

THE GRANGER,

DEVOTED TO THE INTERESTS OF PATRONS OF HUSBANDRY IN CANADA

"In Essentials, Unity; In Non-essentials, Liberty; In all things, Charity."

Vol. 1, No. 6.

LONDON, ONT., APRIL, 1876.

Price, 50 Cents per Annum.

The Granger.

ADVERTISING RATES.

| Per line of solid Nonpareil. | 10 | 15 | 20 | 25 | 30 | 35 | 40 | 45 | 50 |
|------------------------------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|
| 1 inch, 12 lines, do. | 1 00 | 1 50 | 2 00 | 2 50 | 3 00 | 3 50 | 4 00 | 4 50 | 5 00 |
| 2 inches | 1 75 | 2 25 | 2 75 | 3 25 | 3 75 | 4 25 | 4 75 | 5 25 | 5 75 |
| 3 inches | 2 50 | 3 00 | 3 50 | 4 00 | 4 50 | 5 00 | 5 50 | 6 00 | 6 50 |
| 1 column, 13 inch. | 3 00 | 3 50 | 4 00 | 4 50 | 5 00 | 5 50 | 6 00 | 6 50 | 7 00 |
| 1 column, 9 inch. | 5 00 | 5 50 | 6 00 | 6 50 | 7 00 | 7 50 | 8 00 | 8 50 | 9 00 |
| 1 column. | 10 00 | 11 00 | 12 00 | 13 00 | 14 00 | 15 00 | 16 00 | 17 00 | 18 00 |

The annual rate not to be used for any advertisement inserted for a less period than one year. Annual advertisements payable quarterly; or, if paid in advance in one sum, a discount of ten per cent. will be allowed. Transient advertisement not cash.

The GRANGER AND GAZETTE is published in London, Ont. W. L. Brown, Secretary London Division Grange, Editor. All communications to be addressed to Box 91 F, London, Ont.

The Grangers and the Parliament.

The Parliament of the Dominion has acknowledged that the Patrons of Husbandry are a power in the country, by a select committee of the House submitting for their consideration eighteen questions bearing on the subject of free trade and protection now before the country. Never were farmers before treated with such consideration, now they have organized and intend to have their opinions respected. No doubt such consideration would have been given before, but there were no means of reaching them as a body; there was no head. The Grange has supplied this want by having a systematic order of farmers.

We would like to ask the opponents of the Grange movement how this large body could be reached so expeditiously as it can at present, through their various Granges having a common head. No farmer, on this account alone, can have any excuse for not belonging to the Order. Every farmer in reality is a Granger, and he should act as one.

The questions proposed include in their scope the whole subject of free trade and protection. In fact, we think some of the questions in substance are only repetitions of preceding ones, the difference being in the wording. However this may be, we offer a few observations on some of the enquiries.

The questions 4 and 14 (which, we claim, are one and the same) about growing Indian corn: It may be stated that it does not pay to raise corn in Canada; we can purchase Western corn cheaper than we can raise it here. There are very few seasons that corn can be raised profitably and then only on particular soil. As a staple crop it is not what Canada wants to raise. Let her stick to her barley, wheat, peas, &c.

Sugar beets and tobacco, in 5th question, are not our forte. True, they can be raised, but will it pay us? that is the point. The tobacco raised in Canada is not a commercial article, or one which could be depended upon. In fact, Canadians could never make it a staple product. Adaptability of climate is in reality the guide of what can be raised. The point is not whether such and such productions can be grown in a country, but can they be raised to pay the greatest profit to the producer? If a Canadian farmer can produce a bushel of barley more profitably than a bushel of corn, and a farmer in the Western States can grow corn as much cheaper than he can raise barley—exchange.

The cultivation of the sugar beet and flax is a question which requires a greater consideration. It is certain that these can be raised in this country; but take the beet for example: It can be raised, as far as size is concerned and yield, but the saccharine matter is so low in proportion to warmer climates, that we could not compete with them. Experiments of growth are such as not to warrant our Canadian farmers in growing that kind of produce. Grinding in bond, which is mentioned in the circular forwarded, we

can conceive may be made a handle for millers to make a speculation of by having a tariff. If a duty of say 10 per cent. be levied, they must have a drawback or an allowance in exportation, and between the import and export they will have a chance of a margin, which will come out of the pockets of the farmers.

