

ROYAL AGRICULTURAL SOCIETY.

Committee Meeting, March 19, 1856. Present—Henry Longworth, Esq., President; Hon. Judge Peters, Hon. Geo. Coles, Hon. Mr. Mooney, Hon. Mr. Bagnall; Daniel Hodgson, Thos. Pethick, Geo. Wright, James Robertson and Jeremiah Simpson, Esquires; Messrs. Isaac Thompson and John Johnston.

Resolved, That Jeremiah Simpson, Esq., be elected an Honorary Member for the ensuing year. Resolved, That Messrs. Thos. Dodd, George Tweedy, and Samuel Collings be requested to act as Judges of Fat Stock at the Show to be held this day.

The Secretary informed the Board, that Mr. Geo. Smith had returned the Turnip Prize pursuant to a Resolution of the Committee of the 6th day of February last. The Secretary also laid before the Board a letter received from Geo. Smith, relative to the Resolution of the Committee enquiring himself and Geo. Lewis for their conduct as Turnip Inspectors, which together with a letter from the said Geo. Lewis, the Board observe, has appeared in the public prints. Much abuse, the Committee would not of course, condescend to notice, but they observe these parrots state, that they were condemned without a hearing. However conclusive the evidence of their misconduct, the Committee are sensible, that to have condemned them unheard would not have been correct. The Committee therefore, deem it proper to show, that this statement is entirely untrue. On the complaint being made to the Society, the Secretary, by order of the Board, informed Messrs. Smith and Lewis of the charges made against them, and notified them to attend before the Committee on the 2d January, to explain them; they both attended. The Affidavits of Charles Binns, James Dean, John Jackson, Christopher Cassidy and Angus McLeod were read to them, and they both denied the charge, and asserted, that all the Turnips weighed by them had been left untailed. Mr. Smith saying, that he would make his Affidavit that such was the case, and Mr. Lewis, that he would not swear to it, but that he had acted impartially, and the Committee might make the best of it, and he would not attend again about the matter. After hearing all they had to say, the Committee were of opinion, that the Affidavits sufficiently substantiated the charge, but in order to prevent the possibility of any injustice being done to the Inspectors, before passing any Resolution against them, the Board directed the Secretary to write to each individual competitor whose Turnips they had measured, to ascertain whether his Turnips had been tailed or not. At the sitting of the Board on the 6th day of February, the Secretary informed the Committee that he had received verbal answers from the following competitors:—Mr. James Howatt, of Crapaud, stated, that the Inspectors made him trim his Turnips properly, by cutting off both tops and roots. Mr. Joseph Wise stated, that he was told to trim his in the same manner as the above, and added, that they were trimmed, and well trimmed too. Mr. John Wright, of West River, informed the Secretary, that his Turnips had not been tailed previous to weighing. (The weight of Mr. Wright's Crop was 20 tons 13cwt. 4lbs.) Mr. Patrick Berrigan also stated, that his Crop, which weighed 18 tons 14cwt. 3qrs. 6lbs., were also untrimmed, previous to being weighed.

The following written replies were received from other competitors:—

Belmont, Jan. 19, 1856. W. W. Irving, Esq.; Sir—You wish to know whether the Inspectors had my Turnips topped and tailed previous to weighing, or whether they merely topped them, and weighed them with all the roots on? I was present, when my Turnips were pulled and weighed; the roots were all cut off, as well as the tops. I observed one of the men cutting away too much of the Turnips at the root, and told him in hearing of the Inspectors, not to cut away so much of the Turnips.—One of the Inspectors held the bag, while the Turnips were put into it, and unless they shut their eyes, they could not but see the roots were cut off; but I am inclined to think, they had them pretty wide open.

Yours, &c. (Signed) Esq. E. Wright.

Goose Pond, St Peter's Road, January 25, 1856. Dear Sir; I am not surprised that complaints should have been lodged against the Turnip Inspectors. Mr. Smith, when examining mine, could scarcely get a drill, but was too cool, as he said. I am not sure, that they forbid the tailing, but they allowed me to do so. They also showed me the weight of a Mr. John Wright's, and stated, that I would be before him; notwithstanding, he obtained a Prize and I did not.

I am, &c., &c. (Signed) Alex. Robertson.

