

found that the stoppages resulting from too much machinery, always was more loss than gain, and if one good machine with two hands can cut from 15 to 20 acres of grain per day, it is best to let "well enough" alone.

Now, a word with regard to raking off. The Hussey machine leaves the grain behind, and it must be bound up before you can go round again, whereas the McCormick throws it outside of the track, and you can cut down a whole field without binding a sheaf; this is a seeming advantage, but not a real one, as the grain has of course to be bound; and I would much rather bind it at once than let it lie on the ground, for, if it should rain, the grain lying in bunches would have to be spread out to dry, making additional work; and, more than that, the binders work with more spirit when stimulated by expecting the machine round again as soon as their portion is bound, and will bind one-third more than if they were not thus urged. I would be much pleased if you would publish, in conjunction with this communication, the result of the trial before the Cleveland A. S., Yorkshire, you will find an abstract of it in the *Albany Cultivator* for January, page 46, where they were tested, before a jury of thirteen gentlemen, under nine different points of comparison—the jury only decided on seven points—the weather being unfavourable, they declined expressing their opinion on the last two, viz., which requires the most amount of horse labour, and also the amount of manual labour; but I say most decidedly that the Hussey machine is much superior in both these points, and particularly, in manual labour, as I have myself raked with them both.

And I will now conclude this altogether too long an article by recommending all farmers who have their land sufficiently clear of stumps and stones to work a reaping machine, to get the Hussey kind, and will warrant it to afford (if they give it a reasonable chance) every satisfaction, and, if it is necessary to back my testimony, I can get, in one hour's walk, half a dozen of my neighbours who have tried both machines, to endorse my assertions.

Yours most truly,

One of the Judges on the Foreign Department,
Indubitably, J. Wood of At Brockville.
Per H. H. H.

Our correspondent has enclosed to us some results obtained by the trial of Hussey's and McCormick's Reapers, which took place last harvest, under the direction of the Cleveland Agricultural Society, in England. We subjoin the principal facts as given in the papers. We cannot lay our hand on the January number of the *Albany Cultivator*, or we should be glad to comply with our correspondent's request:—

"The performances of the rival inventions were again tested by a jury of thirteen gentlemen, on a crop of wheat, 25 bushels to the acre, very much "laid," and a field of barley, also 25 bushels to the acre, very short in the straw, and if possible, more laid than the

wheat. The result was that the jury gave their award in favor of Mr. Hussey's machine upon seven out of the nine leading points on which it had been pre-arranged that their decision should turn. These seven points of superiority were:—

"1. That Hussey's reaper cut the corn in the best manner, especially across ridge and furrow, and when the machine was working in the direction the corn laid. 2. That it caused least waste. 3. That it did most work (taking the breadth of the machines into consideration). 4. That it left the cut corn in the best condition for gathering and binding. 5. That it was best adapted for ridge and furrow. 6. That it was least liable to get out of order. And, 7. That its first cost was the least. Of the two remaining points (viz., which required the least amount of horse labour, and which the least manual labour), the jury declined to express any decided opinion, in consequence of the very unpropitious state of the weather."

Hussey's Machine was afterwards tried before Prince Albert in Windsor Park,—the material being Fern, and the action of the implement was highly satisfactory to the Prince, and a large number of beholders. At the close of the trial his Royal Highness ordered two of the machines for himself, one for Windsor and the other for Osborne.

The American Reaping Machines having created considerable interest in England, it might be supposed that nothing had been attempted in the old country towards the construction of such an implement. The truth, however, is, that the Machine is a British invention, and that the principal merit, rightfully belonging to our ingenious and enterprising neighbors, consists in effecting such improvements in its practical working, as to adapt it to the wants and circumstances of a new country. There is an elaborate article on the subject in the *Scottish Journal of Agriculture* for August, 1828; and in *Loudon's Encyclopædia of Agriculture*, the origin and progress of these Machines are succinctly traced, from the one made by Boyce, in the commencement of the present century, down to the improvements effected by Bell, of Scotland—accompanied by two engravings of the latter. Various reasons could be assigned why Reaping Machines have hitherto made but little progress in Great Britain; and, such being the improvements effected of late years in the mode of cutting grain by the Sythe and Hook, we are not so sanguine as to expect the rapid introduction even of the much improved American Reapers, except, perhaps, in particular localities. Upon moderately size farms—where the mixed hus-