

I cheerfully do so, premising, however, that my own information is limited, and that I have no personal knowledge of the origin of the vine.

As I have been informed, it is a seedling developed near Rochester, N. Y., some four or five years since. In the spring of 1877 it was brought under my notice, and as I found that the vine had already been planted here in a small way,—notably by Mr. L. W. Decker, of Decker's Park, from whom I informed myself of its qualities,—I engaged more extensively in its cultivation.

It was introduced to my notice as of the "Champion" variety, and, I think, was known to Mr. Decker by that name; but I have since learned that the name "Champion" was used as a general descriptive name, in the absence of a more appropriate one.

It appears there are two other varieties of the "Champion"—the "Champion" proper and the "Talmán Champion"—with neither of which can the present be confounded. I am also informed that the horticultural societies in the States cannot agree to name it "Champion;" they have refused to do so, and the vine has no recorded name whatever. Among my vines I received a hundred of the true "Champion," whose fruit ripened last year fully a fortnight later than that of the "Beaconsfield;" so that I know there is a great and essential difference between the two varieties.

This is simply all I know of the history of the vine, and I have only to add that, having visited Mr. Decker's vineyard in the autumn of 1877, I know mine to be identically the same as that grown by Mr. Decker, which fact may enable the Society to identify it.

I have stated in a circular and have published that I am prepared to supply these vines from my own vineyard at Pointe Claire, and I ought perhaps to explain here that this supply will come from 45,000 cuttings from my own vines that I have now in the nursery.

I have no desire to overpersuade people to purchase my vines. If there be any hesitancy or doubt on their part as to the success of the experiments, by all means let them wait until the next harvest of fruit that they may see and be convinced. I am content that the vine shall be dealt with on its own merits.

My reasons for avoiding any repetition of the name "Champion," and for naming the vine the "Beaconsfield," are these: I found it to be a really valuable vine, very early and prolific, and one admirably suited, as I think, to our climate, which the "Champion" is not.

To continue to name it the "Champion" would create confusion and occasion disappointment to persons who might engage in its culture, for the chances are that they would purchase the variety that is properly called the "Champion"—a much inferior vine, and one having no particular qualities to recommend its cultivation here—and the result of this mistake would bring discredit upon the "Beaconsfield," and upon all who may have recommended its cultivation.

Apart from business considerations, which of course had their due weight, I am of opinion that the giving it a distinguishing name was a prudent step, protecting the public, as it will, from falling into the error