



NOTICE TO CORRESPONDENTS.—1. Please write on one side of the paper only. 2. Give full name, Post-Office and Province, not necessarily for publication, but as guarantee of good faith and to enable us to answer by mail when, for any reason, that course seems desirable. 3. Do not expect anonymous communications to be noticed. 4. Mark letters "Printers Manuscript," leave open, and postage will be only 1c per 1/4 ounce. We do not hold ourselves responsible for the views of correspondents.

SIR,—I beg to herewith hand you a copy of a letter which I addressed to the editor of the *Globe* on the 31st October last, and a copy of which I forwarded to the editor of the *Mail* on the 30th inst., with a request for its publication in the last-named paper, but which, up to the time of writing, has been refused an insertion in either of these nominally provincial, but in reality Toronto journals, in the hope that you will make room for it in your widely-circulated journal, in order that the farmers of Ontario may have a practical illustration of the fair play which either their interests or their representatives may expect at the hands of either the *Globe* or *Mail*, when they run counter to the all-grasping city of Toronto.

While it is not for me to express an opinion as to the matter contained in my letter, I think I may be permitted to say that, written as it is over my own name, and by one who, however unworthy of the position, is an elected representative of the farmers of a not unimportant section of this province on its Board of Agriculture, it should not have been refused admission to their columns without good and sufficient reasons—reasons which might, and, I venture to think, will have to be made public before the candid reader of my letter will come to any other conclusion than that the course of these two journals in this particular instance affords strong presumptive evidence that, notwithstanding all their political squabbling, they have entered into a solemn league and covenant to, so far as in them lies, make the whole of Ontario mere hewers of wood and drawers of water to the all-important city which is their common home.

Were I not afraid of trespassing too much on your valuable space, I should like to point out how, ever since 1858, the citizens of Toronto have been striving to monopolize the Provincial Exhibition not out of love for its proper objects, but as a means of drawing away from other cities and towns their trade and centralizing everything within itself. And I cannot help adding that I entirely agree with you as to the impropriety of tacking on to our agricultural exhibitions the various "attractions" which have recently become so fashionable. Such things would be much better left in the hands of a Barnum.

Yours truly,
Peterboro', Nov. 14, 1881. JOHN CARNEGIE.

To the Editor of the *Globe*.

SIR,—Knowing by observation that it is contrary to your sense of fair play to permit those differing from either your opinions or statement of facts, a fair hearing in your columns, I cannot say that I am surprised at the treatment which you have thought proper to accord to the brief communication which I ventured to address to you on the 19th inst., with regard to some of the statements contained in an article on "The Provincial and Toronto" in your previous Monday's issue. Happily the *Globe* is not the only medium through which the public can be reached, as, if it were, it would not only be useless for me to pen this, but impossible for any one questioning the correctness of either your facts or opinions to make themselves heard. As it is, however, I feel rather encouraged than discouraged by the treatment which my letter received at your hands in the issue of the 27th inst. Had the facts I submitted and the question I asked been as easily disposed of as you would have your readers believe, we have evidence in the promptness with which room can be found in the *Globe* for anything written in the interests of "Canada's Great Fair," that my letter would not have been held under consideration for a week, and then presented in the garbled form in which it appeared in your last-named article.

In addition to giving you the amount paid in prizes and for expenses in 1878, I called your attention to the fact that while the gross receipts on exhibition account that year amounted to \$22,570.21, the Association paid for:

Prizes.....	\$15,521 00
Folder.....	1,604 00
Gate keepers.....	525 00
Judges.....	1,315 00
City of Toronto.....	4,000 00

Making a total of.....\$22,665 00

or nearly \$100 more for these five items than the gross receipts, and I think not unfairly, asked you to point out how, with these facts before you, you could make out that the Provincial Association still owed the City of Toronto some four or five thousand dollars on account of the exhibition of 1878.

Well, sir, for reasons best known to yourself, you did not deem it expedient to place before your readers all my figures, but instead picked out the two items which suited your purpose best, and, after so culling them, let us examine your reply to my question.

You said (I won't garble your answer): "The explanation is this:—In 1879, 1880 and 1881 the Toronto Exhibition was conducted by the local association. The financial results of the two first-named years were that the sum of \$25,672.99 was cleared over and above the expenses of the exhibition and the prize lists. In 1881 there was a cash surplus of receipts over expenditure, amounting to \$1,576.30, making a total sum earned in the three years and applicable to the extinguishment of debt \$27,249.29—an average of more than \$9,000 a year. The presumption is that if the exhibition of 1878 had been conducted by the Association, it would have yielded an equally large surplus. Doubtless the surplus of 1881 would have been much larger had it not been for the prevalence during the entire period of the exhibition of bush fires, which made farmers afraid to leave their homes."