P. S.—I measured the same space as they did, and my weighings averaged 165lbs. and theirs about 70lbs. A. Robertson. To W. W. Irving, Esq., Secretary R. A. Society.

W. W. Irving Esq. 5th Jan. 1856.

Sir, I have received your letter, and in reply have to state, that some of my Turnips were weighed with the roots on, but the greatest portion were trimmed and made fit for market before weighing. This was done in presence of the Inspectors, Messrs. Smith and Lewis, and not objected to by them. It is quite true also, that Mr. Smith offered me a sovereign for my chance of the first prize—all of which I will swear to, if necessary.

Yours &c. &c. (Signed) JOHN THOMAS. Jan. 17th 1856.

Sir, In answer to your note of 2nd Jan. inst. requesting me to state, for the information of the Agricultural Society, whether my Turnips were "topped and tailed" at the time of the inspection; I was present in the field, and assisted to prepare them for the inspection, and cut off the tops and roots, and so they were weighed.

Your obt. svt. (Signed) JAMES D. HASZARD.

The Committee also observe, that Mr. Lewis attempts to throw blame on the Secretary, Mr. Irving, for informing Mr. Binns that Messrs. Smith and Lewis's turnips had not been tailed, but there is no ground for the imputation. Through the untrue representations of Messrs. Smith and Lewis, Mr. Irving had been induced to measure their turnips with the roots uncut, believing that they had measured the turnips of Mr. Binns and the other competitors in the same manner. On paying Mr. Binns, the second prize, he very properly remarked, that to weigh turnips with the roots on, was not a proper mode of ascertaining the crops; and but for this accidental remark, the improper conduct of the Inspectors might have remained undetected.—Both Messrs. Smith and Lewis were well paid by the Society for making the inspection, and had the Secretary suspected their conduct of unfair dealing, and remained silent, he would indeed have been to blame.

Moved and Seconded that the above be inserted in the Minute Book, and published in Haszard's Gazette.

Read Tenders for printing the Annual Report and transactions of the Society for the past year.

Resolved that Mr. Whelan's Tender be accepted, being the lowest.

Read the following letter from Judge Peters: Sidmouth Feb. 14th 1856.

Dear Sir, I think our September cattle show would be much increased, if a prize was given for yearling Heifers—I last year gave the Society 40s. to be offered as a prize for ploughing in Buck-wheat, which was not competed for. I therefore desire, that it may be offered as a prize at the next cattle show, for the best Heifer calved in 1855. I also enclose 30s., which I wish offered as a prize for the second-best Heifer calved in the same year, 1855.

I remain &c. Your obt. Servt. JAMES H. PETERS.

To W. W. Irving Esq. Secretary R. A. Society. Moved and Seconded, that the thanks of the Board be given to His Honor Judge Peters for his liberality.

CORRESPONDENCE.

MUTUAL FIRE INSURANCE.

Mr. Editor; Among the few companies that have been formed in our City, I do not see one that has prospered so well, and promises to be more useful and beneficial to the Community than the Mutual Fire Insurance Company. On enquiry I find that this Institution has now been in operation about 7 years; that a few individuals who had made the calculations and every allowance, became satisfied that nearly three times the amount of money was drawn from the Island, in the shape of Premiums, that it cost to pay the losses incurred in it, and therefore determined to get up a Mutual Insurance Company among themselves, for the first two or three years, their business was very limited; owing to a want of confidence in the system; the promoters however determined to persevere, feeling that as they had such a limited income in the shape of Premiums, they had only a limited number of risks to run. The system now appears to have gained confidence, and no wonder, when we find the parties insured in this company only pay half the premium charged by the Foreign companies, and as a proof of the correctness of the calculations made by its early promoters, I observe, that they have paid all their losses and expenses of working the company; and should no accident happen them this year, they will have cleared £1000 in the bargain! and that the interest of their Cash Capital, now overpays the annual expense; this also shows their company is very judiciously and economically worked. A person insuring in this Company pays about half

the rate of Premium charged in the other Companies, and signs a Bond to pay the extent of 5 per cent. on the amount he has insured, in case of a loss that would absorb that amount over the amount of Cash in hand; consequently if it should so happen that after insuring in the Company several years, one was called on to pay even to the full extent of his Bond, he would be no worse off, than if he insured in a Foreign Company.

