

engines were working at one time to say nothing of those that were not entered in the contest but were giving daily demonstration of their ability as plowing engines. Among these must be mentioned the Rumely Oil Pull Tractor which pulled a Rumely 8 bottom 14 inch engine gang and which did most excellent work. The Oil Pull drew a large crowd of spectators and the work done by both engine and plow was such as to give it a high place in the estimation of future users of farm power. This engine burned 11 cent fuel oil in both its brake and plowing test although it was not entered for any medal. The old reliable Hart-Parr was also giving a demonstration on the plowing field, pulling an 8 bottom 14 inch John Deere Engine Gang. It also burned 11 cent fuel and to say that the quality of work done was perfect would be cutting it short. No class was provided for cheap fuel oil engines consequently both the Hart-Parr and The Rumely Oil Pull were not entered.

The International Harvester Co. also gave daily demonstration with two of their engines that were not entered in the contest. One engine, a twin cylinder, pulled an Oliver engine gang and the other, a double opposed, pulled a P and O Mogul engine gang.

To the observer the various plows that were at work were of as much interest as the engines even though it was not and was not intended to be a contest of plows. As a matter of fact, the quality of plowing cut very little figure in the judges' decisions only in so far as straightness of furrow and finish at the ends is concerned. There was

steam Tractor, the Gas Tractor 30 h.p. gas tractor The Flour City 40 h.p. Gas Tractor and The Hart-Parr 25 h.p. gas tractor although the latter was not in the contest. Most of the International Harvester Co. engines pulled P. & O. Engine gangs. The Gould Shapley & Muir 20 h.p. gas tractor pulled a series of Verity gang plows, the Avery Tractor pulled a 3 bottom 14" P. and O. gang and the Burrell motor was

The Flour City Tractor, which won the gold medal in its class in 1908 and 1909, was making a beautiful showing and bid fair to eclipse its previous records when some new cork grips that were being used in the clutch for the first time became filled with oil and it was impossible to make them hold. This compelled the engine to withdraw as it would have taken considerable time to change back to the wood-

rive before we go to press and if so they will be published, comment being withheld until our September issue. We, however, give below the judges' score card and the unverified reports of the points as won by the different engines.

Score Sheet as used by Judges. Brake Test.

	Points.
Horse power hours per unit of fuel 100	
Water used, in gallons per carrying capacity of engine	10



The Avery Tractor Pulling a 3 Bottom 14-Inch P. and O. Gang. The Little Tractor Attracted No Small Amount of Attention

equipped with Moline beams and bottom.

It is no longer a question in the minds of those who have given time and attention to the traction plowing proposition but that the plow has its own place to fill. The suitability of the plow for the work in hand is no small factor in the success of the engine and while it is not possible to secure a contest field that will cover all plowing conditions a

en shoes that are ordinarily furnished with this engine. It is hard for any contestant who has made all possible preparation to go through a test to have some slight accident make a withdrawal necessary but such are the chances that must be taken by those who go after glory in a motor contest. The quality of work done was not judged by the regular judges but was in the hands of Angus Mc-

M. E. P.	10
Steadiness of running, vibration, condition of engine, etc.	10
Horse power hours per 100 gallons water	21
Draw bar H.P.	20
Brake H.P.	
Plow Test.	
Fuel per draw bar H.P. hour	90
Water per draw bar H.P. hour	30
Acres per hour per Brake H.P.	20
Quality of plowing	10
Distance travelled per fuel capacity of engine	15
General condition of engine, stops etc.	15
Design and construction	50

Score of Points.

Class.	No. Pnts.
A. 1. International Harvester, 15 H.P.	1 306.7
2. Avery Tractor	5 275.3
B. 1. International Harvester, 20 H.P.	3 329.3
2. Gould, Shapley & Muir, 20 H.P.	3 292.2
but developed 34.15 H.P., consequently was disqualified for this class, Birrell Motor No. 6 did not complete tests.	
C. 1. Gas Tractor, Minneapolis, 30 h.p.	18 354.4
2. International Harvester, 45 h.p.	9 350.1
3. Gas Tractor, Winnipeg, 25 h.p.	7 334.0
4. Gould, Shapley & Muir, 30 h.p.	8 274.6
Kinnard Haines No. 10 did not complete plowing test.	

Stream Engines.

D. 1. J. I. Case Co., 12 h.p.	12 267.6
E. 1. Avery Co., 20 h.p.	13 269.3
2. J. I. Case Co., 25 h.p.	14 297.0
Developed over the 90 H.P., consequently were disqualified for this class.	
F. 1. J. I. Case Co., 32 h.p.	16 356.1
2. Avery Co., 30 h.p.	15 291.9
3. Rumely Co., 36 h.p.	17 280.8

Signed.

A. R. Greig,
L. J. Smith,
Engineers in charge.

The 1910 contest was in many respects much more complete than those which have been held in the past, yet there is still much

Continued on Page 83



The Rumely Oil Pull Kerosene Tractor Pulling a Rumely 8 Bottom 14-Inch Engine Gang

practically every variety of engine gang on the market today at work on the plowing field.

The Cockshutt engine gang was pulled by the Case 32 h.p. Steam Tractor, the Case 25 h.p. Steam Tractor, the Case 12 h.p. Steam Tractor, the Avery 30 h.p. Steam Tractor, the Avery 20 h.p. Steam Tractor, the 25 h.p. Gas Tractor and The Gould, Shapley & Muir 30 h.p. Gas Tractor.

The John Deere Engine Gang was pulled by the Rumely 36 h.p.

plowing contest nevertheless furnishes a very good basis for comparison.

The plowing contest in 1910 lasted two days and although the weather was exceptionally warm, judges, manufacturers and spectators stayed by the game nobly. Some of the engines, through accident or otherwise, were unable to finish their allotted amount of ground which necessitated some of the other engines finishing the work after the contest was over.

Kay, Esq., Supt. of the Indian Head Experimental Farm, James Murray, Esq., Supt. of the Brandon Experimental Farm and Prof. S. A. Bedford, of the Manitoba Agricultural College. These gentlemen are all practical farmers and admirably qualified to judge the work done.

It is with regret that we are obliged to omit a detailed discussion of the various tests as conducted in 1910. It is possible that the judges' tables may ar-