

and have established in some one article of general demand an immediate and a lucrative monopoly. All of these, from the least to the greatest, depend largely for their success upon "turns of the market," upon changes of value to which they contribute nothing, and upon currents of demand which flow entirely from the general progress of society.

I do not know in what sense the President of the Board of Trade may have himself "toiled or spun;" nor how far, like most of us, he may have benefited by the toiling and spinning of those who have gone before him; nor how far he may have inherited resources which do not fail when he is sleeping. Not being a Communist, I hold that the profits of capital are as well "earned" as the wages of labour." It is enough to know that in a great community he has lived an active and a useful life. I hope he may continue to do so for many years to come, and that in the course of them he may learn that there have been other toilers and spinners than in the class to which he himself belongs. Perhaps even he may come to know that none have done better work than that class which has been reclaiming and improving the soil of England for centuries before there was a chimney in Manchester, or a forge in Birmingham.

Vulgar errors are more common in the science of politics than in any other. In the natural sciences they arise from mere ignorance of facts. But in politics they arise even more from class prejudices, and sometimes from class antipathies. Such is the error—one among many—that the value of agricultural products, more than the value of any other products, depends upon the general progress of society; or that they rise in price more certainly and more steadily than others; or that increments in value of agricultural land have been secured without a proportionate application of intelligence, and a proportionate expenditure of capital.

On this matter I have had a pretty large and a pretty long experience. That experience, extending over more than five-and-thirty years, enables me to assert with confidence that the increased value of agricultural land has been during that period—taking times of depression and times of prosperity together—less than ordinary interest on the enormous outlay which has been required to establish and maintain it. It is often said that one-half the world does not know how the other half lives. The speech to which I refer is a curious example. It is, however, not the first time I have observed, that there are some members of the manufacturing class who have no idea of any industry which is not represented by a mill, or of any expenditure of capital which is not typified by a chimney-stalk.—ARGYLL, Cannes, April 11.—*Agricultural Gazette.*

FINANCIAL STATEMENT.

HILLSBURGH AGRICULTURAL SOCIETY,
1882.

RECEIPTS.

Balance in Treasurer's hands from last year.....	\$ 70 04
Interest from J. F. Miller.....	85
Rec'd from J. A. Purdy for bull service.....	35 25
do Benj. Rice do.....	27 00
Sale Bull S. Hammond to W. Eaton.....	15 00
do Dingo to Benj. Rice.....	15 00
Government Grant.....	162 01
Sold Ayrshire heifer, W. G. Clarke.....	70 00
Rec'd from O. Miller for calf sold.....	7 62
do John Nichol Boar sold.....	13 23
Rec'd for door fees at Exhibition.....	8 47
do Interest on monies lent.....	5 00
do Membership Fees.....	103 00
	<hr/>
	\$322 62

EXPENDITURES.

Secretary's salary, postage 1881 &c.....	\$10 60
For Treasurer's book and postage.....	67
Henry Burrill for Lily 6th.....	60 00
Expenses on do.....	4 12
Obed Miller half purchase of bull and heifer.....	87 58
Discount on Government Draft.....	40
G. A. Purdy keep of bull S. Hammond.....	51 00
Benj. Rice keep of bull Dingo.....	51 00
Printing 125 Prize Lists.....	3 50
Benj. Rice's bill.....	10 65
Building exhibition tent and watching.....	14 60
Printing exhibition hand bills.....	1 50
Premiums at exhibition.....	81 30
Eaton to keep bull (1883).....	19 00
Benj. Rice bill omitted in 1881.....	3 50
Paid for Devon Bull.....	25 00
do Ruggles for grade Boar.....	13 00
do Secretary salary and postage for 1882.....	11 02
Paid use of hall 11 nights at 25c.....	2 75
	<hr/>
	452 08
	<hr/>
	\$80 54

We certify this to be a true statement of above Society's Financial Accounts.

EDWARD CLARKE, *President.*
W. T. NICHOL, *Secretary.*

SHEEP HUSBANDRY IN COLONIAL TIMES.

"Sheep were first introduced into the Colonies by the London Company, in 1609, at Jamestown, in Virginia, where in 1649 they had increased to about three thousand. They were first brought to Massachusetts about the year 1633, and were kept on the island in Boston Harbor to protect them from the wolves and Indians. Charlestown in 1651 had four hundred sheep, and Lynn had considerable flocks which were kept on Nahant under a common shepherd. Hutchinson gives the number of sheep in Massachusetts in 1640 as three thousand. The Dutch West India Company in 1625 first introduced sheep into New Netherlands, and others were imported in 1630. But in 1643 there were not more than 16 sheep in that Colony, and ewes were worth from \$8 to \$10 each.

"On the 14th of May, 1645, the General Court of Massachusetts, 'having an eye to the good of posterity, knowing how useful and necessary woollen cloths

and stuffs would be for our more comfortable clothing, and how profitable a merchandise it is like to be to transport to other parts, doth hereby desire all towns in general and every one in particular, seriously to weigh the premises, and accordingly that you will endeavor the preservation and increase of such sheeps as they have already, as also to procure more at all convenient speed into the several towns by all such lawful ways and means as God shall put into their hands,' etc.; desired 'to know who will buy sheeps at the rate of 40s. apiece, under three years old.' Wolves were so destructive of sheep that in 1648 an order was made offering bounties for every wolf killed of 30s. to an Englishman and 20s. to an Indian. Premiums of less amount had been previously offered and paid for several years, and were renewed at different times to nearly the close of the last century. In 1782 Massachusetts offered £4 for every wolf's head and £1 for every whelp. No less than \$1,250 were levied in the little Swedish Colony on the Delaware, in 1677, as bounties on wolves' heads. In 1654 the Assembly prohibited the exportation of sheep, and even the killing of any for food under two years of age, save for the use of the owner's family.

"Connecticut, in 1640, made some useful orders respecting the cultivation of hemp and flax and the improvement of sheep. The Governor of the Swedish Colony on the Delaware was instructed to encourage the propagation of sheep with a view to a large export of wool to the parent State. The Assembly of Virginia in 1657 prohibited the exportation of sheep, and in 1662 ordered that no wool should be exported under a penalty of fifty pounds of tobacco for every pound so exported. It is probable that this prohibition had the desired effect, for in the early part of the 18th century sheep were abundant, yielding good fleeces but wool was so cheap, we are told, that sheep were shorn only for the purpose of cooling them.

"The General Congress met in September, 1774, and, in the resolutions passed on the 20th of October, requested the people to use their utmost endeavors to improve the breed and increase the number of sheep, killing as few as possible and not exporting any, but selling on moderate terms to the neighbor who might need them. In 1775 the first act of the Assembly of Pennsylvania was to recommend the people to abstain from eating, and the butchers from killing the sheep, and the Association of Butchers signed an agreement to that effect in December. It was ascertained in the following year that the number of sheep killed was 20,000 less than in 1774. The Congress of Deputies, which met at Annapolis, in