We must say that some of the questions proposed cannot be answered definitely, as it will depend to a certain extent on the locality, quality of land, &c., whether stock raising, grain, or dairy produce is most profitable; or whether a combination of all is not the best.

The remedy for keeping farmers' sons and daughters on the farm, proposed in the ninth question, is amply answered in the Grange principles. Make farming more attractive by enhancing the comforts of our homes, and making agriculture more desirable by developing a higher social and intellectual culture—impressing on the minds of young men and women the importance and independence of farm life. The remedy does not lie with legislation; it remains with farmers themselves. The seventeenth question there proposed is included in this. The manufactures which are most intimately connected with agriculture are certainly those of agricultural implements; and from the opinion of a number of those engaged in their production, they can be furnished as cheaply here as in the United States.

Not Paying Their Debts.

Some of the newspapers and the outside public are trying to make capital by saying some Grangers are leaving their old debts unpaid in country stores and dealing for cash in large centres. However this may be, we do not claim that virtue and integrity are exclusively confined to Grangers. The same motives and passions influence and actuate men, no matter what they are called, what they wear, where they live, or what they do. Because a man is a Granger it does not follow that his whole moral nature is regenerated.

The Grange does not claim to make honest men out of rogues, but it does say it wants brotherhood with no other than men of sterling integrity. If men of the Order have acted thus, they have every far forgotten the precepts of the Order: "In our dealing with our fellow men be honest, be just and fear not, and keep ourselves unspotted from the world."

The Grange should exercise its authority in bringing those members to task if such is the case. But we are inclined to the belief that it is only clap-trap circulated by parties opposed to us. It is only human nature for its opponents to take the advantage of any little scandal they think will injure its influence. As we said before, we cannot deny positively whether debts have remained unpaid or not, but if it is on a par with other representations we have taken the trouble to find the correctness of, it is very doubtful. A silly story about the way Grangers blunder in purchasing has been circulating from one end of the Province to the other. It was in the matter of purchasing nutmegs. The way it was done of course was that the Granger was so profoundly ignorant he did not know the difference between a pound and a barrel, and ordered barrels instead of pounds—a quantity no wholesale merchant would have on hand at one time. What particular locality this happened in has not yet come to light. The credit in this one transaction is given to every part of the country from Gaspé to Sandwich. It is unnecessary to state the statement carries an absurdity on the face of it; and what we are surprised at is that respectable papers and men who claim to have common sense should give credence to it, and try to make capital out of it against the society. It would do very

well for a joke, but when such nonsense is taken up by our opponents it shows they have a lame cause. But let this be as it may, we wish to be judged by our principles and not by the follies and acts of individual members.

If the principles upon which the Order is built—considering the dimensions it is assuming—are wrong, its own weight will crush it; and if they are right and have their foundation based on human needs and demanded by the new conditions and advancement of the age, it will last, and the Grange need fear no such petty attacks.

We would not lay so much stress on this only from the fact that newspapers who claim to occupy a respectable position in Canadian journalism and would be loth to demean their editorial columns with such petty trash on any other subject, are full of such trifling quibbles at present.

It might not be out of place in conclusion, to recommend that our members aim higher and, not be influenced too much by pecuniary interests—forgetting the higher motives of truth, fraternity, social and mental cultivation. Any person who joins the Grange to make merchandise, is unworthy of the name of Patron. It is the duty of members to ask does he join the organization from a favorable opinion he has conceived of its principles as likely to advance and benefit the rest of the world as well as himself, or whether it is from the degrading influence of pecuniary motives.

In speaking thus we do not wish to leave the impression that there are no pecuniary advantages to be looked at in the Grange, but simply that this should not be predominate, and be used as a handle to induce members to join.

The Depression.

