IMPORTANT TO FARMERS.

MR. MANN'S NEW REAPING MACHINE.

He who could make two blades of grass to grow where only one grew before, has ever been held as a benefactor to his country and his kind. Laws have certainly been passed of late years which seemed to set this maxim at defiance, and, in spite of nature, as the Ministry did a dirty job "in spite of Church," means have been taken to induce the farmer to look upon an abundant harvest as a curse instead of a blessing. But these were the deeds of boroughmongers, aristocrats, and tithe parsons, and it is to be hoped that with their downfall will be banished all such feelings, and that we shall again observe genius, talent, and worth, honoured amongst us. If then, the grower of two blades of grass, be honoured above the grower of one blade, why should not honour be paid to him who can *cut* ten blades where only one was cut before? To inventions and improvements of all kinds, that seemed to set long-established theories and opinions at defiance, the world has ever looked with a cold and suspicious eye. When Columbus offered to find a new world, he was driven like an outcast and mendicant from place to place, ere he could get any one to listen to his projects. When Henry Bell launched his first steam boat on the Clyde, his friends jeered and the public looked on to laugh at the foolish whims of the "enthusiast." When Fulton set sail with *his* steam boat upon the broad breast of an American lake, the people seemed to rejoice in the breaking of his paddle wheel, because, they said, it would put an end to so foolish a project. Yet Columbus *did* discover a new world that will one day become the master of the old; the Clyde is now covered with steam vessels, and a monument has been erected to the memory of Henry Bell; and the lakes of America would have been comparatively useless but for the "foolish project" of Robert Fulton.

It has been thus with the benefactors of their kind in all ages and in all countries; and it would form a curious and melancholy list could we have placed before us in one tabular view, an account of all those who, having been the first to point the way to improvement, have died broken hearted, the victims of neglect and even of the scorn of those who have afterwards profited by their discoveries. A nobler sight we cannot conceive than that of a poor, but ingenious man, struggling against the contempt of the world, the advice of friends, and the sneers of enemies, to overcome prejudices, and instruct mankind in that which is to their own benefit. He may see the utility of his inventions,—he may feel assured that his discoveries will one day be acknowledged as all in all important; but ere he can rouse attention to his plans, and obtain the ear of those who have most interest in the thing, his energies are worn out, his spirits destroyed, and he sinks into a premature grave, leaving others to reap the rewards which his genius had won.

We should grieve, indeed, could we think that such would be the fate of the very ingenious person to whose invention we are about to draw the attention of our agricultural friends. The subject is one of interest, indeed, to all men; for to all is it of importance that the harvest which providence vouchsafes to us should be speedily as well as cheaply won. This is a part, and an important part too, of every man's business, and we may therefore need little apology to our readers for devoting a portion of our space to the description of a machine which promises to be of so much service in lightening the labours of the harvest field.

The invention to which we are anxious to attract public notice is a machine for reaping corn, by which that important operation will be performed at less than one third its present cost, and at least at six times its present speed. The inventor is Mr. Mann, a working millwright, we believe, at Raby, in Abbey Holm. His machine is sufficient proof of his ingenuity; and we understand he has not the worldly means of pushing his invention into notice. These are sufficient reasons for rendering him all the aid in our power.

It is somewhat singular that amidst all the improvements which have been made in the implements of agriculture, for centuries scarcely any alteration has been effected in the sickle used for the cutting of corn. A writer in the Quarterly Journal of Agriculture, in noticing this subject, has observed "That, throughout the whole world, little or no change has been effected upon an operation so important, for the last 3000 years. The sickle of the Egyptians, as depicted upon their tombs, is observed to be not very dissimilar to that of our own times, and all nations, who have cultivated the cereal grasses for food, and have, at the same time, possessed the use of metals, seem to have followed the same example. This circumstance is certainly a remarkable one; and while so many and so varied and so difficult operations are performed by the power of machinery, it is a matter of even surprise that a perfectly efficient reaping machine has not yet been effected."

