

tion to escape the fierce summer heat of his own land, and who can at once reply that the best help that employers in Massachusetts and the neighboring States can obtain comes from this Province; that a man or woman applying for employment in Boston can hardly give a better reference than to say that they came from Nova Scotia. Our traveller finds the problem more insoluble than ever. He gives it up, and in this he is but following the lead of clear headed men who for generations have considered this, have written and talked on the subject, but who still saw our land remain unsettled, and our people seeking in preference a living elsewhere. I have lived among you more than twenty years, have farmed amongst you for sixteen. I can speak with some knowledge of the country, and with personal experience of an agricultural life; I can testify that with reasonable care every crop grown in temperate climates such as that of England, bears at least as well here, that as a general thing prices are good, and sales certain. I do not purpose giving my own financial experience, but I have learned enough to understand why all our young men do not, under present conditions, take to a farming life and it will be well to consider the obstacles, and enquire if they can be removed.

I believe the question resolves itself very largely into the very natural enquiry, "Does farming pay?" Is a fair return obtained for the interest of the value of the land, for the capital invested in stock and implements, as well as fair wages, or remuneration for the work done by the farmer and his family? Now, this is, I believe, the rock on which so many split, that the young people get disgusted and take the first chance of escape. Here, under present conditions, a farmer on a good farm, which he owns, has an easy, comfortable life, thoroughly independent, and very little hard work, although very little actual cash. But I believe in most cases that his year's operations would not stand the test I propose; in fact the returns do not justify the outlay, and the spread of education super-added to the native common sense of our people teaches them this is not right, and they leave. I have expressed the view elsewhere that our system or want of system of farming is in fault. Mr. Caird, or some other leading agricultural authority, in a letter addressed to the English press lately, expressed the view that not only was there no system of agriculture suitable for all countries, but that even in a country like England the conditions of land, appliances, climate and markets were so various that every farm must have a system of its own. Here in Nova Scotia our earliest farmers occupied the alluvial lands at the heads of the bays,

and trusted largely to hay, which was produced on these marshes without any effort; as the country settled inland, intervals furnished hay, and the system of depending on hay as a main crop was adopted even by farmers working only upland. Any one who will give but a few minutes' thought will see that hay farming on upland, even if all the hay be consumed at home, must in a measurable time run a farm completely out, that the amount restored to the land will not maintain it in a productive state, the farm is starved; the owner next starves, and his children imbibe a dislike for the occupation; they seek a living elsewhere, and naturally gravitate to the nearest large town. The country feeds the towns the world over, supplying fresh, healthy inhabitants to replace those who get used up in the mill of city life. As an illustration of the necessity for adapting ourselves to the changed conditions, I can quote the position of my neighbors. Before the days of railroads, Halifax obtained all the hay it required by road, and the farmers within 20 or 30 miles devoted all energies to raising hay, carrying back goods of every kind as supplies for their neighborhood—thus getting a load both ways—the railways now carry in hay from places 100 miles away, and do all the return transport. The farmer of the neighborhood had his prices for his only marketable article cut down, and, losing his transport business, became poorer and poorer. He blames farming as not affording a living, and now in many cases the farms are deserted and mainly for want of readiness to adapt his system to his changed surroundings. This case is really our own, although the details differ—we must adapt our system as circumstances and conditions change.

I was much interested in a description given lately in the *Times*, the great London newspaper, of the agricultural industry of the Southern States, and there were some points so similar in it to our own condition that I had intended to read it, but the hour is now so late. It points the folly of depending so much on one crop, shows how the country languished until a wiser policy was initiated, and instead of accepting the position of being merely a grower of cotton for factories in other parts of the world, it has now laid itself out to produce what it wants for itself, such as is suited to its climate; and the prosperity created thereby is so great that it is no longer contented with supplying itself with raw material only, but has decided to work up these into articles of general use; and the exhibition held last year at Atlanta, in Georgia, showed what strides were already being made in this direction.

In my early days in Nova Scotia, I was passing through the neighboring

county (Guysborough), and, chatting with a resident, he, in describing his mode of life, mentioned "my potato land always grows potatoes, and my oat land oats," I was staggered and asked if he had no system of rotation, but he assured me that this was his regular practice. There were several feet of snow on the ground, else I should have requested an introduction to his crops.

In the county to the east of us I was informed by a sensible and intelligent man, who preferred to follow farming as an occupation—I do not like to style him a farmer—that it was the practice in his neighbourhood to plough up the land and take two or three crops of oats, then let the land run out to pasture, till it got rich again; that the cattle were yarded at night on land intended for potatoes the following year, and that all the manure was reserved for wheat. Could farming prosper under such an arrangement?

In the late issue of the *American Agriculturist* I read an advertisement "Mixed farming in Nebraska, grain, corn and live stock growing combined," and most "profitable and agreeable of any occupation." Now I believe that in this the advertiser has struck the nail on the head; this is what we can and must do in Nova Scotia, follow mixed farming—grain and live stock combined—but even when we arrive at this we are only on the threshold. We now come to the necessity for intelligence and thought.

Years ago Mr. Mechi, the razor strop maker, taught the farmers of England to think about their business, and of course stirred them all up against him, but he, with all his zeal and faith, took the tone that grain paid the expenses; and that cattle were a drag necessary to maintain fertility, but not at all profitable, and I fancy that our best farmers here now hold pretty much that view. I go further, I maintain that under the system we have hitherto followed we have lost money by feeding cattle. That is, that taking the amount of food given to an ox at its selling value we have all lost money by keeping him. He eats \$50 worth of food, and very rarely adds that to his value during a winter season. Now this will not do, we must improve on this arrangement, we must aim at making profit, both in cattle and in grain.

In an address delivered here two years ago I call to mind that Mr. Gregory dwelt on the great future that was open to us by cattle shipments to Europe, and in enlarging on this point he rendered excellent service. I believe that our market there is practically unlimited, but we must learn to supply what our proposed customers want, not old tough working oxen, fatted up for beef when past their