

year the annual Government grant of \$100 was obtained and has been placed to the credit of the Association. There were held in 1882 twelve committee meetings on the following dates: Jan. 10th, 20th, and 27th; Feb. 13th, 18th, 22nd, and 24th; March 3rd, 10th, 16th, and April 4th and 26th. The Officers and Committee for the year were:—

A. Downs, President.

C. W. Anderson and Prof. Lawson, Vice-Presidents.

C. P. McLennan, Secretary.

R. J. Wilson, Assistant Secretary.

F. C. Stevens, Treasurer.

Messrs. Thos. Goudge, Joseph S. Belcher, W. H. Gibson, Geo. Piers, J. E. DeWolfe, Henry Keeler, R. T. Murray, John Naylor, Executive Committee.

The report is respectfully submitted to the Association by the Secretary,

C. P. McLENNAN.

The report was unanimously adopted.

A resolution was moved to the effect that the subscription be reduced to \$1 instead of \$1.50. Passed.

The Secretary laid his resignation on the table, mentioning that his duties were such as to preclude his giving the attention to the work that the office demanded. His resignation was accepted. The officers for the ensuing year were then elected as follows:—

President.—A. Downs; Vice-Presidents, C. W. Anderson, Prof. Geo. Lawson; Treasurer, F. C. Stevens; Secretary, Wm. McKerron.

Executive Committee.—Messrs. Jos. S. Belcher, Henry Keeler, Thos. Goudge, W. H. Gibson, J. H. Burton, J. Reddan, J. E. DeWolfe, Geo. Piers. The above were all re-elected with the exception of Messrs. Wm. McLeod, J. H. Burton, and J. Reddan.

The Treasurer's report was read, revealing a pleasant condition of the finances.

Six new members were proposed and accepted: Messrs. Henry Bauld, Welsford West, Archibald Graham, J. H. Burton, H. Fuller, and J. S. Franklyn.

The President reported that he had had an interview with the Halifax County Agricultural Society in regard to the holding of a show of poultry in connection with the Agricultural Exhibition to be held in the Autumn, and suggested that a prize list should be offered by the Association. The matter was laid over for the consideration of the incoming officers.

The meeting was very enthusiastic and the general feeling was that the Association is entering upon a new era of success and bids fair to eclipse all its former efforts in the extending of its operations.

To the Editor of the Journal of Agriculture

DEAR SIR,—In the February issue of the JOURNAL there appears a communication from Truro, commenting on my letter to *Annapolis Journal* on Maize as winter food for farm stock. The writer intimates that I have not been sufficiently explicit in my statements, and that it

would have been more satisfactory had the grounds of my conclusions been stated; "because," he says, "there are persons slow to believe that green fodder corn possesses any such value." The accuracy of his say is indisputable. There are lots of persons "slow to believe," who, if they saw an animal dying of strangulation from eating turnips, would express doubt unless convinced of the fact by positive truth. Possibly, it would have excited some pleasant emotion could details of the experiment have been given in *extenso*; "that," as he adds, "the ignorance of these people may be enlightened." My apology for omission must be that I was not aware Truro, in the farming line, contained any persons ignorant of the value of Maize—in all its varieties—as a supplement to a dry pasture in summer, and a short common in the winter; furthermore, when the article was penned, persons who pin their faith to those popular nutritious condiments, straw and turnips, were not under consideration. My motive in bringing this, as I considered, important business to notice had reference only to the practical part of the operation, not in a science point of view.

Our method of farming, although it may, in some degree, be systematically pursued, is rarely conducted on scientific principles. We have no cradles of Agriculture—no experiment stations for affording to the people opportunities for thorough education in Agriculture and those sciences which it calls to its aid. A comparative analysis of the substantive food for farm stock, and the rationale of the principles of feeding animals for a special purpose, are practical experiments which require to be scientifically investigated. It is evident that the field is too great for farmers to cope with individually. It would be an extreme stretch of energy on the part of "rusticus" to periodically weigh his stock—to record in definite weights the amount of the various substances required for a given number of pounds of live weight and establish a feed ration. We have men no doubt that could do it, but the result arrived at would be open to question, and, unless endorsed by the highest authority—the knowledge obtained would be serviceable to none but the experimenter. Mr. Colchester says, the straw and turnip men "refuse to accept unquestioned a bald statement." Unquestionable they are wise people. There are any amount of bald statements copied from exchanges into our dailies that have scarcely an Agricultural hair about them. Of course, straw and turnip people know what reliance to place upon them. Mr. C. says, "they have"—meaning the straw and turnip people—"an idea that swedish turnips and mangles are not inferior to fodder corn, and argue from this, that, 4½ tons of swedes are not more than

equal to a ton of hay." Furthermore, Mr. C. says, "we know that turnips and straw have been largely and successfully used in the fattening of cattle." I am not disposed to say the above quotations are *dequos*; but it would have been more satisfactory if some definite value had been given to the hay, and the quantity required of these several articles as food, "Straw and turnips," for a maintenance ration. Mr. C's criticism begins at the latter part of my letter and reads as—"that the cost of ensilage from fodder corn fully prepared and stored is two dollars per ton, and that in nutritive value 2½ tons of this preparation are equal to a ton of hay. These are my words: "The cost of ensilage through the process including feeding is at the rate of two dollars a ton, and hay medium quality," the average or medium quality is \$10.00. In conversation with Mr. Fitch, who had charge of the stock, these questions came up—the value of the hay, and relative expense? feeding the ensilage? fifty cents a ton he reckoned would cover expenses? it was rather more labour taking the fodder from the silo than taking hay from a mow? Again, I am made to say: Ensilage alone does not contain all the ingredients required to put flesh on an animal. I don't say that—my words are: "Those who practice soiling or house feeding are cognizant of the fact that green corn does not contain sufficient nutriment to fully supply the requirements of the dairy, or fit animals for the shambles, any more than good hay." The straw and turnip men may have a peculiar method of running a dairy, and fattening cattle for the slaughter with their raw alimentary rations, and attain flattering results. But it is generally understood that these combinations are slow in effect, and in the wind-up not so economical. There are certain facts often overlooked when turnips are fed—exhalations are more profuse—and the animal forces are taxed in proportion to a super-abundant moisture. Observant farmers are aware that coarse food rations require more water than a nutritious and concentrated food; hence the rationale of combining some kind of succulent food with straw. The sequent of a nitrogenous ration, in excess, is an increased flow of liquid; results, swashy animals, and bespattered stables. Mangles are mentioned by Mr. C. as a root not inferior to fodder corn—they and turnips in the aqueous element are twins. Mangles are said to be more valuable for feeding purposes than swedes,—from special and personal experience I do not uphold that view.

There is difference of opinion among farmers, and good ones too, respecting this variety of beet; no doubt a good specimen of the tribe, selected with regard to saccharine qualities, would, with