This singular fact appears to have struck Mr. Mann at an early period of his life; for we find that his first attempt to remedy the defect here spoken of was made in 1820, and a model shown at a meeting in the Abbey Holm in that year. But like almost all first attempts it failed, not from any defect in the principle, but from the rudeness of its manufacture. From that period to the present time, the machine has occupied a large share of his attention, and much labour has been devoted upon it. In 1832, under the auspices of the Highland Society, the machine was tried at Kelso. Of this trial we extract from the "Quarterly Journal of Agriculture" the following account:—

"In consequence of the early harvest of last year the crops had been almost entirely cut down in that neighbourhood before the day of the show. The only piece of standing corn to be found was at the distance of four miles of Kelso, and thither the machine was transported, in order to be seen in actual operation by a committee of the judges. It happened that the field of operation was a small patch of unripened oats, much straggled, and which had been considered so worthless that cattle had been allowed to traverse it. It may therefore be conceived, that the trial was disadvantageous to the machine, but, under all the circumstances, it performed in a tolerably satisfactory manner."

The Highland Society did not award a premium, but they offered Mr. Mann a small sum to produce another model with such improvements as experience had suggested. An offer of £10, for such an invention, does not strike us as being very liberal on the part of a rich and powerful Society and certainly could not be said to afford much encouragement to genius. The paltry sum, we should think, was insufficient to pay for the materials of which the model was to be formed; and it is not therefore surprising to us that instead of sending a new machine to the Kelso *liberals* he sent back to them the old one, with all its imperfections on its head. This was probably not very wisely judged on his part. But an Irish gentleman, a Mr. Vandeleur, had offered to purchase the new machine, and to him it was sold—the *munificent* £10 of the Highland Society being no inducement to refuse the offer of a purchaser who had the good sense to see the merits of the invention, and the spirit to avail himself of it.

This is the brief history of the invention. The machine which has gone to Ireland is complete in all its parts, and has, we believe, been found to answer its purpose beyond the most sanguine expectations even of the inventor himself.

We should now endeavour to describe the machine itself and its mode of operation; but without sections and drawings we find this next to impossible, and shall not therefore attempt it, lest our imperfect description should obscure the merits of the invention. The cutting power of the machine, is a revolving cylinder, which cuts a breadth of 3½ feet, lays the corn smoothly and neatly upon the ground, the heads all one way, at right angles with the point of direction; and this work it performs, with one horse, at a rate of from 2½ to 4 miles an hour, without leaving a single stalk uncut. There is no shaking of the corn, and it is laid down so smoothly that it can be sheaved with the utmost ease. The machine, with one man and a horse, will thus cut upwards of an acre per hour, or about twelve acres a day; and in our variable and uncertain climate it would be superfluous for us to point out the vast importance of quick cutting. Of the saving in expense every farmer will be better able than we to judge; but from the inquiries we have made, we believe that, including interest of money for the cost of the machine, the expense of cutting by it will scarcely exceed sixpence an acre.

We trust we have now said sufficient to attract public attention to the subject, and to bring into notice an invention which cannot but be looked upon as one of very great importance. That it will ultimately obtain general use we have no doubt;—but every right-thinking person must desire that the ingenious person who has made the discovery should reap the full reward of his toil and ingenuity. Trusting that our brethren of the broadsheet will aid us in the endeavour to make the merits of this invention generally known, we shall only now add that Mr. Mann is prepared to execute all orders for his machine, and to warrant its completeness and capability to perform the work required.

NAVAL AND MILITARY BIBLE SOCIETY.

DEPUTATION TO CARLISLE—PUBLIC MEETING.

A deputation, consisting of Captain Bazelgette, R.N., Captain C. Cambell, R.N., and Lieutenant Simmons, R.N., visited Carlisle, last week; and a public meeting (numerously and respectably attended) was held at the Assembly-room of the Crown and Mitre Inn, last Friday evening—Thomas Graham, Esq. of Edmond Castle, was called to the chair. The meeting was addressed by the Chairman, the Rev. John Fawcett, the Gentlemen forming the deputation, the Rev. Mr. Monkhouse, and the Rev Mr. Woodrow. The Naval and Military Bible Society was established in 1780; its object is to supply the soldiers and sailors of Great Britain with copies of the scriptures, in some cases gratuitously, and in others at reduced prices. The facts stated by several of the speakers clearly proved that in the case of the British sailors, there is especial need of a society whose agents visit each vessel as she enters port, and who present the scriptures to the attention of the sailor before he goes on shore, where his money usually "makes itself wings, and flies away."

