

	DRAUGHT.		FURROW SLICE.	
	cwt.	lbs.	Depth, in.	Width, in.
Modeland.....	3	108	6	8 $\frac{1}{2}$
Bingham.....	3	96	6	9
Gray's.....	4	32	5 $\frac{1}{2}$	8 $\frac{1}{2}$
Howard.....	4	90	5	8 $\frac{1}{2}$
Lap Furrow.....	4	28	5	10

From this table it will appear that Bingham's plough required less force than any of the others, while the furrow slice was larger. This implement reflects great credit on the inventor and manufacturer. The mould-board is very well shaped, and is calculated to lay down the slice properly. It may be remarked, however, that this Plough did not give the furrow slice so good a cut as some others. This, no doubt, was in great measure owing to the set of the irons—a point so essential to the proper working of a plough. The result was, that the grass was very imperfectly buried, and a much smaller amount of tilth was given for covering the seed. This defect can be remedied by any blacksmith who has been accustomed to put plough irons in order. The clevis of this plough was regulated by a screw, very ingeniously applied. The workmanship was very good; and altogether, this implement seems to deserve the encomiums passed on it here and in Europe.

Modeland's plough is very similar in shape and construction to Bingham's, and owing to the set of the irons, did the work better. It is strongly made, and is highly commended by those who have used it.

Gray's Scotch Iron Plough made the best work. This plough holds, on this side of the Atlantic, the high position which it has attained in Great Britain; it is unquestionably the best implement in use as a sward-plough, that is, for thorough and handsome work. It is, however, heavy, cumbersome, and hard to draw. The same patterns of castings, when affixed properly to wood, as has been done by Mr. Cairns of Paris, C.W., and others, give a handy and excellent implement, easily drawn, and in every respect better suited for every-day work than the iron plough.

The next in order is Howard's. This plough made fair work, but, as will be seen from the table, requires considerable force. It is a very complicated, heavy, expensive implement, and unsuited to the country. It had, however, the merit of a skim-coulter; but which, not being used at the trial, deprived the plough of one of its important elements. The skin-coulter is an approximation to the principle of the Michigan sub-soil. It cuts a thin paring from the top of the furrow slice, and thus more effectually buries the grass than can be done by the ordinary coulter. The American plough, however, is stronger, cheaper, and does the work far more thoroughly.

The last plough regularly entered for trial, was the "Lap-furrow." In light soil and in cross-ploughing, or stubble ground, in which there is not much grass, this plough might be used with advantage. It is capable of performing a large amount of work in a given time, but on stiff sod or hard clay it would make very inferior work.

The undersigned regret that a fair trial could not be given to the double plough of Messrs. Ruggles & Nourse. Although this implement is much inferior to those made on the same principle in the State of New York, yet in the hands of a good ploughman, it was capable of making better work than any plough on the ground. Unfortunately, the ploughmen present were unacquainted with the implement: it was also out of order, and there was too little time for a fair trial of it. As an exterminator of couch-grass, and a deep and thorough tiller, it stands unrivalled, and seems destined to supersede many ploughs now in use. The undersigned would suggest to the intelligent and thoroughly practical farmers of York, the propriety of making a special occasion for the trial of this important implement. This is all that is needed to render it generally appreciated.

In conclusion, it may be remarked that trial matches, such as that got up at your suggestion, will bear an important part in promoting good husbandry. They bring out many points which do not and cannot be made to appear at the ordinary ploughing match, by testing comparatively different implements. They deserve encouragement and attentive consideration from farmers, because, when properly managed, they must produce lasting benefits.—We have the honour to be, Sir, your obedient servants,

DAVID CHRISTIE.

J. C. AIKINS.

E. W. THOMPSON.

JOHN WADE.

W. McDougall, Esq., Editor *Canadian Agriculturist*.

[It is proper to state that Col. Thompson and Mr. Wade did not actually sign the above, but expressed their concurrence in separate communications, which do not essentially differ from the more formal statement of Messrs. Christie and Aikins.—Ed.]