

In my opinion, that which has chiefly injured the schools at St. Anne and at L'Assomption is that the managers and assistant managers of these schools (ecclesiastics) have never previously gone through a theoretical and practical course of agriculture, but, on the contrary, up to the day of the beginning their novel duties, they generally knew very little about farming. The Superior of the classical college to which the school of agriculture is affiliated is, of right, the manager of that school. I may say, without injustice, that he hardly troubles himself at all about agriculture. The assistant-manager is an ecclesiastic whose duty seems to be to watch over the morals of the pupils: he, naturally enough, interests himself but little in agriculture, properly so called. Whence it follows that these schools have no real heads, and that very little, if any, mutual helpfulness (*cohésion*) exists between the managers, on the one side, and the professors of agriculture and heads of the practical departments, on the other. Yet, it is clear that, in order to conquer the popular prejudice in this country against intensive agriculture (*agronomie*), our schools must be supplied with heads who are thoroughly skilled in agriculture, men capable of showing by the most useful and profitable practice, that a man well taught in all that concerns his art can make a farm pay much better under his control than can the mass of the farmers of the country. (1)

But let me be well understood: far from objecting to the clergy directing these schools established for the benefit of Catholic youths, I am persuaded that the greatest services to be rendered to our French agricultural schools may come from the devotion of the ecclesiastics or the religious orders, who will do for agriculture what our clergy have done for classical education. Still, as no one can teach successfully what he has not thoroughly learnt himself, it follows that the managers of our agricultural schools must devote themselves entirely to agriculture, after having gone through a special apprenticeship to the practice as well as to the profounder studies of scientific agriculture. But the point on which I insist is, that our schools be as soon as possible confided to the care of ecclesiastics, the most competent that can be found, who will accept, for their whole life if necessary, the mission of successfully managing our schools of agriculture. This so special mission, of course, cannot be undertaken without the entire approbation of the ecclesiastical superiors. I do not hesitate to say that I have just indicated the special weakness of our schools of Saint Anne and L'Assomption; the want of a constant and energetic superintendence by devoted specialists, exclusively studying the interests of their schools; while on the contrary, the reason why I entertain good hopes of the Richmond school is, that the present manager of that establishment has the whole power of direction in his own hands: the cultivation as well as the teaching, the internal and external economy of the school, are all under his guidance. This is, in a word, the style of management which I believe to be indispensable in all our schools.

Another defect, a grave one in my opinion, at St Anne

(1) The originator of our agricultural schools is the Revd. Mr. Pilote, member of the council of agriculture, Curé of Saint-Augustin (Portneuf), and heretofore Superior of the college of Sainte-Anne. It is our duty to say that a man so devoted and energetic as Mr. Pilote, might, under favourable circumstances, be the Superior of a classical college and at the same time conduct with success an agricultural school created by his own exertions.

Unfortunately, Mr. Pilote himself, could not support the arduous labours which his double task imposed upon him; and after the struggles of many years against the numerous difficulties of all kinds which he had to surmount, he was obliged to retire.

But what we have said in praise of Mr. Pilote, to whom our province owes a deep debt of gratitude for the useful institution he has created, proves the truth of our thesis: that to be at the same time the manager of a really useful agricultural school and the effective head of a classical college and seminary, is almost impossible.

and L'Assomption, is that the pupils do not board at the college. They have to go elsewhere for their meals; and this causes a loss of time, the trouble of changing their dress, interruption of their studies, &c. Again, I observe that the pupils do not take a sufficiently active and defined part in the general work of the cultivation of the farm. The reason assigned for this is, that they have neither enough experience nor interest in it, and, therefore their work would be, if not injurious, at least almost useless. It seems to me that pupils supported by public funds at an agricultural school should be what the active, intelligent and earnest son of a farmer is: that they should do with their own hands any work that may be required. A watchful guidance is, no doubt, necessary; but the pupil who, under a good teacher, does not execute in a profitable manner the work entrusted to him, fails either in intelligence or in purpose. In neither case does he deserve to be boarded and taught at the public expense. According to my notions, no pupil should be admitted to our schools, unless he has practised, *bonâ fide*, the routine of agriculture for at least three years. Pupils of this class would be really useful in carrying on the work of the farm, and would be more likely to derive benefit from the study of intensive agriculture (*agronomie*) than the mere boys who, at present, constitute the mass of the students.

A DAIRY-SCHOOL INDISPENSABLE.

A third defect, common, indeed, to all three schools, is that instruction in the management of the dairy is almost entirely neglected. This department is intimately connected with the rearing of stock, even of those beasts which are intended for the slaughter-house, as the best milch-cows must end their career there. With the dairy, too, are connected almost all the branches of agriculture: the production of food for the cattle, straw for their bedding, and the utilisation of the inferior productions of the farm. The present visible improvement of our farming, it must be admitted, is almost entirely due to this industry. The pupil of our agricultural schools ought, then, to be allowed the opportunity of becoming a good butter- and cheese-maker, at the same time that he is learning to produce both animal and milk under the best economical conditions. I feel sure that our schools will have no difficulty in finding scores of pupils, as soon as this so paying a pursuit shall have become an essential part of their system.

To attach a good dairy-school to each of our three schools of agriculture would, probably, be impossible. It would triple the expenses, and where could competent professors be found? But a first-rate provincial dairy-school might be founded, with a model-farm annexed for the production of milk, the rearing of calves, &c.; and to this special school, pupils who had finished their course elsewhere might come to devote themselves to the study of this industry alone. The professional dairymen, too, would probably frequent this establishment to perfect themselves in their trade, and to take out diplomas, more especially if the profitable system of making butter and cheese all the winter were practised there.

Four schools like these, well managed, would and ought to bring about a complete change in our agriculture in a very few years. With fifteen pupils to each school—and thirty would be a more likely number—each county could secure the agricultural instruction of one of its most promising youths. Before long, every parish in the country would possess a model-farmer, a graduate of one of our schools, and a finished maker of butter and cheese. This would be the shortest, surest, and cheapest way of arriving at those model-farms in each parish which every patriot longs for, but which can never be realised as long as our schools are unable to