The benevolent object of the Naval and Military Bible Society is to provide each mess (eight men) on board men of war with a bible and two testaments, and each merchant vessel with a copy of the scriptures bearing the seal of the society, the name of the vessel, and the purpose for which the book was given, namely, for the general use of the crew; the book thus becomes the legalized property of the vessel.

The society has its agents in our different sea-ports, the agents, (many of whom are men in humble life) give their services gratuitously, and by means of their unpaid labours the society are enabled to offer the scriptures to the sailors at very reduced prices.

The most decided and encouraging success has attended the plan of visiting the vessels immediately on their entering the port. Before this plan was adopted but few copies of the scriptures were sold, although judicious means had been employed by the society to ensure the purchase of the scriptures by the sailors—such as having the depository as near as possible to the places most frequented by the sailors, and large handbills in the neighbourhood specifying where the scriptures might be bought. During the past year *eight thousand and seventy-six* bibles and testaments have been sold, principally by the active and gratuitous exertions of the different agents.

To the army, guard-rooms, Hospitals, and places of assembly for religious worship, Bibles for the use of the soldiers, are gratuitously supplied, as well as to every soldier who is able and willing to read the scriptures.—Facts, proving that soldiers who read, and who framed their lives according to the scriptures, were among the bravest of our troops, were detailed to the meeting.

It was stated that the bible, saved from the wreck of the Bounty, and rendered the instrument of introducing Christianity among the interesting colony of "Pitcairn's Island," had been furnished to the ill-fated vessel by the Naval and Military Bible Society. (The history of Pitcairn's Island is doubtless familiar to most of our readers.)

An auxiliary branch has been established in Carlisle, the President is Mr. Graham; Vice-President, Captain Wauchope, R.N.; Treasurer, Mr. Ferguson, Fisher Street; and Secretaries, Rev. Mr. Fawcett, and Rev. Mr. Woodrow. Lieut. Simmons, R.N., has remained some days in Carlisle soliciting donations and subscriptions on behalf of the Society, and his success has far exceeded his expectations.

A collection, amounting to ten pounds was made at the door. Subscriptions and donations to the Society will be thankfully received by the Secretary.

TEMPERANCE SOCIETIES.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE CARLISLE JOURNAL.

Sir,—I was sorry to see, under the head of "Temperance Societies," in your last *Journal*, an article from the *Examiner*, which cannot but be pronounced, by every impartial and unbigoted mind, as one heap of false reasoning and gross perversion, as well as an unprincipled attack upon the motives of the promoters of these Institutions. With your permission, I shall attempt to expose the assertions of the writer in the *Examiner* in as as few words as possible. In the first place then let me state, that though not a member of any Temperance Society, I am friendly to the object they have in view, and can bear my disinterested testimony to the purity and uprightness of the motives which influence those persons who are members in whose society I more immediately move. The *Examiner* objects to the Temperance Societies because, "amongst the leaders of those societies are a large proportion of ignorant fanatics, who will prevent that service, (viz., the abating of the great curse of drunkenness), and occasion a reaction by attempting to convert these associations into engines for the propagation of mischievous asceticism, at variance with the true principles of Christianity." Whether there be such persons as are here ascribed I do not say; they do not, however, come within my personal knowledge. Such persons may or may not be connected with these institutions;—but, suppose they are connected with them, this does not furnish any argument against their utility. It may be regretted that any attempt should be made to pervert the objects of the societies in the way thus spoken of; but certainly it is no sort of argument against the principle of the thing. It might be said with equal show of truth, that because we have a Church Establishment, which may not be over pure and decent, religion must, of course, be of the same nature; or because some foolish and unprincipled individuals are engaged in the same cause with yourself, you, therefore, must be foolish and unprincipled.—But the assertion is too trivial to require a serious answer. It is next asked, "Do those persons who contend that the labouring classes and all others should drink nothing but water, and pretend that they have the authority of the Scriptures for their proceedings, forget that the first miracle of the founder of Christianity was in adding to the joy of the marriage festival, by changing water into wine, and that he chose, as the last scene of his passage through this life, a supper, in which wine was partaken by the guests?" If the *Examiner* had only taken the trouble to examine candidly and fairly the rules adopted, I believe, universally by the Temperance Societies, he would have spared himself this objection as well as some others of the same nature, and shown himself what he ought to be, and I will own, often is, a *real Examiner*. Wine *is* permitted to be drunk, it is only excess in it which is prohibited; and is there an instance of intoxication either by wine or strong drink (which, by the bye, the *Examiner* has not proved to be the modern spirituous liquors) recorded in the Scriptures without severe animadversion? As to the insinuation that the drinking of wine is allowed by the Temperance Societies because it is the "rich man's drink," it is not worth a moment's consideration. Poor men can please themselves whether they join Temperance Societies or not, it is not compulsory upon them. It certainly would be a novelty to see rich men giving up drinking spirits merely to hinder the poor man from getting wine, for to this does the *Examiner's* argument resolve itself at last.

