

of the FARMER'S ADVOCATE in your city. We have had severe rain and wind storms, with night frosts, which have done much damage to potatoes everywhere in this Island. In one day we ploughed nearly two acres of land with subsoil plough, having four teams hitched on to it, and one on the small plough, followed by 14 men, spading along the furrows. That is going to be our parsnip and mangle wurtzel patch.

PROTECTION VS. FREE TRADE.—In your April number there is an article on Free Trade vs. Protection, signed by John Granger; which is evidently written by some one who has not studied the subject, and shows entire ignorance of the bearings of the question, the *Globe*, no doubt, is his political bible.

Now, to show what Protection would do for farmers, we will take official figures. Last year we bought wheat to the value of \$6,657,652 And sold wheat to the value of \$4,959,726

	\$1,697,916
Of flour the imports were	\$2,462,618
The exports amounted to	1,545,242
Proving that we bought more	917,376
wheat and flour than we	
sold by	\$2,615,292

Now, if we had a protection of 10 cents a bushel on wheat imported from the States, every bushel of wheat raised in Canada would be worth 10 cents more than it is to-day, as our market is ruled by the price that wheat can be laid down for from Chicago and Milwaukee; and those western markets are controlled by the European markets. Therefore, as a consequence of protection, our millers would grind up every bushel of Canadian wheat for the home market, and the deficiency, which they would import, would pay 10 cents a bushel to the Government. Now, we import about three millions of dollars worth of Indian corn, which is almost entirely used for distilling, and horse-feed in cities; if we had a duty of 10 cents a bushel on it we might be able to grow rye to take its place, which would be very desirable as we could then put in a fall crop where we cannot raise fall wheat, and it would also raise the price of coarse grain for horse feed in proportion. Thus I have proved that Protection is a direct benefit to the farmer. Of course our millers would require a protection of 75c. to \$1 a barrel to enable them to shut out Yankee flour from the Lower Provinces; and in order to recompense our consumers for the enhanced price, we would protect all industries, and thus encourage manufacturers, keeping what population we have at home and bringing more into the country instead of driving away capital and skilled labor and spending over half a million of dollars, as was done last year, in bringing over emigrants, many of whom were a burden to the country rather than a benefit. But manufacturers are John Granger's particular foes; they combine, and form monopolies and put up prices of goods. Well, if they do, cannot he sell his farm and go into manufacturing and have a share of the monopoly? What absurdity to talk of monopoly when any person can go into any business out of which he thinks he can make a profit. But let us look on what ground Mr. Granger forms his theories of monopoly. Are we paying more for shovels, spades and many other articles which have a tariff that protects them, than we used to do when we imported them? Mr. Workman in Parliamentary Committee testified that they were cheaper now than then. And let us look at the Yankees, with their high protection, and see what it has done for them. They have paid off an enormous amount of their war debt; and by keeping out foreign manufacturers they have developed their own, so that now they can ship cotton goods to Britain and sell at a profit, and are now sending 30,000 pieces every week. It is a well-known fact that the larger a factory, or any kind of business, can be run, the less per centage of profit is required, and that manufacturers by running in special lines of goods can turn them out considerably cheaper than by making all sorts. Therefore it is natural to suppose that by keeping our own trade for our own manufacturers, and not allowing the Yankees to sell any goods in Canada, that goods could be made and sold cheaper than at present. It is true that the Yankees are trying to run out our manufacturers by selling at probably less than cost at present; and if they should succeed, will they continue to sell as cheap then as now? No; they will then go for profit, and we will have to pay bigger prices than ever, and be less able to pay

them, as we will have lost both capital and population; and to show the effect of that on the farmer, at the Easter fair in our town I was only offered 4c. for fat cattle that last year would have sold for 5½c. to 5¾c., and this winter I sold sheep and lambs for \$1 a head less than the season before, although this year's lot was better than last. What is the reason? Our mechanics and working classes are only half employed and cannot afford to buy meat.

Our annual imports amount to 75 millions; now if we by imposing a protective tariff can manufacture say between 30 and 40 millions, what an immense increase of population we could employ, which must all consume farm produce and pay taxes, and as we have a certain amount to pay every year for taxation, whatever our population may be, it follows that the greater our numbers the less each individual will pay; and thus we would have a larger demand for our butter, eggs, potatoes, beef, and everything we raise, and cheaper goods in the long run. Another great advantage to the farmer with a family grown up is, that if he is not able to buy his sons farms, or if they do not happen to be so inclined, they can be employed in our own workshops and factories, or there will be far more facilities for them going into some business, without leaving their country and breaking up all home connections.

John Granger says: Are farmers content with the home market for their crops? Do they not know that the best markets are abroad, and that foreign consumers of Canadian farm produce are the more able to buy, and pay a full price, if their goods are freely admitted into this country? In answer to him I would say that I am content with a home market, where I can sell my produce to the consumer and save commissions, freights, profits and other charges on both what I sell and buy from him; and thus we both save money.

John further says: The Grangers should remember that low duties encourage importations and facilitate the payment of good prices for their exported crops. He is right when he says low duties encourage importations; but that is not what we want, as we have to send cash out of the country to pay for those importations; but that it facilitates the payment of good prices for crops is *bosh*, utter nonsense. Come, John, prove your assertion. Will the British grain merchant or miller give us a penny a 100 more for our wheat than for Odessa, or United States wheat, considering the quality, although neither Russia nor the States are Free Traders, but the strongest of Protectionists?

