

Farmers' Societies.

Richardson & Webster.

The steady growth of business in manufacturing agricultural implements and cheese factory supplies by this enterprising firm, of St. Marys Ont., may be largely attributed to the general satisfaction given by their goods. Growth acquired in this way is necessarily of a substantial nature, and will at once commend them to all interested in securing good material and workmanship at living prices. While visiting their shops recently we were pleased to learn that those who purchased "The Monarch Ensilage and Fodder Cutters" from them were so well pleased that they had written expressing their satisfaction after a thorough trial, thus showing their high appreciation of the machines they had bought. In addition to a fine stock of plows, horse-powers, grinders, etc., etc., we would especially mention a root pulper made by them. The season is now upon us for the use of this useful implement, and we feel assured those who intend purchasing will lose nothing by communicating with the manufacturers at once for prices and further information in regard to these machines. While in conversation with a member of the firm we were pleased to learn that they are doing business in their various lines with the Patrons of Industry, and we feel sure this must be a cause of mutual satisfaction and profit to both manufacturer and consumer. We think every farmer should do all in his power to bring about a cash system of business, as well as direct dealing with those who manufacture what they require, and thus relieve themselves from the present burden of keeping up an army of middlemen. From their determination to give satisfaction to their patrons, the push and energy manifested in their business, we predict for them a prosperous future.

Patrons, Commercial Travellers and Merchants.

In looking over the November number of the FARMER'S ADVOCATE, I noticed an article by Uncle Tobias. Who is he? Is he a man who understands what he reads? He says: "The organizers are making rich out of the farmers whom they profess to serve." This is a mistake. As a patron, I do not think they are paid in proportion to the services rendered; they are promoting an honorable cause, and enlightening the farmers in matters of vital importance to them. Tobias states the merchant cannot live if only allowed twelve per cent. over invoice prices after paying rent, interest, breakage account, etc., etc. We claim merchants pay travellers too high salaries, viz., from \$800 to \$1,500 per year and all expenses. Who pays these salaries? Why the merchants' customers.

The aims of our organization are not to rob any man out of what belongs to him. Our motto is "fair and equitable terms to all men." We consider agents and commercial travellers unnecessary and burdensome, taking the cream from off the producer's milk and appropriating it to their own use. Mr. Tobias is mistaken when he says merchants who sign contracts to sell at an advance of twelve per cent. are fools, and that such have no capital and are not ranked among the foremost and best business men. Does Tobias remember the season when farmers throughout Ontario threshed from five to eight bushels per acre of wheat, and sold at from 70c. to 95c. per bushel. In many cases the crops were never harvested. Did the merchants then sell their goods to farmers and laborers at a reduction? The manufacturer and merchant did not ask the producers whether they could afford to pay thirty, fifty or ninety per cent. advance over cost in these depressed times. What profits does the farmer receive on the capital he has invested? Stop and consider! Few, indeed, are making three per cent. over expenses. Many are just making both ends meet, and hundreds of hard-working men are yearly losing money. Few, if any, are receiving fair wages for themselves and families, after allowing say five per cent. on money invested in their business.

What merchant would be willing to pay the farmers for produce twelve per cent. over actual cost of production?

Tobias instanced butter, and asked: "If it cost eight cents per pound to produce, how would farmers like to sell it for nine cents?" If the questioner knows anything about farming, he must know that if it were not for the calves that are reared, butter would not pay for the food the cow eats. Concerning the Grange, alluded to by the writer, this was and is a grand organization, but it was not supported by the farmers as it should have been.

There are too many farmers who do not think for themselves. These men allow others to transact business for them. Tobias states the farmers are getting too big for their boots. Not so; farmers are entitled to far more consideration than they have ever yet received in America. They are the pillars of our country. The time has come when they should and will demand their rights.

FIRST PRIZE ESSAY.

Would it be Wise to Increase the Indemnity to Members of the Legislative Assembly to \$800 per Annum?

FROM HULLETT GRANGE.

