

North Carolina 14½, South Carolina 9. The remarkable fact is, that "wet weather" accounts for this in the Carolinas. There was drought in Eastern Massachusetts; the valleys of Virginia were "overwhelmed by floods," and in the Missouri valley "excessive rains," in some States "drought."

The highest average acreage of Wheat is in "The Territories," 26 bushels, Nevada 24, Oregon and California 19, Massachusetts, Rhode Island and Connecticut between 17 and 18, Vermont nearly 17, New Hampshire, Maine, Minnesota and Kansas 15, Arkansas 11, Maryland, Virginia, Missouri and Louisiana 9, Georgia and the Carolinas 8.

Oregon yields the heaviest average of Oats, viz., 36 bushels, California comes next, 35½, Michigan a fraction less, Vermont next in order of all the States, close upon which follow Nebraska, Ohio, Pennsylvania, New Jersey, New York, Connecticut, Rhode Island, which are all above 30, and New Hampshire follows them within a fraction of that quantity. Maine and Wisconsin 27½. But in the sunny South, the falling off is lamentable: Georgia 14½ bushels of oats to the acre, and South Carolina less than 10 bushels.

The greatest average yield of Potatoes is in California, 148 bushels per acre, the Territories 145, Vermont 140, Texas 128, Maine 125, Arkansas 109, Kansas 106, Missouri 103. Every other State in the Union yields less than 100 bushels per acre, Indiana giving no more than 45. Of the States not named, and under 100 bushels, the northern ones are most productive.

The highest average yield of Tobacco is in Massachusetts, 1,320 lbs. per acre, Connecticut next 1,250. The yield in Virginia is 739 lbs. The smallest yield is in North Carolina, 586 lbs.

A letter has been published in the *Morning Chronicle*, by a gentleman in Cornwallis who writes under the plume of "Agricola," containing animadversions upon an article published in this Journal. It appears to be necessary for us to correct some of the erroneous statements made, so far as they deal with matters of fact. As to *opinions* on the Act of last session, and circumstances connected therewith, we have not offered any, and feel that our sole duty is to assist in carrying out the Act of the Legislature. If "Agricola" will again read

our article and compare it with his own letter, he will see that, in his anxiety to make out a case, he has attributed to us a large amount of statement and expression of sentiment that has never appeared in our columns. He must know that the two courses pointed out by him as the legitimate ones to be followed by the Board were neither of them possible. The Board was abolished on 4th April, 1871, and was not authorised again to act till 24th October. In the interim the members of the Board had no more power to act than Agricola himself; and, on this account, the Government naturally enough, declined to advance money for importations; it was only after long consideration, and after the Government were assured that the new Act would remain inoperative so long as there was no organization to carry it out, that it was determined to revive the old Board, for the purpose of organising a new one. It is due to the author of the Act to state that its legal construction is very different from what he intended.

We repeat that, under the law that has been in force since 18th April, 1865, the appointments to the Board have been entirely in the hands of the officers of the various Agricultural Societies, and that, while the changes made have not been very numerous, this did not result from any practical difficulty in the officers of Societies recording their votes, or nominating new men. A few three cent stamps would enable any Secretary of a society to obtain the views of all the other societies in the District, and whatever they agreed upon must of necessity be adopted by the Board, and always was so adopted. Changes were thus made from time to time in several districts,—old members were voted out and new ones voted in, notwithstanding the statement of "Agricola," that "the old member must go in." In those Districts where no change took place, it is reasonable to suppose that this resulted from the perfect confidence reposed in the sitting members. This much may be said, that we have never heard it asserted that the members of the Board spared either time or labour to discharge faithfully the duties imposed upon them. It is a mistake to say, as Agricola does say, and in *italics* too, that the "*majorities of the Societies* must be agreed on one and the same man." If even two Societies voted for one man, and eight others voted all for separate men, these two would carry their member.

We now come to the statement: "The Act of 1871 is rather a side step, and not straight to the front. The choice or nomination of members for the Board is still a complicate and uncertain matter for the Societies, when it might be as simple as A B C." This statement, made by himself, shows in a striking light how

unjustifiable is the tenor of Agricola's letter; but, as we do not wish to discuss the merits of the new Act, it is not for us to express any coincidence with or difference from him. The only object of our article was to explain the position into which affairs had been temporarily thrown during the past season, and to show that the Board were not only free from all blame in regard thereto, but, on the contrary, acted in a straight forward and earnest manner, with a single eye to the interests of our Agricultural Societies.

The last proposal is to enact that each Society shall be entitled to elect one of its members to represent the Society at the Board. That would give a Board of about 56 members,—an Agricultural Parliament, in fact, as large as the Legislative Assembly and Legislative Council combined. Lest the duties devolving upon this body be too heavy, they are not to be troubled with the care of money, for, according to Agricola's scheme, the Government are to appoint other officers to be directly responsible to the Government for the expenditure of the Agricultural Grant. Then, each Society is to pay the travelling expenses of its member attending meetings of the Board at Halifax. "The Societies," Agricola says, "have a right to this." Would they not rather look upon it as a grievous wrong? We do hope when any farther change is made upon the Agricultural Act that the Board will be constituted with a direct relation to the work which it is designed to accomplish, and not sacrificed in a vain attempt to give it a vague and false popularity.

MEETING OF PICTOU REPRESENTATIVES.

At a meeting of Representatives from the different Agricultural Societies in the County of Pictou, held in New Glasgow, this 8th day of December, 1871, for the purpose of electing a member to represent the said County at the Central Board of Agriculture for the Province of Nova Scotia,—Present, as representatives from the following Societies:—

River John—
Pictou—David Matheson.
Gairloch—Kenneth Ross.
Hopewell—Robert McNaughton.
Merrigomish—William C. Oldings.
Maxwellton—David Huggan.

Robert McNaughton, Esq., was appointed Chairman, and David Matheson, Esq., Secretary of the meeting.

Read a letter from Mr. Nelson Sutherland, late President of River John Agricultural Society, who was appointed at the annual meeting of their Society to attend this meeting as their representative, but owing to circumstances therein fully referred to, was unable to fulfil the appointment.