There, sir, is your explanation of how the Provincial owes, in your opinion, your city some four or five thousand dollars, and I venture to think that before I get through I shall be able to show your readers if you permit them to see this letter, that however much the farmers were afraid to leave their homes last September, you are not "afraid" to presume upon their supposed ignorance of the facts to which I propose to call your and their attention. You say that "the financial results of the first named years were that the sum of \$25,672.99 was cleared. Pray, where did you find that out? I have before me the reports of the Industrial Exhibition for 1879 and 1880, and I can't find such a result there. I will, however, tell you what I do find: I find in 1879's statement of Assets and Liabilities, the "amount to credit of capital account, being balanced over liabilities" set down at your sum for the two years, to a cent, namely, \$5,672.99, and this being the case, I think I may assume that it is to this sum that you refer. If so, then you are guilty, either through ignorance, or because it would have made your previous estimate too small by about \$1,600 per annum (and you must always be right under any circumstances) of understating the earnings of your Industrial, because the same item in the report of 1880, on the same balance sheet, is set down at \$36,284.20, which, with this year's surplus of \$1,576.30, brings the total up to \$37,860.50, or equal to an average for the three years of \$12,620.17. So that, according to this method of figuring, the Provincial owes Toronto, not four or five thousand, but \$6,620 on account of 1878. But, is this an honest way of stating the case? Does it really tell the whole truth? Not by any means. Turning to the reports of the Industrial we find among its receipts such items as the following:—

City Council.....	\$5,600 00
County Council of York.....	2,000 00
Net amount of subscription received.....	13,259 65
Electoral Dis. Agricultural Society.....	400 00

Total in 1879.....	\$20,559 65
And in 1880 we find "subscriptions".....	1,575 00
And in 1881 we find "subscriptions".....	633 00

Total outside receipts during 3 years.....\$22,887 65

Now, sir, dare you or any one else openly and above board claim one single cent of this \$22,887.65 as earned by the Association in the sense in which you use the word in the extract quoted from your article. Why, sir, the Provincial Association might just as well and as honestly claim that they earned the Government grant which they receive. Well, then, this being the case, the net savings of these three years as set forth above must be reduced by this amount, leaving the honest earnings of the Industrial for these three years \$8,972.85, or an average of less than \$3,000 per annum, and the "presumption" being "that if the exhibition of 1878 had been conducted by the (Toronto) Association it would have yielded" the same amount, it is clear that the Council of the Association granted to the city of Toronto in 1878 \$1,000 more than was their due.

Then, sir, you find it necessary to excuse the smallness of the surplus of 1881 by reminding your readers that "the prevalence during the period of the exhibition of bush fires," reduced the attendance, and consequently the receipts. It also reminds me that in 1879 (to quote the words of the Industrial's report) "the Association was fortunate in having the presence, at the opening of the exhibition, and on several other occasions, of His Excellency the Governor-General and Her Royal Highness the Princess Louise, and there is no doubt that a knowledge of the fact that the exhibition was to be under the immediate patronage of their excellencies was an incentive to many from very long distances to visit it. The exhibitors also experienced much pleasure from being afforded an opportunity to explain to their excellencies the nature and quality of the various goods, &c., manufactured by them," while we are also told that the "trials of speed, the display of horsemanship by ladies, the games of school children and the glass hon. were features which attracted considerable attention." And yet, with all these special attractions, the honest earnings of 1879 only netted some \$5,000.

Then, in 1880, notwithstanding "the finest display ever made in the city of Toronto" by the O'Jedfellows, Caledonian games, dog show, bicycle races, and in fact everything calculated to draw a crowd except the greased pole and pig, and notwithstanding the collection of \$5,442 for entrance fees and space charges, for which the Provincial makes little or no corresponding charges, the exhibition of 1880 only netted out of honest earnings between three and four thousand dollars. While those of 1881 have dropped down to less than \$1,000.

A good deal has been said about the costliness of the management of the Provincial, and I am free to confess not without cause; yet fair play is fair play, and fair play constrains me to point out that while the Provincial in 1878 footed up \$7,110, exclusive of the grant to the city, the expenses of the Industrial in 1879 were \$9,190.40; in 1880, \$9,182.80; and 1881, \$7,942.13. I mention this fact not to justify unnecessary expenditure on the part of the Provincial, but to show that it scarcely lies in the mouth of Mr. Withrow and his colleagues to talk, as they have been doing, about the expensiveness of the Provincial Association.