Taking the inquiries and the evidence given before the depression committee as a guide, it would puzzle a person of more than ordinary intelligence to guess for what purpose said committee was originated. There was, no doubt, a necessity for inquiry into the cause of the numerous failures in business and the stagnation in trade. But an inquiry of this kind, to be beneficial, should be thorough, and not for the purpose of serving party or class interests. Whether this has been the case or not, our readers will be able to judge. For ourselves, we fail to see that the principal cause of the depression has been touched upon. It appears, as far as we have been able to glean from a casual review of the evidence given in the papers from time to time, that the manufacturers generally have acknowledged to considerable prosperity. Most of them have earned, within a few years, considerable fortunes, showing that they have carried on their business to advantage.

The farmer, as well as the manufacturer, has been fairly prosperous. It is only the mercantile interests, or a portion of the laborers and mechanics in the cities, that have suffered from the want of trade and the demand for labor. In a well regulated country, the farmers will always prosper while they depend upon their own exertions, and not any factious prevention of competition. All that any government can do for the farmer, as a class, is merely to let them alone, and to give no undue advantage to other classes; as it is obvious that if one or more classes are favored, it must be at the expense of the rest. Not that we believe that any such assumed advantages by protection or taxation can, in the end, benefit any class of the community, as has been pretty conclusively shown by the experience of the late depression.

Anything, however, that creates fluctuations in commerce must, to some extent, be injurious to all classes, as it checks the demand for all kinds of produce, though it has less effect upon that of agriculture, as it is the most necessary.

Under these circumstances it would, in our opinion, be very bad policy for the agriculturist to join the manufacturer, or any other class of the community, in asking for protection. The producer of food has a natural protection anywhere. He and his family need never be short of provision, and, besides, there is an incessant and universal demand for them. All profit is derived from the surplus of farm produce. It sustains all labor, and without it no other trade or calling could live. The farmer, therefore, cannot be benefited by any kind of restrictive law or protective duty. Even if a Chinese wall were built around the country, so as to prevent imports and exports, it could not benefit the farmer. Supposing he obtained a higher money price for his produce, he would have to pay more for all that he purchased; and as neither the manufacturer nor the merchant could live on less profit than what would maintain themselves and their families, and assuming that they had not equal facilities of production, as the parties shut out by the wall, the farmer must inevitably lose by the operation, as he would get less real value in exchange for his produce than he would have done in the open market of the world. One thing we may always depend on, what we will call, for want of a better word, the general instinct of society. What is sanctioned by universal practice must be correct in policy. In all our private daily transactions, we go to the cheapest market, and by so doing, we sell at the dearest, as buying and selling is only compound barter: the use of money makes no difference in the effect of the transaction. If we buy cheap we must sell dear. The farmer, therefore, needs no protection; he is more independent than any other class, because there is always a demand for his produce. It never goes out of fashion, and it is not easy to produce too much. Prohibitory laws, with respect to the importation of agricultural produce have been tried both in France and England, but they were found to be so injurious to the interests they were intended to protect, causing such great distress and fluctuations in prices, that after numerous suspensions they were finally abolished altogether. While they still existed in England, they were so injurious to the farming interests—causing at times extremely low prices, and again extremely high prices—that no calculation could be made upon farming profits. In the thirty years of their existence, the were altered five or six times to relieve the agricultural distress; and the same number of Depression Committees sat in the House of Commons to inquire into the causes of such distress. In the year 1835, after the British Corn Law had been in existence for twenty years, and had been altered no less than three or four times, the price of wheat was lower by two shillings sterling per quarter than it had been for fifty years previous. We should, therefore, decry any, so called, protection for the farmer. He is in the most independent position of any profession or calling in the world. He has only to lay out his money to the best advantage to improve his farm and increase his stock; and under ordinary circumstances he may be certain of a fair share of comfort and happiness. He should never allow himself to be dependent on one kind of crop; his husbandry should be diversified, as if one crop misses another may hit, and he will always have something to sell, which will fetch a remunerative price.

Insurance.

The intent of a Fire Insurance Company is to pay none other than purely accidental losses, or those arising by design from causes without the control of the insured. This is manifest from the invariable custom of Companies when giving their annual reports to the public of deploring the large amount of moneys paid for incendiary losses and others arising