

If inspection shall ever be worth the name, the owners of the inspected meat, dead or alive, ought to pay the expense of inspection. This, also, were it enforced by statute, would very soon establish an exclusive dead meat trade on a satisfactory basis, whilst the live meat trade would be given up as hopeless.—*W. B. in Agricultural Gazette.*

At a time when agricultural education is exciting the attention of our people, the following debate, from a Hartford, Connecticut, paper, will be read with interest. The opinion of F. Ratchford Starr should have weight with Nova Scotian farmers. It is pleasing to see that the Connecticut men are not satisfied to fill the air with phantom colleges, fairy farms, and such like phantasmagoria, but make themselves heard by the clink of American gold, and base their schemes on the substantial hard pan of real estate. We have not yet arrived at that stage in Nova Scotia, but we hope the discussions that are now going on in the granges and newspapers will elicit the liberality of some prince of fortune, and lead our legislators into some feasible scheme whereby the needed supplies can be obtained:—

In the house this morning Mr. Hull of Stonington called from the table the resolution providing for an annual appropriation of \$8,000 for the Storrs Agricultural school. The question was on the amendment offered by Mr. Staub of New Milford, limiting the appropriation of \$5,000 per year for three years.

Mr. Hull desired to introduce an amendment to Mr. Staub's, authorizing the trustees of the school to accept of a deed of the property from Mr. Storrs.

Speaker Harrison said he was obliged to rule that the proposed amendment was not cognate, and could not be entertained at this juncture of the debate. It could be submitted after the Staub amendment had been disposed of. A similar amendment by Mr. Noble of Bridgeport was not entertained, and the discussion was proceeded with on the amendment offered by Mr. Staub.

Mr. Starr of Litchfield, addressed the house as follows:

Mr. Speaker—I am not sorry that the matter now before the house is being fully discussed. When it was proposed to reconsider the vote giving \$8,000 annually to the Storrs Agricultural School, I cheerfully assented. The school is a state institution, and all who cast their votes here, whether for or against it, should fully understand its objects.

Mr. Augustus Storrs certainly made the gift to the state in good faith, as is proved by his subsequent action, of which I shall speak in a moment. The \$6,000 in cash presented to the school by Mr. Charles Storrs stamps his recognition of his brother's sincerity and liberality.

It gives me no little pleasure, Mr. speaker, to inform the house that I hold in my hand a new deed to the state of the property in question, executed by Mr. Storrs, March 1st, 1884.

This differs from the original deed in that it provides that after the school has been maintained by the state twenty years from March 18, 1883, "the said premises to become the property of Connecticut in fee simple without any reversion to the party to the first part—Mr. Storrs—certain water rights excepted.

Also, that if the state of Connecticut desires to dispose of or sell the said property before the lapse of said period of twenty years from the 18th day of March, 1883, it may do so upon the payment of \$12,000, which is but little more than one-half the appraised value of the gift of Mr. Storrs and his brother Charles, conditioned, however, "That the said premises shall never be used for an insane asylum, a poor house, a reformatory, or a charitable institution of any kind except a school for educational purposes, without the written consent of" Mr. Storrs.

I knew the school merely by name, till the senate did me the honor, last winter, to appoint me one of its trustees. Though I duly appreciated the compliment paid me by such appointment, I very reluctantly accepted the trusteeship. I certainly should not have accepted it were it not that I had identified myself with the agricultural interests of the state, and desired to do what little I could to promote them.

The small number of boys at the school has been commented upon. This is owing to no fault of the school, but arises from the fact that the school is yet comparatively new, and is not understood by many of our farmers and others who are likely to avail themselves of its advantages. This difficulty, or objection, is likely to be removed to a great extent, by the discussion of the bill before us. There is no reason why the school should not before ere long be filled to its utmost capacity.

It now rests with the state to decide what support it will give the school. To appropriate a sum that will barely keep it in existence would be to deprive it of much of its usefulness, and certainly not an economical nor wise course to pursue.

Experience has taught the trustees that the annual appropriation should not be less than \$8,000, and the committee on agriculture, after giving the subject due consideration in their committee room, and at the school, have reported unanimously in favor of such appropriation.

What, Mr. speaker, is the Storrs agricultural school? Not a state farm, worked by the state as a mere farming speculation. It is a training school—an agricultural training school, where the sons of Connecticut are instructed in practical and scientific farming, so that they may learn to farm Connecticut or other land to the best possible advantage, thereby advancing their individual interests, and adding largely to the prosperity of the state. It is not to be questioned that her interests are, in a very large degree, identical with those of the tillers of the soil.

But as to training schools! West Point is a national training school, but for which, "the late unpleasantness," would have proved much more unpleasant than it did. We hear of no battles fought, nor victories won at West Point, though there is a daily call to arms there of every branch of the service. Its vast importance, though sometimes questioned in time of peace, is clearly seen

in time of the nation's need. So is it with the naval school at Annapolis. Would that the nation had a fleet as creditable to it as is that training school! A recent event—one that sent a thrill through the civilized world—renders it unnecessary to advocate the value of that school before the legislature of this state, so prompt and so hearty in the recent passage of a vote of thanks to one of her sons, a graduate of that school, who—regardless of personal danger—saved the lives of perishing fellow creatures.

If we train our young men who are to till our soil, we shall do more than can be accomplished in any other way to stop the exodus of large numbers who leave our farms to seek other homes and other occupations.

Massachusetts and other states have agricultural schools in successful operation.

The question naturally arises, does Connecticut need such a school?

Let the following figures, taken from the last government census, speak for themselves:

Connecticut, in 1880, had 30,598 farms, comprising 2,453,541 acres, valued at \$121,093,619; add farming implements and machinery, \$3,162,628, and live stock in state, valued at \$10,959,296, making in all \$135,185,834, exclusive of crops, the value of which may be imagined when I name but one—hay—as valued at over \$8,000,000.

It might be supposed that the figures given demonstrated the great agricultural success of this state, and that no state aid was needed. Not so! The enormous figures given prove the vast importance of the agricultural interests of the state, not its agricultural prosperity.

During the ten years, from 1870 to 1880, the number of farms in every New England state increased. The increase of the number of farms in Connecticut for the ten years was 5,090. But—and it is a very important but—the value of the farms in this state, though thus increased in numbers, depreciated \$3,177,472. The value of farms in Massachusetts during the ten years increased \$29,764,631. Massachusetts has, as I have already stated, a flourishing agricultural school.

Does Connecticut need such a school? Were it possible to estimate the millions of dollars which flowed into the Massachusetts treasury apart from, but influenced by, its agricultural prosperity, and the fearful loss sustained by our state, of which the more than three millions of dollars depreciation in value of farm lands is but a part, we should be startled.

Connecticut may well be proud of many of its farms, but this cannot be said of many more within her borders. We have too many unimproved and neglected farms.

The merchant who puts no money into the bank would be unreasonable were he to expect that he could draw any out. So with the farmer who neglects to enrich his fields, but hopes to get crops from them year after year.

He starves himself who thus starves his fields.

Land that is generously enriched, will be generous in its yield. Like its Divine Master, it "loveth a cheerful giver." It is no new doctrine "He who soweth sparingly, shall reap also sparingly, and he who soweth bountifully, shall reap also bountifully."

If farming in New England cannot be made remunerative, where did the many