

steers. A good ewe in the last year would have given a fleece, and a lamb which in the New York market to-day would be worth \$8 at the lowest, and more probably \$10. A yearling steer in May, 1877, that was worth ten ewes, will have produced nothing, nor will he for a year to eighteen months longer, and the ewe will have produced another \$10; in all, \$20. Now, ten ewes and their lambs will cost no more to feed than one steer, and they will have yielded \$200 in the two years. The steer in the two years will yield no more at present prices than say about \$85 in the market east, where the fleece and lambs of the ten ewes will in the same time yield \$200. Capital is less in the outlay for the ewes, and so taxes less, and land and feed will be the same—while the ewes will be left at the end of the two years and the steer gone. Here are surely inducements to grow mutton-sheep.

If we overstock our home market, England is open to us and will take all the good mutton-sheep we can breed for an indefinitely long time in the future. We can get into the production of mutton on a large scale in one-third the time that we can beef; and we have only to go into that kind to find in a foreign export all the demand we may ask for, all the supply which we may grow.

Politics.

You have been agitated during the past few weeks with another of our expensive and too numerous elections. It is really surprising to see how frantic—almost insane—many otherwise quiet farmers become at such times, and still more astonishing to notice the imagined and assumed knowledge displayed at such times; also to notice the falsehoods and wilfully deceptive plans that are laid to divert or befog the minds of voters.

We much regret that the press morality of our country is at such a low ebb that the truth is concealed and the minds of readers fed with only a deviation from facts. In our capacity we have, despite temptations, attempted to avoid these party issues and conduct this journal in an independent manner. So far have we carried this out as to deprive ourselves of our vote, of our voice at political meetings, and refusing to allow our name to be placed before the country as a political representative. To enable us to form an opinion of men and measures we sometimes take a seat in the audience when any noted speaker or leader is to be heard. We should not attend political gatherings but for the fact that that is the only time any of our rulers are to be heard, and therefore the only time we have an opportunity to ask questions.

Large placards had been posted up throughout this county inviting the public to hear the Hon. O. Mowat, Premier of Ontario, and Hon. Mr. Fraser, Commissioner of Public Works, at London, Ont., on 13th May. The City Hall was filled; farmers from 20 to 30 miles distant were among the audience. We listened patiently until the close of the Hon. Mr. Mowat's address. He did not say a single word about the agricultural interest of this Province. At the close of his address we asked permission to ask the Hon. speaker a few questions.

After waiting again patiently for an hour and a half, we succeeded in overcoming the obstacles thrown in the way, and obtained very clear and decisive answers from Mr. Mowat. Our questions to Mr. Mowat were:

1. Is it the intention of your Administration to attempt in any way the elevation of the elective franchise?

2. Is it your intention to attempt to raise the qualifications of our legislators?

3. What has the Ontario Government done to prevent the introduction or spread of dangerous contagious diseases among the farm stock of this Province?

Mr. Mowat replied:

1. It was not expedient to attempt the elevation of the franchise.

2. It was not necessary for Members of Parliament to own property; they did not deem it advisable to change the present system.

3. He knew nothing about infectious diseases. Hon. Mr. Fraser, the Treasurer of Ontario, a very fluent speaker, delivered a long address, in one part of which he contemptuously alluded to our asking questions. We immediately sprang to our feet and in a loud voice said twice that he dare not answer us two questions. He gave us no chance to ask. We do not believe one in one hundred of our legislators dare answer them truthfully and correctly if we ask them. They are of importance. We may yet ask them if a suitable opportunity occurs.

The Hon. E. Blake also came to this city. The City Hall was filled. Mr. B. is one of our greatest orators. Public notices had been extensively circulated through the county, and farmers flocked in from long distances. Not one word did he say about agriculture. We were allowed, with difficulty, to ask him five questions, viz.:

1. Why a person from the United States was appointed as the first Professor and Manager of the Model Farm at Guelph?

2. Why was that gentleman paid \$1,500 over his salary after his dismissal?

3. Why was the Hon. D. Christie paid between \$1,000 and \$2,000 for an animal that a farmer would not give \$100 for?

4. For what reason was the Agricultural Act altered so as to take the power from farmers of electing members to the Board of Agriculture?

