

The Grange Defended.

SIR,—I write you as one of your oldest subscribers, having taken your paper some ten or twelve years, and am very well satisfied with it as a whole, but take exception to some letters and editorials which have appeared the last few months, which are written for the purpose of injuring the Order of the Patrons of Husbandry. In last month's issue is a letter from a person signing himself "Brant," in which he says that the Grange is a failure in all that it undertook to do. Now, sir, how any man with a particle of common sense about him can make such a statement is beyond my comprehension. He either knows nothing of what he writes, or else tries to injure the Order by using misstatements. The principal objects of the Grange, as you well know, sir, are to make the farmers more independent of other classes; to give them a more thorough knowledge of their occupation, by meeting together and discussing subjects pertaining to their calling; to teach them to take their part in public business, of whatever nature; to use their own judgment, and not be led away by oily-tongued lawyers and politicians to go against their own interests, and also to show them the benefits of dealing without the aid of middlemen and of paying cash for their purchases. Now, sir, I claim that in these particulars the Grange to a large extent has been and is a success, and if there was not one in existence to-morrow, has done more to benefit the farmers than anything that has taken place in our country for a number of years not even excepting your great National Policy, which so far as the farmers are concerned is the greatest national swindle I have yet seen in our fair Dominion.

In the first part of "Brant's" letter he says "it was to raise the farmer from his down-trodden condition and place him in the high station he should occupy in the country." So far as I know this was never promised, and the farmers in this country, at least, do not feel themselves so down-trodden that they are over-anxious to be raised to the exalted station "Brant" expected them to occupy. To a certain extent the Grange has elevated the farmer, by making them more independent and giving them confidence in themselves, so that they are now able to take part in the public affairs of the country. Has the Grange failed here?

"Brant" also says it promised higher prices for what we had to sell and lower prices for what we had to buy. I know of cases—and he might also, if he ever reads the public prints—of the Grangers getting more for their produce, by selling direct to large merchants in this country or sending direct to Europe, than the majority of farmers realized for their produce. I remember seeing in one of the Toronto papers, of the fall of 1878, that the Grangers near Belleville, or one of the towns in that part of the country, sold some 10,000 bushels of barley for \$1.12½ per bushel, several cents higher than the Toronto grain dealers were paying for the same grade at the time. Also another case, which I also saw in a public print, of a large quantity of wheat (I do not remember how much) being shipped direct from the county of Grey by the Grangers, and realizing 10 cents a bushel to the producers more than the grain buyers in that county were paying at the time of shipment. Has the Grange failed here?

Has the Grange failed in enabling the farmers to buy apple trees for from 10 to 12½ cents each that formerly were 20 to 25 cents; to buy reaping machines for \$88 that are retailing at \$110; to buy ploughs for \$12 that others paid \$20 for; to buy turnip drills for \$12 that are sold singly for \$18; to buy harrows for \$11 that I know were sold for \$22; to buy forks for 55c. that retail at 75c.; spades at \$1 that retail at \$1.25, and a great many other things in the same proportion? Let him answer, has the Grange failed here?

"Brant" goes on to say that the Grange is kept alive, and that for a few years only, by designing men, who are making money out of it. There are, I think, only two persons drawing any salary from the Grange—the Secretary and the Treasurer of the Dominion Grange. Both of these salaries combined will reach during the current year the prodigious sum of nearly five hundred dollars. Just think of it. Twenty-seven thousand members contributing to make up this immense sum. No wonder the farmers are poor, when this salary costs every member nearly two cents a year!

If the Grange depended on such men as "Brant" and others I know of, I would indeed tremble for it; but when I see such men at the

head of it as met at the annual session in Toronto last month, I have no fear of it failing in its undertakings, but believe it will grow and prosper in spite of its enemies. I know it will have its ups and downs, but will come out stronger after every trouble. Men who joined for the sole and only reason of making money are leaving, and using their puny influence to injure the Order that could not make them rich in a day. But let me tell "Brant" that there are Grangers in this county who are true to their pledge, and will work for the Order as long as they are able. I suppose "Brant" is one of those persons who, like the Editor of the FARMER'S ADVOCATE, was very favorable to the Grange on its introduction, but turned against it when he found he could not turn and twist it to suit himself.

Now, Mr. Editor, you must excuse the length of this letter; but when I find letter after letter running down the Grange, and such an editorial as yours in last month's number, entitled "Duty," on the first page of volume fifteen, I cannot refrain from writing the above in defence of the Order that has been of so much benefit to the farmers of this country. I do not write over an anonymous name, but my own, which I would like "Brant" and other enemies of the Grange to do also.

THOS. A. GOOD,
Master Brantford Division Grange, No. 8.

[Perhaps we should not have inserted the communication signed "Brant" in last issue. To act fairly we insert Mr. Good's reply.]

Shearing Sheep.

