

prise and confidence which makes a poor but easy soil produce far beyond its utmost; and those who undertake the office of judge ought to have every opportunity that can be given them of guiding their decision. Here it is not by artificial manuring so much as by large consumption of purchased food that artificial fertility is best conferred. No artificial manure is so complete as that which is produced by the consumption of farm produce. It is when the storehouse of the soil is already pretty full that a phosphate or a nitrate will make the best return—the added ingredient then bringing into active use fertilizing matter, which, without it, would have remained effete and useless. When the other ingredients of a complete plant food are not naturally present, the artificial addition of one or two is insufficient, and remains without result. In the case of a poor sandy soil like that of Maulden Farm, it is therefore better policy to enrich the home-made dung by added cattle food than by a heavy bill for superphosphate or ammonia salts or nitrates. Mr. Street has found this out, and while his annual manure bill does not exceed £50, paid for superphosphates for his green crops, the 'artificial' food which he consumes, his cake bill, and the beans and peas of his own growth which he consumes, amount to at least £100 per annum. The 2,000 loads of farm manure and earth which he annually applies are thus highly enriched, and applied almost wholly to the green crop quarter. They go to maintain the production of that cattle food on the after use of which the fertility of the farm is thus made almost wholly to depend.

"Of the green crop quarter after wheat there are a few acres in rye and tares to be plowed up in May and June for transplanted kohl rabi; and there are a few acres in mangel wurzel every year for the latest spring keep before the rye and tares are ready. The kohl rabi, which is the main and almost only green crop, is, however, generally sown, pretty much as an early Swede crop would be sown, at intervals all through the month of May, two or three pounds of seed per acre being drilled in rows 22 inches apart, on land which has received a heavy dressing of well-made manure. The rye and tares, white clover, the pasture fields, with a certain extent of cabbages to eke them out in drought, the clover stubble, a few early turnips, the kohl rabi and the mangel wurzel, are the succession which keep cows and sheep, breeding and fattening stock, throughout the year. About two-thirds of the barley crop—Hallett's Pedigree barley is the sort adopted—are sown down with broad clover or with Dutch, and one-third of the barley stubble is plowed up for winter beans or for peas. The whole of this is followed by wheat—Banham's Browick Red is the only kind sown—a portion of the quarter, whatever needs it most, receiving a half-dressing of farm manure. After the wheat again come rye and tares. Tares are preferred, except when very dear, as catch crops, to be followed by kohl rabi, which, from being the rarity we once knew, for experimental use upon little more than garden scale, here usurps the office of providing the whole winter feed of the flock and herd—justifying the confidence thus placed in it, especially in a dry season such as the past, when Swedes and turnips have generally failed."

Patrons of Husbandry.

Some members of the Order have written to us, finding fault with the remarks made on the subject in the last issue of the *Advocate*, many of whom do not give their names for insertion, but merely sign "Granger." We publish the letters received, merely abridging them, as we must economize space, and not, by inserting them in full, exclude other matters of importance to agriculture, to which our paper is mainly devoted. To the writers we say, we do not take the part of manufacturers against farmers. The farmer's interest is ours, and every measure we advocate we believe to be for their good. We support the Grange system as a farmers' organization, and we have aided in the introduction of it into Canada. We believe that much good will result from it, and wish it every prosperity. At the same time, we do not devote the *Advocate* wholly to their interest, though we expect the best class of farmers to become Patrons. We expect the greatest benefits from it will be from their social meetings, and

their discussions on subjects of agriculture, and that from general improvements and better management there must be good results. We do not expect permanent advantages will be gained by farmers by extensive trading in general commodities. Contributions sent us, which are likely to promote any good or carry out any improvement, will be always received with great pleasure.

Why should there be any clashing of interests between manufacturers and farmers? We do not think it a judicious policy to array class against class. While we, at all times, uphold the rights and just claims of farmers, we do not wage war against others, and certainly we cannot in justice be said to support manufacturers in opposition to the farmer's rights and interests.

Napanee, Ont., Feb. 8, 1875.

SIR,—You will confer a favor by giving the following statements space in your valuable paper, in reply to Mr. Dunnington's questions in the February number of the *Advocate*.

Firstly, I am a patron of a Grange; secondly, I have been a merchant for a number of years; and, thirdly, I am at present a farmer. I merely mention the above to convey the idea that I am at least partly qualified to answer his questions.

First—"What is a fair profit for a merchant to make on his goods, and a farmer on his wheat?" With our present credit system, a merchant should make a profit of not less than twenty-five per cent. If everything was sold for cash, fifteen per cent. would do very well.

I do not care to raise wheat for less than twenty-five per cent. profit; but I do think that more wheat has been raised for a number of years, in the older sections of our country, without any profit than with it.

Secondly—"If the Grange movement is fair and honorable, why make any secret of it?"

