

have a curtailment of railway companies they can return bet-
stockholders. Better money for Canada at which again implies a greater general injurious monopolies!

and Crops.

most severe droughts months that we have at and hay, were not it, but the late crops, offered to an alarming and have been in a ing state for a long place are now very has been under the or less of their win- have become dry, watered their stock, having to drive in do do that. The root many places a total got their growth, and light crop. The fall sown in land as hot es. In some places use some of the wheat been found, but the night, with the ther- shade, must shrivel much of the wheat then rain comes and r. We hope it may us you, but we write we wish to see the ex- meter yesterday was in our warehouse win- be at all surprised if eat sown would be so itate receding in the have abandoned the wheat, and will not stock cattle will be what you can, be- One bushel fed this ch fat as two, three, or ev n ten, in cold pond on the treatment

Importations.

Smith, one Clyde- ro, one Clyde mare, e Ayrshire cow, and re, three Ayrshire de horses. Montreal, two fillies d a two years old. e, one Clyde stallion. ettsville, a two year

sheep, 7 stallions and

correct number of Leicesters, horses the several breeders are more numerous & Beattie, we hear, Craig, Snell and aught a lot of fresh y. Our exhibitions their appearance.

al Emporium.

had the opportunity or of this institution. opportunity to take one he time is not far dis- I be worth a pr mium, en regret that you had n earlier date. You ty, and we would re- me subscriber at each They can only cost ain hundreds in a year may be derived from it. ever returns.

IES IN CANADA.

Canada are said to be here is no reason why e Provinces should not with the dairy districts There is no danger of The *Western Rural* ground, and does yet, tion always produces n, if the commodity al value to the com-

Correspondence.

A. G. DEADMAN VERSUS PROVINCIAL AGRICULTURAL ASSOCIATION.

Dear Sir,—

I wish to make a few remarks in further explanation in regard to the above suit, the leading facts of which are so truthfully given in one of your late issues—more especially as it merited the severest censure and condemnation from you, in that the most disgraceful means were used to gain a verdict, irrespective of, and contrary to the rules laid down in the by-laws of the Association, by one member of the Association, the Rev. R. Burnett—who is also President of the Fruit Growers' Association—positively swearing to facts that were proven by four highly respectable farmers (men known in their respective neighborhoods to be above reproach, and whose words are as good as their bonds, three of whom exhibited in the same class and section as I did, as well as in other sections of the fruit department, and were opponents to myself by closely competing with me for the prize) to have never taken place. It was the general opinion of those who heard the evidence at the trial that he swore to facts that he must have known were perfectly untrue, and well merited the contempt of every one present, when we remember that he ought to be the vindicator and exponent of truth and honor; also, that he is unworthy to claim the distinctive name he bears, and is a disgrace to both the Fruit Growers' Association and Provincial Agricultural Association, President of the first and member of the Council of the other.

That no exhibitor or member can have confidence in any institution where such men as this Rev. "gentleman" have the ruling power is evident—who, by assuming an authority not given him by the by-laws of the Society (see Rule 44) laid down for their guidance, can, by his own arbitrary will and pleasure, without any just reason, cancel an award given by the judges, and award it to any friend who may be an exhibitor in the same section.

Now, Mr. Editor, the great principles involved in this trial were, 1st, can the committee appointed to investigate any complaint in their respective departments, cancel or withhold an award given by the judges, if the exhibitor obtaining such prize has complied faithfully with the rules of the Association? 2nd, can they, or have they the power, after withholding an award (in case there have been found good reasons for doing so), give such prize to any other exhibitor who had not previously received any prize in that section. I decidedly say no; and on these grounds I sued the Association for \$8, being the amount of my prize awarded for the 2nd best 20 varieties of apples.

Knowing that my fruit was correctly named, and that I had complied with the conditions relating to exhibitors, I could see no valid reason why they should take it away from me. At first, on applying to Toronto for my prize money, I was informed by Mr. Thomson, the Secretary, that my award was cancelled by order of the committee in that department, and confirmed by the Council. I then wrote to enquire on what grounds, or how had I transgressed the rules that it should be taken away from me. After two more letters I began to find out the reason: *That on the complaint, he thinks, of one G. J. Miller, that my fruit was incorrectly named; but when the first trial came on, I was prepared to prove by six witnesses, three being exhibitors in the same section, and who are the leading fruit growers in this part of the Dominion, and who have been brought up to the business from childhood, that the names were correct and that my fruit was worthy of the second prize.*

They then totally abandoned this plea as their defence, knowing they could not sustain such an excuse. We said, then, "produce the written protest that was put in (which the rules of the Association require), which will explain the reason for your setting aside the first award of the judges."—This they could not do, although I had subpoenaed all papers and books relating to the matter. They could not produce this protest or show that there had been one.

On these grounds I obtained my first verdict, open to a new trial if they could produce this protest.