SIR,—As there is a diversity of opinion as to the propriety of agricultural societies fixing a specific time that sheep must be shorn on or after to be eligible to take a prize, and after watching the working of such rules for the last fifteen years in different societies, I have failed, with a good many others, to see any good result from such a rule. With a few exceptions, those who advocate for such a rule strongest are not generally directly interested in the exhibition of sheep, but being placed in office are anxious to show their authority as law-makers; or, perhaps, they have heard their friend or neighbor complain of getting beat at the fair because others had shorn earlier than they had and had the advantage in wool—a common excuse for a poor sheep. Such a rule might be all right if exhibitors would conform to it; but it is very evident a great many do not, and instead of being a protection to the honest exhibitor, it acts as a bonus to the dishonest one. Now, if there is any advantage to be gained from shearing before the 25th April, why should any man be deprived of it? and to shear much before that time I do not think would add to the appearance of a sheep at show time, unless it was a very poor woolled one. Get good, competent judges, men of experience, and they will not be deceived by a month's wool. The rule is no protection to the inexperienced man; for if the best or show sheep were all shorn according to such a rule, the poorer ones can be shorn as much earlier as the owner sees fit, and taken to the fair not for exhibition but for sale, and when the inexperienced purchaser comes along he gets beat, because he thinks he is getting a heavy fleece at a comparatively low figure. Then, again, the 24th April is a very unseasonable time to shear sheep; about the time they are let out to grass to be stripped of their winter clothing and exposed to the sudden changes of weather is very injurious; either earlier while they are still housed, or later when the weather has become more warm and settled, would be much better. But while everybody expects that everything on exhibition is shown to the best possible advantage, and exhibitors are allowed to stub and scrape the horns of their cattle and oil their pigs, and use every device that tends to beautify their exhibits, I see no tangible reason why the exhibitors of sheep should be made an object for special rules and regulations. But if necessary at all shows, great and small should have one uniform rule, and that of itself would aid materially in the practical working of it. Would be pleased to hear from others interested in the above subject.

J. J., Abingdon.

SIR,—I maintain that there is no such thing as worm in the head in sheep; it is simply a stoppage of the blood. A simple remedy is to cut the veins under both eyes and pare the toes of the front feet till the blood comes. I have had many cases in this neighborhood, and have been successful when the animals were given up to die.

A. C., Harloch, Ont.

The Agricultural College.

SIR,—I think you were hardly justified in your severe strictures on the fall sale of fat stock at the Ontario Agricultural College at Guelph. In a pecuniary point of view it was a failure, but that very failure will serve as a guide to farmers who may have stock to fatten. The principal fault appears to be in selecting cattle too young to have attained their full growth, so that part of the feed was required in building up bone and muscle instead of laying on flesh and fat. As for leasing the farm to a company of practical farmers, that would tend to defeat the very object for which the College was intended, viz., for the education, physical and mental, of our farmers' sons. Such a company, if formed, must be conducted on the commercial principles of profit and loss. They might take farmers' sons or others to teach them farming, but to be a source of profit thews and sinews would be of more consequence than mere brain power. I consider our Provincial Government deserve credit for their intention to introduce during the present session some measure calculated to place the College on a permanent foundation. I agree with your correspondent, J. P. P., of Hespeler, in thinking that it would be an improvement on the present system to elevate the standard of admission, so as to do no work there that could be attended to in our common schools. If that were done, an extension of the course for a third year would be less necessary, although still desirable. Besides, farmers' sons who wish to work at home during the summer can attend a winter course of lectures, whilst during the summer the students are paid 10 cents per hour for working on the farm, which, if they are steady and industrious, will go far towards defraying their expenses.

A. C., Guelph, Ont.

SIR,—I send you an extract from an English paper respecting Iowa. Can you give an opinion as to the comparative advantages of that country and our Northwestern Territories for an English emigrant worth (say) from \$15,000 to \$20,000 capital? What would you advise an Englishman with that amount of money and little or no experience in farming to do—a man having a number of sons growing up, and a wife and daughters accustomed to city life? The eldest available boy, being about 17 years old, is now at the Guelph Agricultural College.

C. H., London.

[The extract sent contains a very favorable account of one of the States, in which the profits are shown to be large and risks small. It admits they cannot raise wheat equal to our Northwest Territory, and also states that the writer purchased corn last year at 12½ cents per bushel. We would advise your English emigrant with that amount of capital to keep a fast hold of his money for one year after arriving in America; to take a small house near where his fancy leads him to live; part with his money only in America on undoubted security, if he is able to discern; put his boys to work for their living with a good farmer; live within his means, keeping his expenses so that he can spend about half of his income in examining different parts of America and observing the ways and habits of the country; learn to adopt them, abandoning English ideas and English plans as much as possible. This is very hard to do. Make no ostentatious display; be very cautious about letting people know what you are worth. The elder girl might go to the best farmer in the neighborhood, and become as one of the family, if she were willing to make herself useful and learn what is wanted of a farmer's wife. By adopting such a plan he might be worth twice as much in three years as he would be by investing with the first oily-tongued speculator or agent that he may meet. Travel, observe and wait is our advice.]

In reply to a correspondent who asks for information as to the utility of variety in feeding, we give the following from an exchange: "It is an established fact that a single kind of food is not enough for the best growth, health and comfort of animals. Like ourselves, the stock which we keep does relish a change of diet—thrives better with a change of pasture. Coarse fodder should be mixed with that which is of a finer nature, and the highly nitrogenous fed with substances weak in nitrogen. It is this love of change that makes the colt, cow and even the oldest horse feel glad when turned into a new field."