I am of opinion, that the advantage of having your money and interest in case of no loss, is equivalent to the risk of having to pay three or four or even five per cent. in case of a heavy loss.

In dividing the amount the Company have insured, by the number of policies issued, they average only about £200 each, and at that average 9 or 10 buildings would be burnt down, before a party could be called on for 5 per cent.

It is quite evident to me, that unless the foreign Companies were making handsome profits out of us, they would not continue their Agencies, might we not therefore make and keep this money among ourselves—should we not all join this Company, and as soon as we have a Capital of two or three thousand pounds—have the Premiums reduced to one quarter per cent. Although I have been always insured in the foreign offices, I mean to withdraw from them and insure in the above.

Yours &c. A CITIZEN.

(For Haszard's Gazette.) THE SCHOOL ACT. (CONCLUDED.)

In Nos. 1 and 2 communications, I took into consideration the schoolmaster's labour and responsibility; compared his position and prospects in life, with those of other public officers, and glanced at education in the U. States and Silesia. All tending to show, that he is not dealt with according to his deserts, and a due regard to the melioration of this country. It is true, that many teachers get their board by subscription, but in many Districts it rests with a few spirited individuals to bear the burden, while others equally benefited, manage to slink, and "pay nothing by hook or by crook."

In addition to the qualification of the First class, the Second class teachers must know Algebra, Geometry, Trigonometry, Mensuration, Land Surveying, Navigation, Astronomy, and Geography with the use of the Globes, for which they are paid the unenviable sum of £5!! Is this a sufficient inducement to study the necessary branches to become a Second class teacher? I'll leave the public to decide.

I have just read a suggestion of the Hon. Colonial Secretary in the House, that all teachers should pay a pound yearly into a Fund, and in case of continued sickness or old age, should be entitled to £20 yearly. According to this scheme one person's contributions in 20 years would amount to £40 for which he gets nothing, if he has not the luck to get sick, or old. If Mr. Coles were a Schoolmaster, I think he would prefer being paid a sufficient salary, that he might provide against old age &c.

Nerily I say unto Legislators, if you do not say £100 for the Second class teacher this session, you will be remembered next day of responsibility.

But I fancy I hear you asking with a smile, whence the Funds are to come. Every judicious thinker will accord, that education is the pillar of the nation; that the Revenue of a country should be devoted, not only to serve its present wants and protection, but to raise its people to intellectuality, reflection and refinement; for in proportion as intelligence increases, so do civility and the protection of life and property; also in the same ratio do prejudice, superstition, vice and crime, decrease. Therefore if these innumerable advantages are desirable from education, is it too much to say, that the half of the Revenue of any people should be dedicated to the attainment of this momentous object! their own enlightenment!

At present (according to Mr. Whelan's speech) only about 2-7 of the Revenue, or £18000 out of £42000 are expended on education in this Island. Hence, the maintenance of (266) persons and the Central Academy, as well as some other incidental educational expeditures, would satisfy only thirty of our 2400 gentlemen.

O ye law-makers, do not harbour the viper of selfishness, when you are legislating for your children, and the rising generation, who are destined to be the statesmen and administrators of affairs in this beautiful Isle. Prove yourselves philanthropists now, and succeeding generations will bless and crown your day, with honour and everlasting fame. I might say much more on this interesting subject, but having occupied a good deal of your

valuable space, and hoping that the few hints may not be unimportant, I beg to remain, Dear Sir, Yours, &c. &c.

Bedouee, March 6th, 1856.

Gentlemen; I think it somewhat unfortunate for this City that its funds are in so low a state that drains cannot be cut to let off the surplus water, and also that scavengers cannot be employed to gather up the masses of dirt and manure on the surface of very many of the streets. I trust the funds may not be so small another spring.

Yours, &c. &c. C. Charlottevoun, 21st March, 1856.

THE LORD'S DAY OBSERVANCE MOVEMENT.

DEPARTURE TO LORD PALMERSTON.

