

nication, and we hope this may be looked on, as this want will greatly retard the advance of improvement. There are many of the rivers of Lower Canada that we believe might be made navigable for small steamers for a moderate outlay. This would be very desirable. Nothing would tend more to advance improvement than ample and easy means of communication to all parts of the country. It would induce the farmers, to improve their lands, and raise a large produce if the market were of easy access to them. They would see that it was their interest to raise a large produce when they could dispose of it. They would also come out of their back settlements, and see the progress of improvement near our cities and towns. There cannot be any doubt that travelling, and seeing the country, has a great tendency to remove prejudices that we are apt to imbibe when we never see anything but our own farm, and our own management. Travelling gives an opportunity of comparing other farming with our own, and he must be a very good manager indeed if he does not discover some errors in his practice when he sees the practice of many others.

We have seen a report of a trial which took place in England lately, with wagons and carts in taking in a crop of wheat and oats from the fields to the stack yard. The trial was made on two different fields, and where the access to the fields was hilly in one case, and not so in the other. The distance was from half a mile to a mile. There were 5 carts with 5 horses, and 5 wagons with 10 horses. The attendance of men and boys to each was equal. In both instances the carts finished their work before the wagons had done theirs. The experiment was made in the presence of several respectable witnesses. We have been always persuaded that carts are more convenient in a field in harvest than wagons. The wagons are too heavy, and not so easy to manage in a corn field, particularly if the land is not very hard and dry. The hay cart of Lower Canada is

the most convenient and efficient machine we have ever seen for carrying in the harvest, and we were quite surprised to see that they have not been introduced in Upper Canada, but it only shows how much parties are prejudiced in favour of what they are accustomed to, even though they should not be so good or convenient. The Canadian truck we did not see in use in Toronto, but we did see carts that we humbly conceive bear no comparison to the truck in usefulness and convenience. We may be thought to be wrong in our estimate of the hay cart and truck of Lower Canada, but we should certainly be glad to see them fairly in competition and their merits and convenience fairly tested in every possible way. The hay cart is more easy to fill, and is not so top-heavy when filled as a frame cart or wagon. Hay-carts frequently carry with one horse, one ton of hay to the Montreal market, but 100 bundles or about $\frac{3}{4}$ of a ton is quite easy to put on when required. These large loads, however, are not necessary, on the road or in the field, and moderate sized loads are much better. A truck can carry conveniently 8 barrels of flour, and one man can easily manage it. They frequently carry a ton weight, and for iron or almost any article, the truck is perfectly convenient. We hope whatever changes may come, we shall never see Lower Canada without the hay-cart and truck, and good Canadian horses to draw them.

We copy the following articles from the North British Agriculturist, relative to the wheat fly or midge. It corresponds so exactly with what we have known of the habits of the insect in this country that it is as applicable to us as to the Carse of Gowrie. As the writer observes it is most extraordinary, that the habits of this fly are not known to every farmer who pays any attention to the progress of his crops. We see it is the same case here, they call it the weevil, which is altogether a different insect and never injures the grain until it is in the granery. We have constantly watched this