

might be cited as models of progressive ideas. Still more, even amongst the farmers who were the first to enter upon the system of improvement and many have had but slight success, notwithstanding the sacrifices which they have made, and the activity with which they have carried out their farm work, their deficits have increased from year to year, and, after a longer or shorter time, they have had to face almost utter ruin.

These but too frequent disasters cannot but have evil effects upon the advancement of agricultural progress. As a rule the farmer only keeps to the same routine, because he is afraid. To induce him to change his system of cultivation it is necessary to give him a better one, and to give him irrefutable proofs that the latter will produce better results than that which he has hitherto followed, and which we wish him to abandon. To do this it is necessary to have undeniable facts, to show real increase in the revenues of the farm, and in the well-being of farmers who are known to practice progressive cultivation.

Failures in the practice of agricultural improvements have the immediate effect of stopping all progress even amongst the least refractory farmers. Most frequently they do not seek to find out the causes of their want of success, the fact is accepted, and the conclusion drawn that all progressive cultivation is ruinous. To the greater number, the words "improved cultivation"

are but a synonym for amateur farming. Thus an unsurmountable obstacle is raised against these improvements for many years.

In order to make the practice of improved cultivation more general, it is necessary to employ two means of action; first, to prove to the farmers, by figures, that departure from routine is not the principal cause of the decline in our farming; secondly, to place under their eyes examples of improved cultivation which are actually remunerative. If failure in a system of progressive cultivation causes improved cultivation to be despised, as should success cause it to be sought after and adopted.

It is impossible to clearly demonstrate that the system of farming by routine is ruinous, unless it be controlled by means of well kept accounts. In that way the progressive farmer would only give his entire confidence to the system of improved cultivation offered him if the regular system of book-keeping proved to him that that system really gave the good results promised.

Thus, in the case of backward cultivation, as in that of improved cultivation, the farmer should enlighten himself by a system of regular book-keeping. Without it, there can be but guess work, followed by very disastrous results.

L. O. TREMBLAY, Priest,
Director.

Some of the Results of the Improved Culture.

The subjoined will show the state of the Agricultural School at L'Assomption which is subsidised by the Province to the tune of \$4,500 per annum:

Receipts of the farm for the twelve months ending June 30th, 1896.....	\$2,342.63
Expenses for the same period....	3,551.13

DEFICIT.....	708.50
--------------	--------

(See report of the Commissioner of Agriculture for 1896, pages 41-43.)

Financial statement of creamery for twelve months ending April 30th, 1895:

Total receipts.....	\$781.73
Expenses.....	1,002.62
DEFICIT.....	\$220.89

When the schools cannot make both ends meet it is not surprising that the pupils they turn out cannot.

Mr. Beaubien's Valuable Discourse.

The following amendment moved in the House on January, 7th, 1897 by Mr. Dechene will show the taxpayer where the money goes to and why the TAXERS cannot from taxing nor the HONEST MEN from struggling for power.

That this House is prepared to vote the Supplies but regrets to state:

That on the 4th October last (1896) Honorable Mr. Beaubien, Commissioner of Agriculture, at a political meeting at Nicolet, delivered before the electors, to whom he was rendering an account of his mandate a speech calculated to promote the interests of his candidature at the next general elections.