Passing over the passages which the *Examiner* has produced from the Bible, first, because I do not think they at all establish the drinking of spirits amongst the Jews;—and, secondly, because not being a member of a Temperance Society, I do not feel myself called upon to offer any opinion upon the distinction the societies have made between the drinking of wine and the drinking of spirituous liquors,—I now come to that part of the *Examiner's* attack which betrays the most culpable ignorance of the matter the writer was treating of, as well as the grossest perversion of the rules of Temperance Societies. He says, "The Pharisees and the righteous overmuch, who are willing that wine may be taken medicinally, and medicinally only, that is, not at all for common uses, will find their condemnation in these authorities. The religion of Christ is not an ascetic religion, and it is proper that it should be vindicated from those who would diminish the enjoyments and enfeeble the bodies of the people as a means of prostrating their minds, and rendering them subservient to their purposes." Now, Sir, a more carelessly written paragraph—one containing a greater perversion of truth (I say perversion, because the writer had the means of ascertaining whether the statements he here makes were correct) was never penned by any individual. The carelessness consists in the writer's asserting, or at least insinuating, that the rules of the Temperance Societies prohibit wine to be drank, except as medicinally, while he had a little before plainly shown his knowledge of the fact that wine was *not* prohibited at all. The desire of perversion must have blinded the writer's eyes to the shameful inconsistency and tergiversation which this part of the article betrays. Now for the perversion of truth which I charge the writer with. The words he pretends to quote from the rules, as a prohibition of wine, are, I believe, the *exact words* used by many of the Temperance Societies in their prohibition of the drinking of *spirits*, which *are* allowed to be taken *medicinally*, but *only* medicinally? So much for the *Examiner's* desire for truth in this instance! I have yet to notice the arrant nonsense about the "enjoyments of the poor being diminished, and their bodies enfeebled" by the abstinence from spirituous liquors! I have yet to learn, Sir, that men's bodies are enfeebled and their real enjoyments diminished by not getting drunk five or six days in the week. I had really supposed before I read this, that "drunkenness" and not "sobriety" had been the means of prostrating men's minds and "rendering them subservient" to other men's purposes. But it is not for me to object to such a happy illustration of the consequences of getting drunk!

What the *Examiner* observes about the South Sea Islanders I cannot understand. If abstinence from spirituous liquors has had no worse effect upon them than it has had upon Englishmen, then may the *Examiner* "bay the moon" before it convinces men that that effect has been to diminish the enjoyments, and enfeeble the bodies of the people. My letter has extended to great length, but it is necessary that imputations so unfounded should not go forth to the world unanswered. With great respect, your's &c.,

Brampton, Sept. 18, 1833. VINDEX.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE CARLISLE JOURNAL.

Brougham, 19th Sept.

