

THE MONTHLY

FARMERS' ADVOCATE



Vol. 5] DEVOTED TO THE BEST INTERESTS OF THE COUNTRY. [No. 2

WILLIAM WELD,
Editor & Proprietor.

London, February, 1870.

Postage Prepaid
Office—Richmond St., op. City Hall

Annual Meeting of the East Middlesex Agricultural Society.

The Annual Meeting of the East Middlesex Agricultural Society was held here and was but very poorly attended. We have seen more farmers at a small township agricultural meeting. We spoke to some of the best farmers that were in the city that day and they said it was no use going there; they would have everything as they choose; that it was a regular political gathering; and the country should not be ruled by the city. Whether it should or not, you must judge for yourselves. It has been remarked to us by a person of note, in this city, that no enterprise could succeed unless it was taken in hand by the inhabitants of the cities. We must all admit that the cities rule the country. We, as farmers, should bear in mind the true saying, "that whatever is of benefit to the farmer is of advantage to the city." We should also bear in remembrance that many things may be of advantage to the cities, and detrimental to the agricultural interests.

To the point. The business of appointing the officers having been completed, Mr. Jas. Johnson brought before the meeting the accounts of the receipts and expenditures of the New Board of Agriculture. He loudly and unsparingly condemned the New Board for their expenditures. He said that this county should not have granted one dollar towards the expenses of the Board. He alluded, triumphantly, to the success of the Western Fair. He was supported in his remarks by David Glass, who also spoke against the expenditures of the New Board. He considered the whole affair a great imposition.

YE CANNOT TELL HOW LARGE A FIRE A SMALL SPARK MAY KINDLE. We do not think the attack of Mr. Johnson on the New Board, either consistent or honorable. Is it for revenge, because he was not elected one of the mem-

bers, or because he could not get his son-in-law appointed treasurer? Or is it to weaken the power of the Board, and destroy what little confidence there may be left among the farmers of the country in the Board?

We deem this attack opened upon the New Board, premature, in any one, more particularly by Mr. Johnson, who sat, as president of the Old Board and never exposed the misdeeds of it, therefore acquiescing with all the corruption that had been carried on by it. We are prepared to show that more injustice was done by the Old Board when Mr. Johnson sat as president of it, than was done when ruled by any other president. It was but a few months past when Mr. Johnson was before the County Council, pressing the demand for money from them for the Board. Why does he now say that we should not have given one dollar? Simply because neither him nor his son-in-law have had the handling or directing of it, but would much like to. You would then have heard no complaints from him. In regard to his laudatory remarks about the Western Fair, we always viewed it at variance with the interests of agriculture. It never was got up for the intent of benefiting farmers in any way. The great and main object with Mr. Johnson, was to get a name to send him to the Board of Agriculture or to Parliament, and to get a lot of farmers into the city and keep them there as long as possible, to get what money they could from them for the benefit of the city. The awarding of the prizes has shown that the main business of it was against agricultural prosperity, although many farmers cannot see through the screen and think it is all right.

One object of it is, to weaken township exhibitions; another, to weaken the Provincial Exhibition, by dividing the interest; a third was to introduce trials of speed, alias racing.

We do not, in this article, enter into the merits of the new Agricultural Act. That is now

law. We merely hint on a few points that are of importance, and should be openly discussed.

We have no desire to shield the New Board from anything they may do or may have done amiss. This paper is free for any farmer to condemn what he may deem amiss in their acts, but, as a New Board, we do not think it proper to assail them unless a just cause is shown. We believe they are doing what they consider best for the country. Many of them are personally interested in agriculture. We should not have noticed these condemnatory remarks had they not fallen from persons that may have some object in view, and that may have some influence, Mr. Johnson being President of the Horticultural Society of the City of London, and Mr. Glass being an aspirant.

We regret that some steps have not been taken to establish a Farmer's Club in this county, where such subjects might be discussed. We have continually advocated the establishment of Cattle Fairs, but we do not advocate fairs where every person must pay a fee every time they go on the ground, as at the Western Fair; nor is there any necessity of compelling farmers to stay two days at a fair, as was the case at this much lauded Western Fair. We invite any farmer to condemn our own writings, even in our paper, if they consider we are in error in our inferences or assertions. If Mr. Johnson and Mr. Glass are so much interested in the welfare of farmers as they pretend to be, would they please explain why they should allow the American still-fed hogs to be brought to this city to be slaughtered and shipped from Canada as Canadian pork. How many hundreds of thousands of dollars of loss must this practice entail on our farmers? How is it that these two gentlemen have danced so conspicuously in expending our agricultural money for agricultural balls? If one-tenth of the money so expended, had been devoted to the formation of a Farmer's Club,

Chas. Steel