

to exhibit the best specimens of ploughmanship, and how, but by labor and study, of observation and practice, are these specimens produced? And how, but by superior specimens, could the art of suitable ploughing be advanced? The excellence and superiority of any thing implies *preparation and time*. And since real excellence cannot be attained without exertion and *enough* of time, therefore, let what will be said of those who do take a long time to their work, they will, if best, not only be awarded the prizes, but must, in the light of the object of such gatherings, be considered the most useful ploughman also. IN THIS VIEW, I hold that the ploughman who produces the most perfect specimen, without regard to the time he may have taken at all, has done more to the progress of the object professedly desired, than a host of others below mediocrity, and more entitled to commendation by far, than he whom some would entitle to the premium from the grounds of usefulness upon his employer's farm. You may rest assured that the man who has acquired the skill to excel his fellows in *excellence*, can also descend to any degree of inferiority to satisfy his master; as to usefulness and the difference of the two is, that while the one from his study and skill can rectify impediments to the case of himself and horses, the other is floundering away in darkness and annoyance that he cannot repair.

Speed and perfection in *lea* ploughing are comparatively a contradiction in terms, and there is a degree of speed also which entails on it the very reverse of speed, as "they that go fast cannot go long." A certain measured pace combines the greatest speed that strength can maintain. I have now, I think, said nearly enough to show that there is a degree of *proportion* and *time* needed for match ploughing to attain the perfection desired, which the allowance of every day work cannot meet, "just as in the business of debate the heavy artillery of *prepared* speeches often do greater execution than the fire-arms' skirmishings of extemporaneous warfare." In one communication it is impossible to do justice to your space and the subject, but I will notice a few of the *objections* and suggestions on the subject in your next number. In the matter of ploughing, the question has nothing to do with the *manner* it is done in, nor the *power* required to accomplish it. The question is, we want *good* ploughing, and *how* can it be attained?

There are in the ploughing of grass land essential things which require certain means to obtain them, and as it is certainly foolishness to increase the laboriousness from draught beyond what is absolutely indispensable to that kind of ploughing for good husbandry, it is also as foolish to sacrifice utility against the objection of a few stones of draught for the horses. My choice at least is, *the most essential kind of good ploughing*, regardless of all draught. Let the plough be a proper one, and a good ploughman will inevitably bring it to work on the least draught possible.

The *setting* of the irons, especially the rising of the feather of the sock, increases the draught certainly, but the increase of draught from this cause does not necessarily make the ploughing very laborious. This may appear strange without an explanation, which explanation will show that, if everything is correct, *this* increase of draught makes the ploughing *less* laborious for the horses. A plough with a flat sock may be as heavy in weight as one with a raised sock, from other and different causes, and we may be deceived by asophism, which makes us take that for a cause which is only concomitant. The relative draughts of three different styles of ploughing will be seen by these indications from the dynamometer. A flat obtuse cut furrow, from 45° downwards, shows in a furrow of 8 inches by 6 inches a weight of 18 stones; a square cut furrow, 8½ inches by 5½ inches, at 45°, 22 stones weight; an acute high-set cutting trim, all *above* 45°, of 7 inches by 5½, 24 stones. From these comparative statements of draught, it is plain that the draught is greatly increased, but without such increases of draught it is impossible to plough *lea* land to perfection. But I have said that it can be explained why this increase draught is not laborious, and the constant pressure gained by the means which increases the draught, and by which the perfection of the work is attained, provides the horses with steady resistance that is perfectly wanting in the obtuse kind of ploughing, and which is the cause of horses *going worse* in the plough of *lig*: draught than in one of the highest trim and the heavier draught. It is invariably the case that the worst plough is comparatively lighter in draught than that of the best working plough on the same ground, and the horses tell by their going forward with a steady measured pace that they like it better, whereas change the trim of