Sir,—I enclose a copy of a letter which I have written to the Editor of the *Patriot*, and which I request you will be so good as insert in your first paper.

I am, Sir, your most obt. servant,

JAMES BROUGHAM.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE CARLISLE PATRIOT.

Brougham, Sept. 19, 1833.

Sir,—I feel myself obliged to reply to a continuation of misstatements of facts in your last paper, and from which you draw conclusions that will of course fail to the ground when the real facts are stated. I state these on the authority of the documents, in the possession of the late Rector, to whom I refer you, as well as to the present Rector and to his Solicitors.

Hornby Hall (the farm belonging to Lord Lonsdale, of which I have a right to the tithes as lessee) is the *only one* in the parish of Brougham on which any question as to tithe *could by possibility arise*. The whole parish is tithe-free, except this farm and four small tenements at Woodside, of which the Rector has uniformly granted a lease to one of the four who arranged it with the others, so that each had his own tithe for a fixed sum, the whole rent payable being £36. The lease included all tithe except hay, which was covered by a prescription. No suit could, therefore, be brought against these four unless the occupants had filed bills against themselves.

As to Hornby Hall you are pleased to assert that the tithes were always let to the farmer. How stands the fact? Out of the last 50 years they have been only let to the farmer for *seven* years, and drawn in kind for the remainder. Mr. John Heelis, the late Rector, let the tithes to Messrs. Pearsons, his own farmers of the glebe, from the year 1787 to 1814, during which period they were drawn in kind. In 1814, John Nelson, father of the present farmer, took a lease of them at the same rent which I afterwards agreed for; this expired in 1821, and the Rector drew the tithes till I took the lease. In the meantime John Nelson paid tithe of agistment yearly to the Rector. You say the "present farmer" never paid tithe of agistment. He has only been farmer since his father's death in 1828; and though he has repeatedly promised to pay *me* tithe of agistment, he has never done it. I have this day seen an acknowledgment signed by his father, John Nelson, in 1823, admitting his liability to payment of agistment, and which was accompanied by a payment for the same.

You say I took the lease *after* Lord Lonsdale had purchased the property—this is equally unfounded. My lease is dated 1824. Lord Lonsdale did not make the purchase for some years afterwards—I think not before 1828: it is not easy for me to prove this, but I feel confident Lord Lonsdale or his lawyers will confirm my statement. The estate was bought in 1823 by a Mr. Hamlet, (of Coventry-street, London, I believe) who continued the owner, subject, as is supposed, to certain annuities to a number of colliers in Whitehaven, until 1828 or 1829, when it was sold to Lord Lonsdale.

You have chosen to insinuate that I took the tithes of this farm *only*, when I might have had the tithes of others in the parish also, and that I became lessee after Lord Lonsdale's purchase, for the purpose of annoying his Lordship—both of which suggestions I have shown to be utterly inconsistent with the facts. However, as the insinuation is made, I shall only say, that if I had done so I should have been fully justified by the example of those you profess to serve. I throw no blame on them, and they have only your indiscreet zeal to thank for my having even so generally alluded to them.

I may also mention that Hornby Hall claims exemption from hay tithe by an annual payment of 10s. prescription. I know both the late and present Rector were advised by lawyers of eminence that this prescription could not stand, yet they have never brought any suit to set it aside.

You recur to the subject of the offices held by me for a year, but evidently in so feeble a manner that it is scarce worth noticing: however, I will put you right in that also. They were not *sinecures*, but offices executed by deputy, and offices of great labour and responsibility, (I refer you to Lord Eldon's speech in July, 1832) and which could not be abolished without providing for the performance of the duties. In order to secure their abolition, with others of the same sort, an act was brought in by the Lord Chancellor, and passed in August, 1832, to abolish them *from and after August*, 1833. It was impossible to abolish them until an act should be passed to provide for the discharge of the duties which were of daily necessity, and to make such provision required much time and enquiry. Accordingly the Houses of Lords and Commons, after a laborious investigation in committees of both houses, passed two acts, but only as late as Aug. 1833, for putting the whole under new regulations. I am blamed for having held for one year (it being absolutely necessary that some one should hold it) what was my clear and undoubted right to hold *for life*, but I gave it up, and so you are pleased to attack me. What do you think of the Rev. Mr. Thurlow, nephew to Lord Thurlow who ceased to be Chancellor forty years ago, who holds two sinecure offices amounting to twelve thousand a year!! Of Lord Ellenborough, who holds a sinecure office of above seven thousand a year; or Lord Bathurst, and many others, relatives and connexions of Lord Chancellors and Chief Justices, including the late Lord Chancellor Lyndhurst. The present Lord Chancellor is the first who ever dreamt of giving up these sinecure places.

