



Salem, Saturday, May 11.

Portland Agency.—L. SAMUEL, General Advertising Agent, is authorized to act as sole Agent for the FARMER in Portland—to receive and receipt for subscriptions and advertisements.

Will the Canal and Locks be a Swindle?

This is a question in which every man, woman, and child in the State is deeply interested. While we are willing to let slide all charges of corruption in the last Legislature in getting up a fat job for a company in the construction of a canal and locks at the Falls, yet we must insist now that that contract be carried out honestly. The paltry charge of a swindle on the tax-payers of \$75,000 in awarding this contract sinks into insignificant twaddle when compared with the great benefits to be derived from the completion of the works. Much wind and ink has been wasted over the proposition that the P. T. Co. made to the State, and it was claimed that that company intended to construct the works of "stone, iron and wood," while the successful company would construct it, according to contract, of "stone, iron and cement." We acknowledge that there is a great difference as to durability between wood and iron, stone, and cement, so much, in fact, that while the one will decay and become useless in a few years, the others would stand for ages—a difference that might easily influence the Legislature in awarding it to the highest bidder.

But are we going to have these locks constructed according to contract? Are the builders going to use stone, iron and cement? We understand that they are not! We learn that they have already contracted for a large amount of lumber to be used in the construction of these works, by which between \$75,000 and \$100,000 will be saved by the company! This is according to our information, and if it be true, the "stone, iron and cement" dodge falls to the ground, and so far as the people are concerned, the canal and locks might as well be constructed of mud and fir brush. There will be but a few years difference in durability between such works and those that are being constructed.

In the name of the Great Eternal, can we not have some honesty in this State? Are the people so many hewers of wood and drawers of water, placed here merely to work for the few bloated lazaroni that hover over them, vulture like, and swoop down upon their prey when they see a fortune at a single grasp? Are the people created for no higher purpose than to labor from one year's end to another for enough to pay taxes to enrich these virtuous robbers? Can a few sanctimonious soundrels engraft themselves upon our Legislature, buy votes enough to give themselves a contract with the State, and then fulfill that contract to just the extent they wish, and no further?

We are in favor of the State owning the canal and locks. If the contractors have well and faithfully performed their work, they should be reimbursed for all their expenditures, but if they shall fall short one jot or tittle of the condition of "the bond," the State should take charge of the improvements, and pay the contractors only what the work is worth to the State. If built with wood now, in five years they will have to be rebuilt, and the rebuilding then will cause ten times as much loss to shipping and other interests as if constructed according to contract now.

ARRIVED.—Hon. George H. Williams, Attorney General of the United States, has reached Oregon, coming overland from San Francisco. He is now in the Southern part of the State, detained by business matters. His friends at the different places in the Willamette valley are preparing to give him a reception due to the distinguished position he occupies.

SHEEP PROSPECTS.

On every side we hear the jubilant notes of the sheep men, and preparations for increasing old flocks and starting new ones. We hear of quite a number of young men who are preparing to go into the business. The sheep raisers have passed through the bluest period known to their business for many years, and now greatly need and deserve a revival of their business prospects. It appears to us that if there is no further tinkering with the tariff, wool will bear remunerative prices for several years to come, and that those already in the sheep business may well feel encouraged.

But right here we desire to offer a little suggestion. We hope the whole farming world will not go crazy and repeat the old folly of going into sheep as a specialty, to be followed in a few years by the usual result—a sheep pelt on every panel of fence. These periodical excitements among farmers, like stock and real estate speculations among merchants and bankers, sweep thousands from a safe business which they understand, into the gulf stream of experiment, and many of them bring up at a sheriff's sale upon their own premises. We hope every farmer will stick to the business he understands, and let "wool gathering" (as a specialty) alone. In the best dairy regions of the east, it is considered that even the present prices of dairy products are more remunerative than wool at seventy cents per pound. The most profitable sheep raising must be on cheap lands and where grain abounds. Wool can probably be produced as cheaply in many parts of Oregon as in any part of the United States, and yet we will not be surprised to see the present excitement carry the production beyond the living point, for the owner of the flocks at least.

With an experience which ought not to have faded from the memory of a majority of the farmers throughout the country, and which will always be remembered with anything but pleasing recollections by many, the sheep excitement ought not at this time to mislead farmers to their damage and ruin. Where circumstances and conditions are favorable to sheep husbandry, more attention will undoubtedly be paid to it than has for some years in the past. We have heretofore advised, and now renew the suggestion, that every farmer might profitably keep a few sheep. With ordinary care a small flock will always pay, because a few sheep can always pick up a living about every farm. Where large flocks cannot be made profitable, a few sheep will prove good property, and should be kept. No meat can be raised as cheap as mutton, not even chickens; and the instances are rare indeed where the fleece of a sheep will not pay for the care and feed he will require.

