

facts? No! Did he have an engraving of prize stock made for his paper for some of his Toronto friends, long before the exhibition took place? Does that show honor to other exhibitors, or the country? A worm trod on will turn. In his report of the last meeting of the Dairymen's Association, he sarcastically reports thus:—"Mr. Weld, of London, here enlivened the proceedings by a desultory speech," and he withholds the following resolution which was passed by the association. Perhaps that shows whether George Brown is right or not, in terming our address "desultory." He also states that we made passing observations on the shortcomings of the Board of Agriculture, and at the same time he has not honor sufficient to add the Old Board of Agriculture, no doubt with the intent to cause an erroneous opinion to be formed by his readers. If he has so much honor, can any of his readers explain the reason why they have never seen any of the following resolutions in his paper? He pretends to give full reports, and perhaps he fails because of his great and overburdening amount of honor.

The Canadian Dairymen's Association passed the following resolution at their last session held in Ingersoll, Feb., 1870:

Moved by J. Jarvis, seconded by H. Ganes, and resolved, That W. Weld, Esq., Editor of the Farmer's Advocate, has the prosperity of the agriculturist in view and we consider his paper is doing a great deal of good in the country; we commend the circulation of the same to our patrons and the farmers generally.

The Provincial Board of Agriculture passed the following resolution at London, in September, 1869:

RESOLVED.—That the exertions made by Mr. Weld, in improving and testing various kinds of Farm Cereals, and in diffusing a knowledge thereof through the medium of the press, are deserving the encouragement and support of the farmers of this Province, and that this council will give to the object of improving and testing seed, its best consideration. (Certified.)
HUGH C. THOMPSON, Sec.

The following resolutions were passed unanimously by the County Council of Middlesex, on Dec. 14th, 1867:

"We earnestly recommend the usefulness of the Agricultural Emporium, established by Mr. Wm. Weld, of London, for the dissemination of superior stock, seeds and implements among the farmers of the Dominion, more especially at this time, when from the ravages of the midge and other causes, our wheat crops are diminishing yearly. The exertions of Mr. Weld to procure new kinds of seed are praiseworthy."

We also recommend his paper, the "Farmer's Advocate," to the support of all persons interested in the success of Agriculture.

And your Committee would also recommend Mr. Weld to the favorable consideration of the Legislature of Ontario, praying that honorable body not to overlook the claims of Mr. Weld to encouragement in the efforts he is making for the advancement of our agricultural interests.

JAMES KEEFER,
County Clerk.

In open Council of the County of Middlesex, 29th January, 1870:

It was moved by Wm. Murdoch, seconded by John Nixon, That this council again recommend Wm. Weld to the Legislature of the Dominion for his exertions in the advancement of agriculture, and would also recommend him to the patronage of the public generally, for his arduous and unflinching labors in this most worthy enterprise. Carried unanimously. (Signed.)

JAMES KEEFER,
County Clerk.

Also a Special Prize of \$50 was awarded to W. Weld, by the Board of Agriculture, at

their last meeting in 1869, for his tested seeds. It is just possible that the matters here referred to may be of importance to farmers generally; at any rate the influential bodies who passed them thought so, and yet they have never been permitted to appear in either the GLOBE or the CANADA FARMER, both under the control of the honorable George Brown. The selfish reason is clear. Agricultural matters, like everything else, must tend to the individual profit of Mr. George Brown, or they find no place in either of that honorable gentleman's papers.

LEGAL HINTS FOR FARMERS.

BY GEO. P. LAND, BARRISTER AT LAW.

No. 2.

In this paper, we purpose only to speak of Lands for which patents have been issued.

A farmer about purchasing, or having purchased a farm, should, before accepting a deed, or paying his purchase money, or giving a mortgage for it, be careful to make the following enquiries, viz:

1st. Is the intending seller the owner of the farm he offers for sale.