The letter from "a Farmer" represents the subject in a more reliable shape, there you have figures and facts, and the case of Redpath & Co. might even have been made stronger, as by shutting up their refinery the importation of sugar from the West Indies (amounting to about 300 cargoes in a year) is entirely stopped; and we cannot export our lumber, pork and provisions to them, as vessels will have no return cargo. Thus, at one stroke, the Yankees destroy an important manufacture, cripple our shipping and export trade and make us pay for the damage done. A Farmer's letter is able, and may convince any reasonable person of the necessity and benefit of protection; but John Granger's letter, what of it? a mass of assertions without any proof; and while some might be led astray by the boldness of the style, I consider it my duty to show the erroneousness of his statements and to help to stir up brother farmers to look to their interests in a political sense.

I don't care what party gives us Protection, but let us support no party who will not do so. We must make it the question of the day, and unite and agitate until we have a national policy calculated to build up our farming and manufacturing interests.

AN AGRICULTURIST.

Guelph, April 12th, 1876.

THE CANADA THISTLE.—There has been a good deal said about the Canada thistle, how it may be destroyed, I will give you and your readers my plan to destroy them—that is, let them grow until the full moon in July. The stalk is hollow then. They must be cut close to the ground. They will not grow up again from the roots. It is a sure way to destroy them. I have tried it to my satisfaction, therefore I would advise every farmer that has thistles on his farm to try it. GEO. EMBURY.

Thomasburg, April 23, 1876.

[We give Mr. E.'s method of destroying Canada thistles, as he vouches for its efficiency. Many methods are proposed for killing them, but still they live.—Ed.]

PARASITES IN THE KIDNEYS OF PIGS.—I have three pigs that has taken some disease in the head, and shortly after they are affected they go reeling around, and then get so weak in the legs that they can hardly walk. Two of them have died since, and the third is so crippled in the legs that it cannot stand while it eats. Would you or any of your correspondents please inform me and your subscribers generally, what the disease is, and what would be the best way to treat it.

Blytheswood, Feb. 28.

J. M. REID.

[The state of your pigs, as is described in your communication, is caused by parasites in the kidneys. Remedy: Give ley with their food, and induce them to eat it pretty freely. Soapsuds is also recommended as a remedy.—Ed.]

I HAVE a two-year old sow that had a litter of twelve pigs on the 10th of March. The mother eat all but five during the first few days. I hoped to raise these five, but on the 28th of March, when the pigs were doing nicely, she eat two of them, and two days afterwards another one; this reduced my stock to two, when I took them from her and fed them by hand.

Now, what I write to you for is to know if there is any remedy for this state of things. Do any of your readers know any plan for preventing sows eating their young? Is there any use in trying to breed from the same sow again?

I consider I have lost equivalent to \$20, and I wish to know how to avoid such another loss, if possible.

JAMES SKENE.

Whetstone Point, Ont.

[In reply to Mr. Skene, we would observe that it is greatly owing to the confinement of sows and the kind of food on which they have been fed, that they acquire such a taste for flesh as to eat their young. Sows that are allowed to run at large, to root up the ground and to use vegetable food that they pick up abroad, never acquire such a habit. Having acquired the habit, she will retain it. The only thing to be done is to fatten and kill her. You need not expect that she will ever nurse her young.—Ed.]

MAGGOTS IN SHEEP.—I had a valuable ewe in good condition, she had two fine lambs about a week ago, and seemed to be doing well until yesterday, when it showed signs of dizziness. It died to-day, and, on opening the skull, I found that the tubes of the face that run past the eye was full of matted corruption, and a little below the eye I found a maggot about a quarter of an inch long. The corner of the brain was affected. If you can send me a cure through your valuable paper, in case any more should be affected, you would much oblige an old subscriber. NEIL STEWART, Kendall, Ont.

April 13th, 1876.

[The maggot that you discovered in the face of your ewe was produced by a small winged insect that entered through the nostril as the animal was feeding. Some places are infested with them. You might observe your sheep running about with their heads close to the ground. This restlessness is owing to the annoyance from these insects. The way to protect your sheep from this is to put tar on their noses. We know no other remedy so effectual.—Ed.]

SORGHUM FOR FEEDING CATTLE.—The cane of sorghum is sometimes used for stock feed. In such cases it is sown broadcast, and when the "sweet" appears in stalk it is cut and cured as hay. Must be cut thus green for this purpose: If it stands till heads form the stalk becomes too hard. It is raised and worked abundantly in Minnesota, which is at English latitude this year.

W. G. BRUGH.

[From our experience we can speak highly of the feeding quality of the sorghum or sugar-corn, having grown it ourselves. From its richness in saccharine matter it must be a superior forage plant. Besides it is very productive, yielding sources of good cattle food to the acre—good if cut green. If it be found hardy enough for our Canadian climate, it will, we think, be a valuable acquisition to our catalogue of plants for soiling. It was pretty extensively grown for the manufacture of molasses and syrup from its sap.—Ed.]