The interview on Saturday between the First Minister of the Crown and a deputation of Ministers and laymen of all Evangelical denominations, headed by the Archbishop of Canterbury, was an occasion of extraordinary interest. Between 100 and 105 gentlemen assembled at his Lordship's residence, 144, Piccadilly. The attendance would have been even more numerous had not the invitations been restricted, in deference, we understand, to the Archbishop's wish that the number should be limited. This deputation included official representatives of the Church, Wesleyan, London, and Baptist Missionary Societies, Home and Colonial School Society, Colonial Church and School Society, Religious Tract Society, Sunday School Union, Sunday School Institute, Ragged School Union, Church of England Young Men's Christian Association, Evangelical Alliance, Protestant Alliance, Protestant Association, Open Air Mission, Pure Literature Society, Lord's Day Society, Metropolitan Lord's Day Committee, Wesleyan Sabbath Committee, and other missionary and religious institutions.

Lord Palmerston entered the room shortly after 11 o'clock.

The Archbishop of CANTERBURY, speaking with evident emotion, briefly addressed his Lordship on the character of the question at issue, urging the close connexion between our national Sabbath and the public maintenance of religion in the land, and pointing out the unanimity of all Christian bodies in upholding the present legal enactments of the Lord's Day. His Grace then made the following address:—

"We who have now the honour to address your Lordship are persuaded that we represent the common belief of the Christian people of this country that the observance of the Lord's Day is of Divine authority and perpetual obligation.

"We rejoice that this authority and obligation have been acknowledged with more or less of Scriptural enlightenment at almost every period of our history; and we are thankful to God for the reverential recognition of that His ordinance, by our Sovereign and her Government.

"We have, therefore, heard with concern that attempts are being made, both in and out of Parliament, to break in upon its sanctity, and that, among other things, it is proposed to open such places as the British Museum and Crystal Palace, and otherwise to provide similar amusements for a portion of the people on that day.

"We are aware that the observance of the Lord's Day by the people comes far and short of what it ought to be, yet at present all violations of its sanctity are opposed to the spirit, if not to the letter, of our laws; and it cannot be disputed that this nation has long been distinguished above many others by its outward and reverential observance of the entire day; and it is well understood by the people that the afternoon is not less sacred than the early part of it, and that secular occupations, studies, and recreations, which are innocent, or even duties, on the other days of the week, are not suitable for the Lord's day. We would earnestly oppose any attempt to diminish that public reverence for the day; we cannot doubt that a departure from its due observance in any one particular would, if not resisted, soon lead to others; and so far from it being reasonable to expect, as some persons do, that the proposed changes would have the effect of closing public houses and haunts of vice on that day, it is more reasonable to expect that the valuable example hitherto set by this country would no longer be maintained with regard to public exhibitions generally.

"We cannot, as Christians or patriots, contemplate the present amount of Sabbath-breaking in the land without deep sorrow; and we would strongly protest against adding the servants employed in museums, the Crystal Palace, and other places of amusement, to the number already engaged in secular business on the day which we are commanded to keep holy. The afternoon and evening are the chief opportunities that many have of attending public worship; and the proposed innovations would add new allurements and obstacles to desertion therewith, and to tempt the young from seeking the instruction which they can only receive at Sunday schools; and it is impossible to calculate the amount of the evils which must certainly arise if a human standard for the observance of the day of rest be allowed to take the place in the minds of the people of the Divine will as it is revealed in Holy Scripture, to which they have hitherto been accustomed. We beg to assure your Lordship that we are

conscious of the gravity of the subject, and we are deeply grieved to find that the Government are proposing to open such places as the British Museum and Crystal Palace, and otherwise to provide similar amusements for a portion of the people on that day. We are aware that the observance of the Lord's Day by the people comes far and short of what it ought to be, yet at present all violations of its sanctity are opposed to the spirit, if not to the letter, of our laws; and it cannot be disputed that this nation has long been distinguished above many others by its outward and reverential observance of the entire day; and it is well understood by the people that the afternoon is not less sacred than the early part of it, and that secular occupations, studies, and recreations, which are innocent, or even duties, on the other days of the week, are not suitable for the Lord's day. We would earnestly oppose any attempt to diminish that public reverence for the day; we cannot doubt that a departure from its due observance in any one particular would, if not resisted, soon lead to others; and so far from it being reasonable to expect, as some persons do, that the proposed changes would have the effect of closing public houses and haunts of vice on that day, it is more reasonable to expect that the valuable example hitherto set by this country would no longer be maintained with regard to public exhibitions generally.