2nd. Is the title of the property a good one. With respect to the first of these enquiries, there are several ways in which the buyer may satisfy himself as to the ownership of the property. If the seller is the patentee of the lot, and produces his patent, this undoubtedly is evidence of ownership, at and subsequent to the date of the patent; and if on search being made in the Registry office of the county in which the land lies, no conveyance by the Patentee is found recorded against the Lot, the purchaser, or intending purchaser, may conclude that the seller is then the owner; unless, indeed, he have express notice of a Conveyance having been made at some previous time by the Patentee. In most cases, however, the seller is not the Patentee; but has purchased from the Patentee, or from some owner subsequent to the patentee. In cases of this kind, the intending purchaser should insist on the seller producing, not only his Deed, but all the other Title Deeds relating to the Lot. The production of these Deeds, coupled with a search in the Registry office to ascertain that he has not parted with or incumbered the land, will be reasonable evidence of ownership. It frequently happens that the seller claims as the heir at law of a prior owner who was either the patentee or an owner subsequent to the patentee. In cases of this kind, the intending purchaser should satisfy himself, in the first place, that the person from whom the seller claims to have inherited the land was the owner, and that he died owning the lot in question; and in the second place, that the seller is the only heir at law of the former owner, and that he is the present owner of the lot. Then as to the enquiry respecting the title. What has been said with reference to the proof of ownership, is, to some extent, applicable to the enquiry as to title; in other words, the evidence which goes to prove ownership, goes also to prove title to a more or less extent. For example: a man who is the patentee of a lot, produces the patent as evidence of ownership. Now the production of this patent is also evidence that he has not incumbered the land by mortgage; for

the rule is that, the mortgagee holds all the title deeds until his mortgage is paid off. If, therefore, the patentee had mortgaged, the mortgagee would be in possession of the patent, and the owner of the land would not have it to produce. Again, if instead of being a patentee, the owner is a subsequent owner, the intending buyer should insist on a production of all the title deeds relating to the property he is about purchasing or has purchased. If these cannot be produced, evidence should be given to account for their non-production, as, for instance, loss or destruction, and that they are not in the hands of an incumbrance. The Registry office should then be searched, or an abstract of the lot should be obtained in order to ascertain whether the present or any prior owner has mortgaged or otherwise incumbered the property; and if so, whether such incumbrance is discharged and still a charge on the property. It is the duty of the seller, at his own expense, to furnish the buyer with an abstract of the title, and the buyer may refuse to carry out the purchase until he has done so. The following is a list of the charges or incumbrances by which lands are for the most part bound or affected, viz.: 1st, taxes; 2nd., mortgages; 3rd., rent charges; 4th., leases; 5th., executions; 6th., dower; 7th., unpaid premiums or assessments in Mutual Insurance Companies. With respect to all such incumbrances as can be paid off it may be stated, generally, that unless the buyer is purchasing subject to such incumbrances he should see that his purchase money is appropriated, in the first place, to paying them off and what remains should be then handed over to the seller. But if the purchase money is not to be paid down but secured by mortgage, the buyer should insist that any incumbrance affecting the lot, be paid off by the seller before closing the transaction; or the former should arrange to pay off such incumbrance himself, out of the purchase money as it became due, and that all monies paid by him for that purpose, should be deemed payments on his mortgage.

TO THE BOARD OF AGRICULTURE.

GENTLEMEN:—When we were attending the Dairymen's Association we conversed with many of the leading dairymen on different subjects, and among others, about your provincial exhibition. It was a common complaint, felt among dairymen and dealers, that the worst cheese exhibited at the last exhibition took the first prize. We know it to be difficult to please all, but the mode of testing and judging appears to have been such as no real judge of cheese could decide by. We believe that you will use your best endeavors to appoint the most suitable persons; that you know judges should really understand the business they undertake. By a little more attention to the appointment of them, greater confidence will grow among exhibitors.

Food For Sheep.—Sheep require about three per cent. of their live weight of hay or its equivalent per day. That is about three pounds for a sheep weighing in the neighborhood of one hundred pounds. But it is not good economy to confine them to hay alone. They do better on a variety of food, and roots of some kind may be regarded as essential to their thrift. If regularly supplied with turnips or other roots, they will readily consume the stalks and straw, and do well on them, while without roots they would require good hay.