

from the causes referred to, the work was generally inferior to previous matches, and therefore time-keepers and interested parties were less on the look-out than they sometimes are; and not easy to tell where many prizes would be, hence chances were got, but it was easy to see that P. was about first, and which, by the evidence of a large group on his land-end, made his time widely known, and that his time was *up before* he finished.

A meeting of Committee was held, and notwithstanding the untoward circumstances, it was decided, that he got nothing, *being out of time.*"

Rules should be binding, and those who infringe them should forfeit all claims, though deserving otherwise. But it is hard to bring ardent competitors or interested on-lookers to avoid doing so, especially when changes, unreasonable and different from long established practice are resorted to. Arising from such innovations, squabbles and ill-feelings may be expected to occur yearly, as at the late Montreal Match, where regard to the regulations was partially exercised and not acted out in every instance, which if they had been so, it is asserted by some parties that more prizes than that of the Senior Canadians would have changed places. But it is hard to know where each prize would have been, if the truth were told in this respect. But it appears to me that some of the rules are illiberal and unreasonable, and entirely inconsistent with the objects which such competitions are, in their truest sense, designed to effect. Is not the competition in ploughing for the improvement of that art chiefly, and through it indirectly agriculture generally? That all the regulations are not subordinate to the chief object, it is not hard to perceive, and look liker being framed from sinister motives and a spirit of strife. Let us look at one or two. "No ploughman shall be allowed to mend or arrange his land with his hands but may stop his horses—keeping his hands on the stilts, however—and make as long a leg as he chooses to tramp it behind him: and further, that no person shall be allowed to aid or instruct, in any shape, the ploughman after begun." These rules were made, I believe, from some of the crack ploughmen, having, last year, arranged the whole length of a furrow with their hands, and from some aiding by instructions or otherwise in

having the work as well as possible. Now, while I don't like to see any ploughman—from any cause, such as a bad plough or obstructions of any kind—in the unavoidable predicament of being obliged, for the sake of his work and in justice to the proprietor of the land, to lift and arrange bad places in his lot, on the one hand, and *disallowed* by a whim of a majority (who probably know little of such matters practically, and overlook common sense and justice through spleen) from making by all the means in his power, as good a day's work as he can; I say, in every respect, it is better to allow the ploughmen all the means they possess of making good work, but restrict them *to time*, and if the fault of recourse to dressing it with hands and feet (which is no fault at all but laudable when needed) lies in his want of skill in holding or in trimming of his plough to work it *herself*, where there is no obstructions, *the time* which will always sound in his ears while mending his land, will be the best incentive to improve himself in every possible way: for the look of a professedly and expected extra superfine day's job; for the discountenancing of a pernicious habit, now exploded and obsolete, of leaving one bad spot to be covered or arranged *afterwards*; and in justice to the proprietor of the grounds; allow, encourage and enforce each and all of the ploughmen to pass none of the work *unclosed*, and he will resort to all possible means to obviate the necessity of touching it with anything but his favourite implement, especially if *time* haunts or rather *hunts* him. It is said, "alike for one alike for all," but except the circumstances are the same throughout, the binding of all to one certain rule, is not *individual justice*. Lots are not all alike. One there is a road in, it is worst to close, but notwithstanding, were it allowed that hands and feet be used (in short a little harder work for it just to come this when there is *time*) its possessor might rival or beat his more fortunate neighbour and competitor. One lot there is not a stone in, and the plough, if in good trim, will preserve a steady onward motion and leave masterly work, if well held. While a plough as good and as well manned, in a stonier lot, cannot make the same work with the same ease: in justice this ploughman must have fair play with his more fortunate neighbour, and if among these untoward