Now let us see what followed. They consulted their lawyer, who, I presume, thought he was a Hercules, and made application for a new trial, setting forth one reason that they could produce such evidence as would clearly show that a written protest had been sent in. The new trial was granted, and now, Mr. Editor, mark the evidence given in support of this new plea. The morning of trial came on, with this great luminary, I believe a Mr. Smart, a lawyer from Hamilton, from whose brilliant rhetoric such a flood of light would appear that the darkness hitherto surrounding the case would soon vanish. Then there was the Secretary, Mr. Thomson, with books and papers sufficient, to all appearance, to try a Tichborne case; and lastly, accompanying this worthy pair, was the essence of truth and purity, the Rev. R. Burnett, President of the Fruit Growers' Association and member of the P. A. A., who came up the second time with the arrogant and presumptuous supposition that the holy character of his profession, and the high position he held ("I am President of the Fruit Growers' Association and member of the P. A. A.") would have such an overwhelming influence with the court that any evidence he might give could not possibly be questioned, and that the testimony of seven honest farmers and fruit growers would sink into insignificance; but did the jury think so? Did this Rev. gent. come out of that court as clear in conscience as when he entered it? Did the evidence prove, although he distinctly swore to the fact, that a written protest was put in? No! When cross-examined, what did he say? He "could not tell what was the nature of the contents of the protest, and knew not what the complaint was." This worthy pretended he acted on the charges contained in such letter.

This was great evidence of a protest having been put in.

Hear what Mr. Thompson said, a gentleman who, I believe, would not sacrifice truth and honor to gain a paltry suit, or try to establish a fact that did not exist. He said on oath that he had no recollection of seeing any protest, or reading one, or handing any to Mr. Burnett. This agrees with his letter to me, wherein he says: "I think the complaint was made to the committee." If there had been such a protest, how was it he had not this one amongst his other protests, which numbered twelve or more? He was the party to whom the protest would have to be handed in, according to law. How was it they did not produce the man who wrote the protest and gave it to the Secretary?

I think this Rev'd swore that Thomson handed him the paper. Further, look at this reverend gentleman's evidence. He swore that he destroyed and tore up all the prize tickets on Thursday, in each section, when he and two others composing the committee had made any alteration, and threw them under the table. Did he do so in the case of Mr. Wm. Buttery, of Strathroy, whose prize was withheld, who took away his ticket? Did he do so in the case of Mr. W. Armstrong, of Westminster, who took his away too, and his prize was withheld? Did he in my case, when I proved it was attached to my fruit during the whole show and was there when the fruit was taken away on Friday afternoon, another witness has since come forward to say she saw it there, too, on Friday. Think you that any reliance can be placed upon the testimony of such a witness?

Again, he swore that your evidence of what he said at the meeting of the Board at Toronto, was untrue; that when you brought my case before the Council as to the reasons for withholding my prize, the Rev. gentleman stated or made out it was an apple called the Pear Apple among my fruit that was incorrect. Now, I had no such apple, and I was prepared to prove at the first trial that it was not the Pear apple, by producing the apple itself, which is a late Winter Sweeting, labelled amongst my fruit as Well's Sweeting. But on being closely examined, he admitted having spoken of this apple—this being the bottom of the whole trouble; but instead of coming forward and admitting that he had made a great error in judgment in the hasty manner in which he formed his opinion, and well knowing that I could easily upset this pretense, they hazarded the chance of obtaining a verdict on a point of law—as to their right upon a protest to alter any award

made by the judges, even supposing my fruit was correctly named.

He further admitted that a Mr. Miller had spoken to him about the way the judges had decided, and in reply he had expressed an opinion that they had not exercised much judgment in making their awards. Now, it was the general opinion of all that this was the only ground on which the award was altered, and that this was that great written protest that was put in, and that these great men were prepared to prove, no matter how questionable the means used, so long as their decision could be sustained.

I trust I have vindicated a principle, that no officer can violate or break the rules of the Association with impunity, and that every exhibitor should have fair play in every department, no matter from what section of the country he comes, and that no partiality should be shown, so that the Niagara district might keep up its old reputation as producing the best fruit, whereas the western part of Ontario is fast outstripping it in the excellence of its fruit and the intelligence of its fruit growers.

I hope and trust we have some honest farmers, who, as directors in this Association, will make a motion and condemn the proceedings of those connected with this suit, which is calculated to bring the Association into bad repute, to engender a feeling of distrust amongst the farming community, who can have no confidence that any prizes that may be fairly and impartially awarded them by the judges will be paid by the Association; otherwise they will find out too late that the farmers are not to be gulled by the great and tempting offer of \$12,000 in prizes to be given away, if they know and feel it is not carried out in good faith, when properly and fairly earned—and when they see that the working and carrying out of its rules are violated, and some of its leading men wanting in all that makes a man the likeness of his Maker—when we see the main object is to pocket out of the handsome surplus remaining after paying all expenses, large emoluments to themselves, squandering, as in this case, about \$100 to defeat the honest payment of an \$8 prize, fairly and honorably won.

