

leather to which it is applied in tanning. A scientist sent out by the department of agriculture spends months in experimenting on the plants. He examines its leaves in every stage of its growth; he tries the roots, the stems, the flowers, and the result is worth a thousand times the cost of all his labor. If the leaves are gathered in June, instead of in the fall, they will be richer in tannin than the imported article, and the leather will not be discolored in tanning. This is but one of the many ways in which the agricultural department at Washington is benefiting the people of the country.

Turning now to Europe, let us judge, if we can, from a few facts, what importance they attach to agricultural schools and colleges there. In a recent report of a committee of the French National Assembly on a project for the establishment of a new agricultural college, the superiority of Germany over France, in spite of inferior natural advantages, is fully shown, and is clearly attributable to the better development of agricultural education in that country and the more common and intelligent application of scientific rules in agricultural practice. There are in Germany alone 184 agricultural colleges, besides a great number of schools of a lower grade, reaching down to primary instruction. Germany spends seven times as large a proportion of her income on agricultural education as does France. Yet the French Government last year voted \$360,000 for agricultural education alone. \$150,000 of this amount was for three agricultural colleges and the National Institute at Paris, over and above the receipts. In addition to these colleges and schools of lower grades in Europe there is a large number of what are termed Agricultural Stations, where every kind of research is pursued that is likely to be of value either in agriculture or horticulture. Some stations devote their attention to a single aim, while others do a variety of work, according to the wants of the locality. There are sixteen of these stations in Austria, ten in Sweden, three each in Russia, France and Switzerland, two in Belgium, and one each in Holland, Denmark, Scotland and Spain.

In England, although there are no Government stations such as described, there are a number of private farms where the same kind of work is done, the public getting the benefit. One gentleman, a Mr. Lawes, has recently appropriated £100,000 to carry on a farm and laboratory as an Experimental Station. These agricultural stations are being introduced into the United States in the last few years, the old State of Connecticut taking the lead. North Carolina and New Jersey have one each, while Georgia has one and proposes to start another, and New York granted \$40,000 in 1880 to start one in that State. The work of the Connecticut Station is principally devoted to the examination of commercial fertilizers and plants and the testing and examination of seeds.

But you ask, what have these countries to show for this very large expenditure in schools, colleges and experimental stations? I answer, Europe, containing an area less than half of this continent, with its northern part an immense plain and its southern very mountainous, supports a population of nearly 300,000,000, and from the sugar beet, a root that we have not learned to cultivate on this continent yet, supplies herself with from seven

to eight hundred thousand tons of sugar every year, or about half the amount she requires for home consumption. Great Britain, with a population of thirty-five millions, or about three hundred to a square mile, even with a succession of bad harvests, is supplying two-thirds of the bread products for her population. The facts, I think, ought to satisfy reasonable minds that the expenditure in Europe on agricultural education is not wasted. Now, coming nearer home, what is Canada doing to advance agricultural education among her people? Nova Scotia, I believe, cannot boast of one public school or college where the science or practice of agriculture is taught. And New Brunswick and Quebec occupy the same proud position! Ontario has a well equipped college and experimental farm, and is sending out every year a large number of men well taught in the theory and practice of their chosen calling. Professor Brown, of the Guelph institution, says: "I consider the problem of agricultural education is being gradually and surely unfolded in our case. Nova Scotia has sent a few students to the Guelph College, and I was glad to see that the Governor General's prize in one of the departments was given to a Nova Scotian, which was the next best thing to its being won by a New Brunswicker, as no doubt it would have been if there had been one there. If, in simple justice to the farmer boy, he should have as good a chance as the one who goes to college to get what he can there to help him to attain success in some other fields;" If, as "it is now believed, that energy, common sense, and intelligence will everywhere outrun energy, common sense and ignorance, and that technical and scientific education will confer on those who enter any profession immense superiority over those who have it not," then the question arises, "is New Brunswick doing all she ought to place within the reach of those whose aim it is to become farmers, facilities for securing that education that confers that immense superiority?"

In view of what is being done in other countries to advance agricultural education, has not the time arrived for the Government of New Brunswick to turn its attention more decidedly in the same direction? I am not disposed to complain or to bring any charge against the present Government, or any Government, in this matter. I believe each successive administration of this Province, of whatever shade of politics, ever since Professor Johnston, the British Gamaliel, referred to in Blackwood, was invited to report on the agricultural capabilities of our Province, have shown a strong desire to do what they could to advance the farming interest. We have a boast here in New Brunswick, from which the press seems to draw a good deal of comfort, one that I think we all duly appreciate. I refer to the fact that we have more miles of railroad, per capita, than any other country or state. And I see from the utterances, as reported lately, of gentlemen high in authority, that railroad extension is still to be the watchword, "or the power behind the throne" of the Government. While farmers as a class, generally speaking, ought to be the last persons to oppose opening up the country by railroads, if such roads have nothing to carry they are not the most desirable property, as perhaps some experience gained in this country might testify. Anything that will add to the productions of the

country must increase the traffic on the roads already constructed. But, to come to the point at once, if the Government have money to subsidize railroads, they can spare a few hundreds to make a start on an agricultural station in this way. We have now, and will have for the next ten years I suppose, what is called a Government Stock Farm. What I would ask the Government to do is to place on that farm and in charge of it, a thoroughly scientific and practical farmer, such a man as Professor Sheldon, who, as all remember, made a hurried tour through, under the auspices of the Government, the fall of 1880. If this course was pursued, and the right kind of a man secured, the farm would then become a means of education to the people, and perhaps eventually become an experimental farm and school. And now, gentlemen, our business in theory has always been popular, but practically to the man who is anxious to control large wealth, or to the man who is ambitious of literary or political distinction it has but few attractions. In some lights farming is improving rapidly, but probably for some time to come it will not be attractive to the class of men just referred to. Some persons are concerned about the status of farming. The business will be just what we make it, respectable or otherwise. If it is conducted in such a manner as to make it pleasant and profitable, and I know of no reason why it can't, then it will be attractive, particularly to the farmer. If those who follow the business are grasping, narrow minded and ignorant the calling will be judged by them. If, on the contrary, farmers are intelligent, broad-minded, liberal in their views and refined in their tastes—nature's gentlemen, as they ought to be—then practically, as well as theoretically, agriculture will be looked upon as one of the noblest of all the ways in which man is called to labor to supply the wants of his nature.

The Association next considered the subject of changing the date of the Annual Meeting. There was considerable diversity of opinion as to the proper time. A resolution fixing the date the fourth Tuesday in January was finally carried.

The election of officers for the ensuing year, next taken up, resulted as follows:

President—Samuel J. Calhoun, Albert.

Vice-Presidents—Queen's, S. L. Peters; Westmoreland, H. Humphrey; York, L. Estabrooks; St. John, Thomas Davidson; Albert, C. J. Osman; Sunbury, C. B. Harrison; Northumberland, John Johnson.

On motion of Col. Beer, it was resolved that counties not affiliated with the Association be entitled to appoint their own Vice-Presidents on affiliating.

Secretary—Major Arnold, re-elected.

Treasurer—R. E. McLeod, re-elected.

Executive Committee—Queens, John McAlpine and John Slipp; Sunbury, W. D. Perley and H. B. Mitchell; Westmoreland, W. Fawcett and O. E. Flewelling; King's, Thos. Roach and A. B. Hayes; St. John, James Shaw and J. B. Hamm; Albert, W. A. West and Jas. McAlmon.