If I have not gone over, by any means, all the ground which one might touch upon in connection with this subject, yet I have said enough to render it necessary for you to "try again" before you make good your assertion, and that I had better stop, or I will give you some ground for refusing to insert this on the score of its length. I must, however, add that while I am prepared to defend the Association from unjust or unfair attacks, I, as a new member of the Council, not only do not feel any responsibility for its past shortcomings, but that I cordially agree with you when you said on the 3rd inst. that "the truth is that the entire agricultural expenditure of the province and its whole policy with regard to the encouragement of agriculture need verhauling." But and this, I am sorry to see, you do not seem to desire the first thing to a proper overhauling is to clear the facts.

Yours, JOHN CARNEGIE.
Peterboro', October 31, 1881.

NORTHERN EXHIBITION, WALKERTON.

SIR,—This exhibition was held on the 4th, 5th, 6th and 7th of October, thereby clashing with both Guelph and Hamilton shows; but notwithstanding this drawback, it was highly successful in the way of exhibits, spectators and also financially, and the directors can congratulate themselves upon the fact that they are reducing their debt and will soon be able to issue a prize list that will be more satisfactory to themselves and the public. It is also gratifying to the Board and promoters of the exhibition to find that the farmers and general community of the north-west portion of Ontario are at their backs and begin to appreciate the exhibition as a place of business where they can buy and sell stock, grain, implements, etc., etc. But for the success of our shows in general it is the opinion of your correspondent that it is not only desirable that the public should be on hand at show time, but they should take a lively interest in our annual meetings. Let them attend in good time and come with memo's of what they have seen wrong and where it can be mended; turn the drones out of the Board, and put workers in their places, and let the new Board feel that they—the members—have an interest in the exhibition and wish to see it succeed, and that if from ten to twenty-five dollars a-piece from all the members present would pay off the debt of the Society, they are prepared to do it. Such meetings as this would encourage the directors, and they would work with redoubled zeal, and the result would be that our exhibitions would be more worthy of attendance. AN OLD STAGER, Walkerton, Ont.

SIR,—I never lose an opportunity to put in a good word for the *FARMER'S ADVOCATE*. I only wish I had taken it seven years ago when I commenced farming; it would have saved me several thousand dollars that went buying experience. There is far more practical information for small capitalists, at about one-sixth the cost, than is contained in "The Field." I have been experimenting this summer in different ways. I moved on to a new place last October (480 acres), and having no land broken, I determined to see what could be done. After breaking about two acres early, I put on the cross plow and a heavy yoke of oxen, and subsoiled about nine inches. My beets, carrots, parsnips and onions were immense, and out of a patch of potatoes, 60 by 30 ft., we fed all our house (seven) from 15th July, and took up 42 bush in Sept., with only two pairs smaller than hens' eggs. Our summer vegetables were A. 1.

I trust that when you next come to Manitoba you will make time to pay us a visit, and see the stock-raising country east of Red River. I forgot to tell you of my hay. I commenced cutting on June 24th, one month earlier than usual, amidst a storm of remarks from those who know everything (9) Prophecies: "It would heat, scour the horses and cattle," etc. Result: Beautiful green hay, and never a blade of waste. Cut Monday, cocked Tuesday, drawn Thursday. It is dry and green and sweet. I used no salt or lime. I don't believe hay ever heats here unless wet, and it was above my waist and some to my shoulders. Our dry winds are what tell. You may depend on my doing all I can for you whenever opportunity occurs. J. F., Cook's Creek P. O., Manitoba

SIR,—I notice in this month's number of your valuable paper an enquiry from Muskoka relative to Manitoba, as to the nature of the soil and method of farming there. The majority of the Muskoka settlers are well acquainted with me; I have traveled through the greater part of the district, and I am well acquainted with its resources. I have also spent this season since April in Manitoba and the North-west, and had a good chance to compare it with Ontario generally. But it would be difficult to find a country which would suit everybody. Some three years ago I met a man in the Nipissing country who had been to Manitoba and returned, and had taken up land in Nipissing in preference. In July last I was in the Parry Sound district, and was told by a man who had just returned from Manitoba and bought his place back (which he had sold before going), that he paid \$175 to get it back. On the 22nd of