To condemn the Grange because it is a secret society, would be to condemn every secret society. But to give some of the reasons why it is a secret society justly, we will suppose a case that would be almost an every-day occurrence if it was otherwise. Neighbor Smith belongs to the Grange; neighbor Jones does not. Smith buys a reaping machine for some thirty or forty dollars less than Jones can. If Smith told Jones, the latter would in all probability make it as unpleasant for the manufacturer as he knew how, and would likely give some other person his patronage for the future.

The Grange does not purpose being the means of any such difficulties—hence the great importance of it being a secret order. We have greatly reduced prices from manufacturers and producers of our requirements—in some cases one-half less than we would be obliged to pay if we did not belong to the Grange—and in justice to manufacturers, and the solemnity of our obligations, we keep secret the business of our order.

Is it at all likely, if there was anything unfair or dishonorable in the working of the Grange, that Patrons would allow their wives and daughters to become members?

So far as beauty, respectability and real worth goes, we have a number of ladies (in the true sense of the word) to grace our Grange.

Again, is there anything criminal in secrecy? We are almost every day making expressions that would be better secret. If secrets are honorably kept, peace, virtue, truth and character are preserved. Is every well-regulated family dishonorable because they have their family secrets? The principles of our order are not secret, and the whole community have the best wishes of the Patrons of Husbandry, not excepting agents and middlemen.

One great feature of the Grange is co-operation. It kills monopoly. It is home enterprise. Cheese Factory Associations are co-operations; but perhaps the most perfect is the postal system. What great advantages from this great co-operative system! If every man had to carry his own mail, it would cost a fortune.

Notwithstanding, the Patrons of Husbandry are becoming quite numerous, and their influence is commanding no little attention. We hope to ere

long obtain as many advantages as our brethren in the States, but as yet we are in our infancy.

Thirdly—"Tell us if a man who cheats and lies for the sake of money is morally qualified to be a Granger."

To this I will say most emphatically, No. We have none such. They would be nice associates for our wives and daughters, and ornaments to our order!

Finally—"If agents and middlemen are such villains now, how can we be sure of their honesty when employed by the Grangers?"

Agents and middlemen are just the men we purpose dispensing with. We do not need them. We want to save their commission.

We claim it is much better for manufacturers to send their price-lists and discounts to the Secretary of the Dominion Grange, as they are sent monthly to all subordinate Granges in our Dominion, thereby giving the Patrons of nearly one hundred Granges an opportunity of sending in their orders, accompanied by the cash (as we do a purely cash business), than to have agents or middlemen to sell to all kinds of customers on long terms of credit, thereby paying large commissions and sustaining more or less losses.

In conclusion, I ask your indulgence, as your paper is devoted to agricultural interests, and hoping this may be of some interest to that part of the community. Very respectfully,

W. N. HARRIS,
Overseer of Newburgh Grange.

Schomberg, Feb. 9, 1875.

MR. EDITOR—DEAR SIR,—Allow me to send you a few thoughts suggested by reading an editorial in your widely-circulated journal, headed, "Manufacturers and Patrons of Husbandry."

Grangers have no unfriendly feelings towards manufacturers, but regard them as essential to our interests, and are not insensible to the benefits they have in the past conferred upon us. We hold that agents are often injurious to both manufacturer and farmer. How often is it that agents, too eager to gain percentage, press sales when, to say the least, the prospect of payment is exceedingly doubtful? Let the unpaid accounts of every manufacturer prove this.

The Grangers have drawn no arbitrary lines. We are yet in our infancy, feeling our way. We have no desire to injure any legitimate calling whatever, but seek to promote the best interests of the country. One of the greatest banes to prosperity is the credit system. We then ask the co-operation of manufacturers, merchants, &c., in producing the desired end. This end can be gained by granting to us the profits given to agents and collectors, while we pay cash for all we purchase.

If this co-operation be withheld, we can establish manufactures which shall be under our own control. We have plenty of capital, and as much knowledge of the business as many who have made fortunes by it.

There are other subjects we might touch upon, such as insurance among the Grangers, the want of representation in our Legislature according to our numbers and wealth. These matters, however, and many others, will doubtless, by and by, engage our attention.

We are silently, but successfully, progressing—in fact, from present appearances, there will soon be scarcely a farmer who is not a Granger.

Yours truly, J. M.

Bond Head, Feb. 9, 1875.

MR. EDITOR—DEAR SIR,—In your last issue of the *Advocate* I noticed with some surprise your remarks on the Grange movement. You are, no doubt, better posted than most people, and know whereof you speak when you say that farmers are making quite as much as implement makers are, and have no risk to run. There are many who think different. You have a perfect right to become the champion of manufacturers' rights.

What you mean by interfering with the general trade is not obvious to the writer; but you cannot mean that Patrons should not use their privileges of buying from those who are willing to sell to them at a reduced rate for cash.

Some large firms have responded to our request; some have not. Some remark that the large manufacturing establishments will not have anything to do with us—small ones may. Well, now, who