The Bulletin of Tuesday, in reply to our request that Mr. Holladay unequivocally retract the damaging slander put forth in that sheet of the week previous, contains the following paragraph:

"But as to taking back anything of censure we have published of your course, you must positively excuse us; we are not on it. If you are—and you seem to be—pitch in. We will, if that will afford you any comfort, look back over our files and retract whatever we have published to your commendation."

We do not object to commendation, and the Bulletin need not trouble itself in retracting in that respect. Neither do we object to censure, but we do object to a *libel*—one intended to injure our business, and uttered for no other purpose. And for the second and last time we demand of Mr. Holladay that he retract the assertions to which we have objected. It will be much easier for him to make a retraction and us to republish it, than for him to defend and us to prosecute a lawsuit. The dilemma is presented, and Mr. Holladay can take hold of whichever horn he thinks best. One he must take.

READ the new advertisements.

STOCK AND FENCING.

In the last number we published a good letter from Mr. Davidson on the importance of fencing the railroad. Since then we have had our attention called to another point by several farmers, viz: Fencing the stock, instead of fencing the grain fields. This of course has nothing to do with the other question of fencing the railroads in stock pastures; but relates solely to the rights and interests pending between the owners of stock running at large, and the owners of grain on their own lands.

When a man buys a tract of land of the government, we believe he ought to be protected in the exclusive occupancy of that land as against his neighbors' cattle. We believe that this was the common law in England, and think it ought to be the law here, especially in the grain growing regions. Take the Willamette valley for instance. The owners of prairie farms as a general thing are grain growers. They have not the timber to fence their farms, and must haul rails—often many miles and at great cost, to protect their crops against the stock of one man located in the brush. Generally, or at least very often, we find that at least a dozen farmers have to fence against the stock of one man, thus requiring an outlay for fencing enough to buy two or three farms, and an annual expense to keep those fences up, enough to purchase a good farm every year. Now we don't think this is right. The prairie farmer who has no timber, and no stock at large probably, has to purchase and haul rails at great expense, to fence against the stock of the man who lives in the timber, and who has plenty of timber on his own land, cheap and easy of access, with which he might fence his stock.

It is not only the great expense of fencing and keeping up these fences, that is to be complained of, but then it is not right for one man to pasture his stock on another man's land. In a country like the Willamette valley, where the whole country is taken up and owned by somebody, no man can turn his stock loose without pasturing them to a greater or less extent on the lands of another. It is less expense to fence the pastures than to fence the grain fields. The fences are constructed on account of the loose stock at large. The hands of cattle are the point of danger, why not then apply the fences to the cattle to restrain them on their own pastures, and not to the grain fields which would disturb no one? It appears to us, and to many farmers we have talked with, that this would be a natural and just regulation at this time. When the country was new, and but little of the land claimed and taken up, and timber not so valuable, it would have been a hardship to fence the stock from all the public pasturage. And so it would be now in Eastern Oregon, and other parts of the State; but the question is, would it not be a measure of protection to the grain growing regions of the Willamette valley?

The States in the East are now taking action on this question, and we call attention to it now so that farmers may discuss it before the sitting of the next legislature, and instruct their representative accordingly. And in order to give the fullest information on the subject, and secure the attention and views of all farmers interested, we hereto append the "Stock Law" recently passed by the legislature of the State of Illinois.

SECTION 1. Be it enacted by the people of the State of Illinois, represented in the General Assembly, That it shall be unlawful for the owners of any domestic animals of the species of horse, mule, ass, cattle, sheep, goat or hog, to suffer the same to run at large in any county in this State, after the first day of October, eighteen hundred and seventy-two, except as herein provided.

SEC. 2. Any owner or owners violating section one of this act, shall, on conviction before any justice of the peace having jurisdiction, pay a fine not less than three dollars nor more than ten dollars, for each and every offense, to the common school fund of the township.

SEC. 3. The county clerk of any

county, wherever it may be unlawful for domestic animals to run at large by virtue of this or any special law, on petition of one hundred or more voters therein, shall give notice with the election notices of the then next succeeding general election in such county, that at such election, the voters of such county may vote for or against domestic animals running at large in such county, or any species thereof, to be mentioned in such notices, and separate ballot boxes shall be used at said elections. Such votes shall be received and canvassed by the proper judges of election, and returns made in the same manner as other election returns, and if a majority of the votes cast on such question is for domestic animals, or any species thereof, running at large, it shall be lawful in such county for such domestic animals, or species thereof, to run at large.

SEC. 3. At any succeeding general election, on like petition and notice, the voters of such counties electing to allow domestic animals to run at large, may vote to rescind such former vote, and to come under the provisions of this law, where no such vote is taken.

HONESTY vs. DISHONESTY.

Last week two horses were killed near Eugene by the cars. The horses were valued at \$200, and the cash was paid for them by the agent of the railroad company at that place. This was all done in one day—the killing, valuation and payment. This is what we call commendable promptness.