5. Why are the farmers of Ontario compelled to pay the expenses of holding the Provincial Exhibition in Ottawa this year?

Mr. Blake replied to the following effect:

1. He was not aware that a person from the United States had been appointed to that position.

2. That the Government had a right to expend money to remove people from office.

3. He knew nothing about the animal alluded to.

4. He knew nothing about the change in the Agricultural Act.

5. The elected had deemed it proper.

Farmers, we have not asked these questions to disturb the meetings or to affect the present elections, but to show you your duty, that is, to obtain information in regard to all questions respecting our agricultural interests from the highest authority attainable. Every lawyer that represents, or attempts to represent our interests, or obtain our confidence, should be examined by you; if he knows nothing about your interests, you may depend on it, he cares but little about you.

Last year we went to Arkansas; there peevish legislators had infested that State so that the main cry had become repudiation. The moral tone was low and debasing. We were in England last year; there no insolvent is found in the legislative halls; there honor, prosperity and contentment reigned supreme.

We as farmers should ask at a proper time and should receive respectful replies. The Hon. O. Mowat not only replied respectfully, but said he should be pleased to receive any suggestions from us. Shortly after we went to Toronto, as we wished to ascertain about the Provincial prize list and the Board of Agriculture. At the Secretary's office we learned that the supplementary grant of \$5,000 given by the Dominion is to be expended in the following manner: \$1,500 on printed matter to be sent into the Province of Quebec, and a portion or all of the balance for gold, silver and bronze medals. The gold medals are to contain about \$30 worth of gold in each, and are to be distributed as prizes. The cash from the prize list is to be cut short to the extent of \$40 for each gold medal awarded. Thus another re-

vision of the prize list is to take place, and we cannot give you the information we wished about it. Hon. Mr. Pope, Minister of Agriculture, gives a prize of \$50 on the veterinary art, and a prize of \$50 for the best horse for all purposes.

We then went to the office of the Ontario Minister of Agriculture, but he was not in the city. The old and generally respected gentleman, Mr. G. Buckland, was in his office, as he always is—hard at work, without assistance, his eyes dimmed with age. But he could not inform us about the prize list; it was not yet arranged.

The present deplorable state of the Board of Agriculture and Arts of Ontario should necessitate a Government investigation, and an entire change in the present mode of electing or appointing officers. There are too many, and dark, mysterious acts and closed doors should be opened to the public. Three gentlemen in the Finance Committee have already resigned their seats; they have evinced a desire to act justly, and their example might be followed by those who know that bad management exists, and they find themselves unable to prevent it.

We next took the liberty of calling at the Hon. O. Mowat's office. We conversed with him a short time and believe him to be desirous of doing good for the farmers and the country. We have just as much confidence in Mr. Mowat's good intentions for the welfare of this Province as we have in Mr. Meredith's. If our affairs were left in the hands of these two gentlemen we do not doubt but they would be much better administered than by the large number of M. P.'s we have to support. In our conversation we found that Mr. Mowat had depended on his information in regard to our agricultural affairs from sources that we do not deem the best attainable. The great fault with all our politicians has been that farmers have been looked on too much like chattels, and the key of the public exchequer would either repel or attract most speakers and most writers. It is oratory and the pen that rule the mind, and cash rules both.

This month's issue will not be placed in the hands of subscribers until after the Ontario election; therefore let no one suppose we attempted to use the influence of this journal for the purpose of affecting political elections. It is for the interest of all farmers this journal is published.

To Correspondents.

We have not space for long articles. Short, plain, decisive answers are solicited to questions, and useful information is solicited on any agricultural subject of importance. Communications have been and will be destroyed when writers do not furnish their true names and proper addresses to this office. It is not necessary for a name to be published, but we should know that writings are bona fide. If errors appear, corrections can be made in the following issue, if our attention is called to such.

If any person at any time should miss any number of the ADVOCATE, they should notify us within one month. We do not profess to keep back numbers in stock. We thank our numerous friends that have taken the trouble to introduce the ADVOCATE to the notice of others and for sending us new subscribers. We hope those that have not yet aided the circulation will try to do so. The more subscribers we have, the more money we are able to expend in improving your paper, and the more the farmers' advocates are circulated, the greater will be the prosperity of the farmer and of this Dominion.