Well may we exclaim, as many exhibitors of the late show told them at the trial,—"It's the last dollar you will ever get out of me," and who left the hall perfectly disgusted with their meanness. I should like to ask either of the gentlemen whether they would have brought a lawyer from Hamilton, and hired an expensive carriage and pair from London, besides paying the railway fare from Toronto, if the money had to come out of their pockets. I guess not. Its the farmers' money and the farmers have to foot the bill.

I must now, Mr. Editor, thank you for the interest shown in my behalf, and for allowing me space in your valuable journal to expose the doings of men high in power but low in principle. Hoping your publication may prosper and that you will ever lend a helping hand to expose knavery, dishonesty and fraud, and that the farmers of the Dominion may always have a helping friend in the FARMER'S ADVOCATE.

I remain, your well-wisher,
A. G. DEADMAN.
Delaware, Ont., August, 1874.

FRUIT.

Allow me to submit for your notice a few specimens of two kinds of apples, neither of which, if we may judge from the few trees seen growing of them, are appreciated as they deserve. I have heard one of them—the "Hawthorn Dean"—spoken of as the poor man's apple; the other—"Duchess of Oldenburg"—is equally as well entitled to the appellation, I think.

The trees from which the accompanying fruit was picked are 6 and 7 years old respectively, planted 3 and 4 years ago, and this is the second season both of them have borne fruit. The Hawthorn Dean is of Scotch origin, medium to large in size, pale yellow, with red blush on sunny side when ripe; a constant, and not only abundant, but very early bearer, while the dwarf habit of the tree admits of its being planted in small gardens without inconvenience.

The "Duchess of Oldenburg" is a large, roundish, rather long apple, beautifully marked and striped with red on a yellow

ground, very tender in texture of fruit and full of juice, making it a favorite with the cook. The tree is as hardy as the Siberian crab, which of itself is a great recommendation. Both varieties are fall apples, fit to use in August, and ripening the end of September and October.
A. P.

August 25th, 1874.

[The specimens sent us by Mr. Pontey, of St. James' Park Nurseries, are of a good growth and perfectly sound; they are now good cooking apples—August 25th. We have no doubt but they will make a fair eating apple in a few weeks. The trees these apples were grown on branch out two feet from the ground. The hardiness, early bearing qualities and utility of the apple for small gardens and for northern latitudes appear to be such as to recommend them highly to all parts of the country where there is any difficulty found in raising the more tender varieties. The sun, in some localities, destroys the apple trees by striking on the trunks of the growing trees. To obviate this, the low stemmed trees should be planted, so that the leaves on the lower branches will protect the stem. In the western portion of Canada this precaution is not so necessary as in the eastern and more northern parts of our country. We hear of many trees, and even whole orchards being nearly destroyed. It is our impression, and the impression of many fruit men, that the low stemmed trees are the safest and best to plant in such localities.—Ed.]

FRICION OF MACHINERY.

Dear Sir,—

Will you allow space for a few words in the interest of farmers who, in purchasing reapers and mowers, are careful in the extreme about cost and a good one? There are some points which may be said to be placed before their eyes which they cannot see. On these points a little light will do good to all parties concerned.

Durability and Less Repairs.

Every machinist knows there is greater wear when the pits are not good and true, there being consequently more strains and friction, which are the worst things to have about a reaper or machine of any kind. "Too much play in the parts of a machine is a bad thing; a machine that runs easy, with little play, is the machine. Good workmen make good work, and wages that are paid in a shop is a good point to judge from as to the kind of work put in.

Material is a point that farmers cannot judge, so that the manufacturers who say they buy at the cheapest market don't buy the best. All know that best brands bring best prices. The present prices of reapers will allow of the very best make and material. Every machinist knows that separate pieces of iron running together is like a candle lit at both ends—soon worn out, and the great friction is a continuous and accumulating expense. To lessen this trouble Babbitt metal of every quality that is cheap is used in reapers, costing from 20 to 9 cts. per pound, while railway companies find it cheaper to use Babbitt metal that costs them 35 cts. and more per pound.

Pitman boxes are made of every description of collected brass, without judgment in many cases, and yet there is no part of a reaper that needs more attention than this; it should be of the strongest kinds, that allow of the greatest durability, and to mix metals of the best and proper quality is the business of a brass founder, and a skillful man at that. Tom, Dick and Harry are not able to do this work properly, but Tom, Dick and Harry are doing the work mostly, to the great detriment of the farmer.

Some parties advertise their reapers as having Pitman boxes of the best gun metal, while few good brass founders would think of making good Pitman boxes of gun metal, it being the most suitable for steam fittings; but he can compound a metal twice as durable under strain and friction as gun metal. Manufacturers are like the brewer who could not make good beer—he was too near the pump; he used the cheapest material.

The heaviest machine is not always the strongest; the material may be very inferior. The best will prove the cheapest to all parties.

Yours truly,
J. LAW.
London, Ont., July 27th, 1874.