A farmer living near Marion Station had a calf killed by the cars some months ago. The railroad employees themselves valued the calf at \$20. A claim was sent to the office at Portland for the amount, and after some delay the farmer received word that the "company" would pay him \$10 for the calf. The farmer signified his willingness to accept that amount, but at last accounts the \$10 had not been paid. This is what we call swindling.

Six months from this time, horses killed at Eugene will not be paid for any sooner than calves are now paid for at Marion. Dishonest railroad managers do more to discourage railroads by bringing them into bad repute in the communities through which they pass, than all other agencies combined. The people should insist that the railroad be fenced. The farmers, we suppose, would be glad to fence the road if the company would furnish the material.

Improvements on the Fair Grounds.

A member of the Executive Committee of the Oregon State Agricultural Society informs us that in accordance with the instructions of the Board of Managers at their January meeting, the committee have commenced improvements on the Fair Grounds, preparatory to the annual Fair of 1872. The mile track has been changed so as to run east and west, which removes it, at the nearest point, some three hundred yards from the pavilion. The land purchased of Mr. Reily has been enclosed, by moving the north line of fence and adding new fencing on each end, which increases the ground within the enclosure some thirty or forty acres. This ground, as well as all within the new mile track, is now being put in order for seeding to timothy in the fall. The committee feel confident that the Society can produce from their own lands sufficient hay for all the uses of the Fair, besides quite a surplus for sale either before or after that time, as the condition of the market shall warrant, thereby receiving a handsome revenue from the land which has heretofore been only a tax upon the Society.

Many reasons might be given for the removal of the track from its old location. Its near approach to the pavilion has rendered it impossible to keep order, so that committees could transact their business, and has added confusion in every branch of the Fair, save the trials of speed. Once removed, there will be far less confusion, an almost entire absence of dust, and those who conscientiously oppose the trials of speed at the annual exhibition will not be compelled, as they have been, to witness them, but can enjoy all the attractions of the Fair, undisturbed by

the confusion incident to all racing. On the ground of safety, too, to the thousands visiting, it is believed the change will give satisfaction.

ANOTHER LETTER FROM MR. JOHNS.

We have received another letter from Mr. J. M. Johns, of Marion, which we are compelled to decline publishing for a number of reasons.

Mr. Johns is a subscriber to the FARMER, and ought to know the position taken by the paper on the monopoly in the Willamette valley.—When he endeavors to draw us into a political discussion, or to insinuate that we are meddling in politics, he simply assumes grounds that he knows to be false. While we propose to have *opinions*, and to express them, on all matters where the interests of the people are at stake, neither Mr. Johns nor any other person can say we have ever counseled any man to vote contrary to his political sentiments. We have advised the people to see that honest and incorruptible men were sent to the Legislature—men who could not be bought—and to vote for none who were not pledged to stand fast for the rights of the people as against this monopoly. This is the extent of our *political* meddling, and we have the consolation of knowing that through the efforts of the FARMER the head of more than one of the political prostitutes who have disgraced our legislative halls and State has rolled from the block into the dust. The counsel which we have given interferes with no party, and violates the political feelings of no honest voter, and would ultimately build up political parties to a higher moral stand-point.

This is the third time that a party in the interest of Mr. Holladay has endeavored to draw the FARMER squarely into a *political* fight, and, as on the two preceding occasions, we shall refuse to step into the pit prepared for our reception.

We have never abused or vilified Mr. Holladay. In the discussion of this question, we have been as temperate in our expressions concerning Mr. Holladay as possible, and certainly much more so than have been his tools toward us. Neither have we criticized his charges for passenger travel, because we have always considered them reasonable when compared with rates charged before the railroad was built. Mr. Holladay and everybody else knows that the passenger travel on his road depends on the rate charged—if high, but few will travel; if low, the number will be large. Common sense regulates the passenger tariff, but avarice controls the regulation of the freight tariff on produce, because the shipment of produce is a *necessity* with the farmer, while traveling is not; or, if so, only to a very limited extent.

The columns of the FARMER are open to the discussion of all questions of interest to the people. All we ask is that articles be written free from slang and abuse, and that correspondents have a greater regard for the truth than for carrying a particular point. If Mr. Johns wishes to argue in favor of the establishment of a monopoly in the Willamette valley, and a perpetuation of that monopoly, the columns of the paper are open to him, provided he will conform to the above requirements. And we wish him to understand this, that we are responsible only for what we say—not for what other papers or other parties may say.

Hops.—William Wells, engaged in hop culture in the southwestern portion of this county, informs us that the prospect for a large crop was never better than at present.—The yield from his crop this season will not fall short of 10,000 pounds. Hops raised by Mr. Wells last year compared with the finest California hops in the San Francisco market.—Hop-growers are now in fine spirits, as their products command sixty cents per pound. Mr. Wells says he wishes more farmers would engage in the same business he is in, as diversified farming will always be successful.