confidence and respect of the farmers. If we could point out a single American boom which, having crossed into our territory, produced any beneficial results to our farmers, then we would have greater confidence in these Institutes. If the professors go around for the

purpose of gathering information, then the farmers should not be called upon to foot the bill; if their purpose is to impart instruction in what they know about farming, then they should be able to show that they can farm for profit, as well as do model farming. If they teach through the light of their own experiments, they teach false principles and practices, and it is no wonder that their system costs the country tens of thousands of dollars annually. If they had investigated anything that could be turned to profitable account, then by their superior knowledge, they ought to be able to make farming pay. The lack of the business qualifications necessary to conduct a large farm has done a great deal towards intensifying the evil.

A sharp line must be drawn between the Farm and the College. Mr. James Mills, President of the latter, is an indefatigable worker, and the high standing of the College as a literary institution is almost entirely due to his energy, ability, and scholarly attainments.

The "Bohemian Oats" Swindle.

A correspondent of the "Country Gentleman" says that the fraud is still constantly breaking out in different parts of the United States, notably New York and Michigan, and he sums up the character of the swindle in the following words:—

"The plan is this: They form an 'association of local farmers, promise them 'inside track' or 'ground floor' in a 'big thing.' Each buys 2 to 20 bushels of the oats, giving note for the same at \$10 per bushel, due a year hence. The 'association' agree to take of each member the next year twice as many bushels as he buys of the 'association,' paying him net \$7.50 per bushel for them. Usually a part of those who go in the first year get out even, so far as cash is concerned, and sometimes make a little, by passing on the swindle to their brother farmers. The Chagrin Falls Exponent truly says 'the grain itself is worthless,' meaning that it is worthless as a crop to raise. The yield per acre in Ohio (and they always have the best field and best care) is from 5 to 40 bushels, the average not exceeding, in my judgment, the average per acre of wheat. For feed, the grain is worth little more than ordinary oats, being without hulls. But they are not good for the manufacture of oatmeal. Ferdinand Schumacher, of Akron, Ohio, the largest oatmeal manufacturer, I think, in the United States, has repeatedly stated that he cannot use them. They are not a profitable crop to raise even if you could get the seed for 25 cents per bushel. Thousands of bushels have been fed to stock by disgusted Ohio farmers when they found they could not get \$7.50 per bushel for the seed, nor sell it at all, nor raise it as a paying crop. Every farmer in Ohio who has ever touched the swindle will substantiate the above, unless he has oats on hand that he still hopes to 'shove off' upon others before the facts are exposed."

Prof. Brown, an English author, in his work on "Animal Life," says that the tendency of animal life in domestication is, in his opinion, "the survival of the unfittest." He looks upon an animal as "a tub with a hole in the bottom," which must be filled by pouring into it quickly, because the quicker you pour in the less the waste.

PRIZE ESSAY.

The Agricultural and Social Elevation of Farmers.

BY C. H. EASTLAKE, RIDGETOWN, ONT.

I hold it truth with him who sings
To one sweet harp of divers tune,
That men may rise on stepping stones
Of their dead selves to higher things.—Tennyson

It has been a popular error in our country, that the exercise of talent is not necessary in the business of agriculture, that a person naturally stupid would make a decent farmer, and that education, in its common acceptation, is of no advantage in its social corner of agricultural prosperity. The theme or countersign to agricultural prosperity should be to-day, to all tillers of the soil, "onward," "upward."

Should the error of no education, no business talent be the supreme thought among farmers, where would the agricultural interests of to-day be? How often is it that people act on this ridiculous assumption? And if in the family there be a son endowed with a little more intellect than the others, this one must have the advantage of an education; perhaps sent to college, then to some profession, or established in some mercantile business, while the others, with essentially no more education than that of the brute nature, were kept on the farm to till the soil. The cause is, as I may say, the degradation of agricultural principles, and farmers have been looked upon by other classes as an inferior, ignorant sort of people; society working on such fictitious ideas, has converted this feeling into a reality, for if a class of beings are treated as inferiors, they feel and act as if they were more and more so, grovelling as it were during the lapse of time. To illustrate this, I might refer to the aboriginals, the red men of the last century, and their wild cannibalism, as compared with their civilized and domesticated state of to-day, scarcely indicating that they belonged to the same species.

However, I deny that the business of agriculture can be followed up successfully by persons of no mental capacity. On the other hand, I affirm that the highest grade of talent will lead to superior results, as in other businesses and other occupations.

Persons in other occupations adopt a different process of labor, for instance, an engineer, a carpenter, a dentist, a lawyer or a physician, is ordinarily obliged to serve an apprenticeship, and learn both by theory and practice the different parts of his trade or profession; yet by common consent (or, as it were, by the instinct of society), if an individual in other trades or professions advertised to do things in an art or profession before he has learned how by theory or practice, he is looked on as a knave or a fool; it is constructively supposed that any of these tradesmen would make a first-rate farmer in less time than it takes to raise a whisker, providing the physical strength accompanies the will or desire.

The whole of this popular prejudice, or popular error, or what you have a mind to call it arises from a false estimation of the very foundation on which agriculture is based. It is by no means asserted that all agricultural knowledge must be the result of manual labor. The professional man, the mechanic, and the merchant, may acquire more knowledge of the principles of farming in one year than the ordinary unthinking farmer in his life-time.