

know whose it was at the time, but judged from its looks to be superior—it was one Clark's of Blantyre, and if it does not beat your's, I'll lose all that I am worth, and eat it to the bargain, after all is over. They laughed the man off the ground—he would not stand. After the exhibitor was off, Mr. Clark, and a number of men, asked me how I knew so well: that I was surely a smith, and was not like one. I told them I was a smith. Well, said he, give me your address, I must call on you some time. You know things about ploughs that I never heard any one could speak about." There is a significant difference in these two exhibitors. The one of 1844 would not defend his implement except on its dynamometer view; and the one of 1850 attempted to defend his, as best, in every respect. The reason was, the winner of 1844 belonged to the West of Scotland, where ploughing is known, and the other from the East contaminated about the border, and English humbug about light draught. I have never seen any of the English wheel or swing ploughs working, but knowing the kind of ploughing that is most desirable, and the impossibility of the English construction to manage these kinds of furrow, and knowing well that a swing plough, trimmed to the highest pitch of furrow, workable by the English wheel and swing ploughs, can be made to go with as little guiding as any wheel plough. I therefore believe, it would only be renewing farces to solace absolute drejudice, to revive or institute demonstrations, (falsely so called) for either the wheel or swing ploughs of England to attempt trials with the immoved Scotch swing plough, is entirely out of place.

Much more might be said in illustration of the comparative merits of the obtuse and acute style of ploughing, relative to England and Scotland, each of which claim theirs as being the best; but perhaps enough has been said of the nature of the debated styles to produce a verdict against the English. Being a Scotchman, it is no reproach to have a bias towards Scotland; but divesting all partiality in that respect, and judging the merits of the relative styles adopted by the two countries, I must say that, in this, England is far behind Scotland, and has yet to learn the principles indispensable to perfect ploughing of *lea* land. The most perfect

style, however, like all rules, is liable to some objections under certain circumstances; these may in a future paper be examined, in connection with things, the examination of which should, perhaps, precede it. Mean-time, however, I may say a few words now, of the objections to allowing ploughmen all the means they possess of making their work, at matches, as good as they possibly can, being restricted to Time. It is almost impossible to show clearly, any persons who have not followed the plough, the propriety of not doing so; but ploughmen, in every-day work, intuitively see the fallacy and ultraism of the exertions in question. Rest assured no ploughman will, if he can possibly avoid it, or help it, bother and vex himself by touching his work with anything but his plough; but if obstructions of any kind renders it a duty to resort to it, it should be done. "A stitch in time saves nine," and it is in this view that the ploughman should be allowed to arrange any bad place when it occurs, to prevent interruption and labour creation afterwards, to him or his employer.

Why, at matches, tolerate or rather prescribe a declension, which every common sense farmer deprecates in his every-day common work at home? What! a Society for the elevation of the art, exacting conditions, calculated to defeat its purpose! It reminds me of a "Highland Cure" resorted to, to do away with the nuisance which the injunction in question has the natural tendency to foster, related in "The Schoolmaster," which, from being pertinent and interesting to young ploughmen, I quote in full, notwithstanding its length: "A farmer in the Highlands had a very careless servant, and from the artful manner in which he concealed his faults, it was with considerable difficulty, and not till serious losses had ensued, that they could be discovered. One of his chief crimes consisted in his reckless management of the plough. He did not consider it of much importance whether the soil was regularly turned up or not; he thought it enough if he got the surface to bear an even and proper appearance, so as to conceal the blemishes that were below. With this view, when his plough stumbled upon any impediment, or *jumped* over a part of the furrow, which it ought to have turned