Another error I must notice. You say the Chancellor's retiring pension is raised from 3 to £5000 a year. I thought that every one knew it *was always* £4000. Why you should call it three one can't imagine. The Chief Justice's is £4000; the Chief Justices of the Common Pleas is £3750. Parliament thought that for the Chancellor, whose office is much higher and more expensive than the others, and not for life, the retiring pension of £5000 was little enough, and so settled it. But it was not given as a compensation for the places worth near £3000 a year actually vacant and given up, but in lieu of the whole 12 or 13 sinecures in the Chancellor's gift abolished by the bills alluded to. To illustrate this—if Lord Lyndhurst or Lord Eldon were Chancellors again to-morrow, they would retire with £5000 instead of £4000, even if they held the Great Seal but a day, and although they have had all the benefit of the sinecures which *the present Lord Chancellor voluntarily resigned*.

Though this letter is necessarily long, I cannot conclude it without noticing another very extraordinary paragraph in your paper of Saturday, signed John Bull, which states "that the Lord Chancellor, in order to allay pain of a distressing nature, is obliged to have recourse to laudanum." I have great satisfaction in telling you that the Lord Chancellor has no pain or complaint of any kind whatever; that he never took laudanum or opium in any shape in the whole course of his life; that he is enjoying the very best health; and that there is no man of his age, not even among the mountaineers of these counties, more likely to live thirty years than the Lord Chancellor; and as for the story of his sleeping 50 hours, which the same letter gives, I was with him the whole way, and I don't think he slept five hours in the carriage, contrary to his usual habit, and probably because he came in an open carriage.—I am, Sir, your most obt. servant,

JAMES BROUGHAM.

HIGHWAY ACCOUNTS.

Sir,—Having the honour to hold the very important office of Surveyor of the Highways, a printed circular, from which the following is an extract, was, the other day, put into my hands:—

"The law requires that you produce your books, &c. at a public or vestry meeting, to be holden within fifteen days previous to the Special Sessions, appointed to be holden on the 7th day of October next, after which the same are to be taken to some one Justice of the Peace, on such a day and at such an hour as shall be agreed upon at such vestry meeting, and unless the accounts have been so laid before the Justice of the Peace, they cannot be passed, as heretofore, at the Special Sessions, at which the new Surveyors are appointed.

"Brampton, 4th September, 1833."

Now, as it is commonly more difficult to find common sense than absurdity in an Act of Parliament, the Magistrates have hitherto used a seemingly wise discretion in not enforcing the Highway Act to the very letter—absurdities and all, upon the Surveyors. And why they now think proper to adopt a different course, I am at a loss to imagine. Were the absurdities of it all, they might, like other whimsical vagaries, be laughed at, and so passed by; but it is no laughing matter for the poor Surveyor, who not only has to call a public vestry of his neighbours, and those whose local knowledge give them every chance of knowing whether the accounts be correct, but he must trudge to the distance of many miles, with his large folio under his arm, to a Magistrate, who, of course, can have no personal knowledge of the matter but what he can gather from the Surveyor's book. And after all this he must attend a petty Sessions, and there present his accounts to Magistrates whose knowledge upon the subject is necessarily quite as limited: indeed, *the very same Magistrate may possibly have to examine the accounts a second time.*

I do not mean to deny the propriety of the Magistrates looking narrowly into the Surveyors' accounts, experience has proved the necessity of it; but surely

Image © THE BRITISH LIBRARY BOARD. ALL RIGHTS RESERVED.