

Canadian husbandry, and that they might be read in the schools by the scholars who were hereafter to become farmers. This measure was adopted as the only means possible of connecting the Society with the rural population throughout the Eastern section of the Province, and to show them that there was a Society organized, who however remote and separated by distance from them, were anxious for their welfare and desirous that they would introduce such judicious changes in their modes of farming as would likely prove advantageous to them—and the Society had the more confidence in the success of their measure, because there could not be any suspicion of self-interested motives attached to their efforts by the rural population—whose perfect confidence is so necessary to any Society that would propose changes in a system farmers were so long accustomed to follow. The Society were desirous of being regarded by the rural population as the Society of the people, actuated by no other motive but that of promoting their prosperity and augmenting their means of comfort and happiness; by suggesting the means to them by which they might attain these benefits from the resources within their own power. The proposition is generally admitted that agriculture is, and must be, the main stay of prosperity to this Province, and it may be presumed there is not one individual at this meeting that does not entertain this opinion. This Society, as the Agricultural Society of the people, cannot possibly have any other object than the improvement and prosperity of agriculture as the best means of giving strength and stability to the main stay of Canada; and if they will only follow the example of the great Agricultural Societies of the British Isles, they will confer a greater amount of unmixed good on the rural population and upon the country generally, than could be expected from any other measures possible to introduce. One of the principal objects for which this Society was organized was the establishment of Model Farms and Agricultural Schools. To accomplish this, considerable funds would be required. The question then appears to be—would such Schools and Model Farms produce general benefit to the country proportioned to the expenditure that would be necessary for their establishment? The Directors think that they would, and that such establishments would, under judicious management, soon pay their own expenses, and be of incalculable benefit to Canadian farmers, and to the country generally, affording a suitable education, and practical instruction in the art of agriculture to young farmers, and instructing laborers, or those

who were to be dependent upon the wages of labor, in all the various works of the farm; and those again who would be educated and instructed at these establishments, teaching others throughout the country how to farm, and how to execute every farm work expertly and well. The Canadian farmer only requires to be convinced by practical demonstration of the advantages of introducing a change in their system of agriculture, to insure their doing so in nine cases out of ten. On Model Farms this can be properly demonstrated, and this would be one of their principal uses.

The Directors will feel much gratified if their management of the affairs of the Society is approved of by this meeting; and in retiring from this management, they would earnestly recommend the care of Canadian agriculture to their successors in office. There is much good expected to result from the action of this Society, and it would be a matter for deep regret, should public expectation be disappointed.

A. N. MORIN, *President.*

WM. EVANS, *Secretary.*

Montreal, March 24, 1849.

FACTS IN FARMING.

There is a remark we often hear, when urging farmers to take an agricultural paper, which is this, "Why, sir, there is nothing practical in them, or so little, that we will not pay our money for one." Now there is no truth in the remark; and in proof of my assertion, I ask of any candid reader if he ever knew a farmer who has attentively read an agricultural paper for two years, without improving his farming more than ten times the value of the paper? A neighbor of mine, an old man, has taken one for two years; and a few days since, he remarked to me, that he had made an improvement which was fifty dollars profit to him last year. After reading your articles on draining and irrigation, he drained a cold, wet field, and turned the water from it so as to run over a dry, adjoining meadow, thus "killing two birds with one stone," by draining the one and irrigating the other.

In 1840, I had six acres of land entirely worthless, being covered with bogs and bushes, upon which the water stood most of the year. I drained it, cut up the bogs and bushes, plowed and sowed it with buckwheat, for two years, and then seeded it down with Timothy. The result of my labors was as follows:—

160 bushels of buckwheat, valued at . . .	\$80
8 tons of hay, in two years,	80
Increased value of the land,	150

\$310

From this deduct—

For expense of draining, bogging, &c., . . .	\$100.00
For seeds, plowing, harvesting, &c., . . .	115.00

\$218.50

Net profit, \$91.50

I would ask every farmer who has such land to "go and do likewise." It would be a better investment than