The question is one of vital importance to the people of Ontario. We are of opinion that in the social, as well as the political and moral interests of the province, it would not be wise to increase the said indemnity to \$800 per session. To consider this problem of interest, it will be necessary to note closely the ability of members of the Assembly—the time which is spent in political matters and which is lost to his own private business, and consider whether or not they are at present overpaid. We think that the majority of our members are men who could not command a salary approaching \$800 for a short portion of the year, or do a business that would give such good returns. A large number of the members can procure the services of a substitute to prosecute their business at a much lower rate than they enjoy. Of course there are exceptions to that, such as an editor, physician or lawyer, very few of whom enjoy a seat in the Assembly. The farmer, who forms 75 per cent. of the rate-paying population, and who is the backbone of our noble country, cannot realize \$800 above expenses for the whole year. The objection may be raised, "Farmers have not the ability to legislate for us." We say, if the farmer represents 75 per cent. (and he does) of the voters, let us have a like proportion of them in the Assembly, and we venture to say we will have a more economical and just as efficient government.

Every man should be amply remunerated, if possible, for the labor done. A farmer often labors long and hard and has scarcely anything to show for it. A lawyer or doctor, too, may spend all the year at his business, and will be well pleased if \$800 appears on the right side of his balance sheet.

Let us consider two and a-half months to constitute the average length of each session, and about one and a-half months as the aggregate loss of time outside of the session, that would really interfere with his business, either in thought or action, thus making a total of four months lost time, besides, of course, that lost during elections. This, then, would be at the rate of \$2,400 per annum. We feel certain that there are very few M. P.'s whose incomes exceed the half of that sum.

In the three ridings of our county (Huron) we are represented by two farmers and a lawyer, the united incomes of the former being, so far as we know, less than that of the latter, who is a leading barrister of the province. Now, when we average the incomes of these three men we feel sure the average net income would not be \$800 for a year. Of course part of this \$800 is paid out in expenses; but most of the members are at an unnecessary expense while in session, and even then it would cost them something to board at home. Then there is a certain amount of honor connected with the office for which the holder might sacrifice a little.

Other countries carry on their government on a cheaper plan than we do. The members of

the Congress of the United States do not receive as much as the members of our Assembly would receive at \$800 per session. While trade and business are so much depressed as at present, every means should be employed to lessen expenses.

Garden and Orchard.

How to Grow Plums for Profit.

BY G. W. CLINE.

In the first place select your soil, which should be rather heavy. Although sometimes plums do well on a sandy land it is rare, but on a clay loam, or even a good heavy clay—the very heaviest possible, if well drained—plums often do the best. Having grown this fruit for some twenty odd years for market I have studied the question pretty well, and have noticed in my own orchards, as well as in others through the country, that plums require a good heavy soil. If not heavy on top, if there is a good heavy clay subsoil in under, well drained, they will do well if properly planted and cultivated; but soils for plums must be either naturally drained or have underdrains to free it from standing water. The plum, like the peach, requires dry feet, or rather, dry soil for its roots to run in to grow thrifty. A wet, soggy soil will kill any fruit tree in a short time. Soils with plenty iron, salt and potash are the best for plums. If not naturally in the soil they must be supplied, more especially the potash and salt, by commercial fertilizers. Soils that are very slippery or "greasy" when wet you will generally find strong with potash. Having selected your soil, and drained it, if not naturally dry, the next thing is the trees and planting, which is another very essential part in growing fruit of any kind, and too often overlooked as something trifling. A very heavy soil, or any soil that does not work up finely after spring plowing should always be well plowed in the fall in ridges, the same width that the rows of trees are to be apart, which I claim should be about one rod. I plant mostly 12 by 15 or 16 feet apart, but a very strong, light soil will grow much larger trees than a very heavy one. Persons planting can judge for themselves. One orchard now planted 17 years, 12 by 16, the larger growing varieties have filled up all the space. Another orchard, planted some 21 years, on a heavy red clay subsoil, same distance, has plenty of room yet. Both orchards are doing well, or I might say first class, the first mentioned orchard being on rich alluvial soil.

Trees.—Don't run away with the idea that only large or extra large trees are the best, for they are not. They have to be grown to suit an ignorant class of customers who expect by buying trees of almost bearing size to get fruit much sooner, but as a general thing they do not. A good, thrifty, small-sized tree, not forced as the larger one is, and having plenty of fine fibrous roots, which you cannot get on a large, overgrown tree at any price; but on the smaller tree you will always get the best roots, and it is the roots that count in growing a top. A large top generally catches the eye of the uninitiated, and they order a lot of large trees at an enormous price. Nurserymen cannot grow and deliver large trees nearly so cheaply. The extra manures for forcing, the extra cost in digging, the extra cost in packing and freight all combine to give you the larger and poor tree at an exorbitant figure.