DOMINION PARLIAMENT.

A message from the Governor-General transmitting the report of the Chinese Commission was laid on the table.

Mr. McCarthy introduced a Bill to amend the Patent Act of 1872. He said the Minister of Agriculture had power under that Act to hear complaints with reference to the manner in which the licensee had fulfilled certain conditions, and the decision of the Minister was absolute and binding. He doubted the power of Parliament to confer such a power, because it was a matter which concerned civil and private rights, and should be dealt with by the Provinces. The Minister of Agriculture, however, would not give up this power, and he therefore thought it well to provide for a means of obtaining testimony, and also to provide for an appeal to the Supreme Court from the Minister's decision. He would be glad if some one would move an amendment taking away the power of the decision from the Minister altogether.

Mr. McCarthy introduced a Bill to amend the Canada Temperance Act. He explained that under that Act those who are authorized to sell liquor in a county where the Scott Act is carried, such as brewers and distillers or wholesale merchants, may sell to persons who would take it out of the county, while persons who live in such a county may buy it outside and bring it into the county. This seemed to him absurd, and he proposed to amend the law so as to allow those who have the right to sell under the Scott Act to sell in their own county as well as out of it. The limit would be the same as that now provided—namely, ten gallons of wine and eight of beer.

Mr. Kranz moved for a Committee of the Whole to consider the following resolution: "That it is expedient, whenever Parliament decides that a law prohibiting the importation, manufacture, and sale of intoxicating liquor for beverage purposes should be enacted, that equitable provision should be made for the compensation of brewers, distillers, and maltsters, so far as respects the diminution in the value of the real property, premises, and plant owned and used by them in their business." He said that the principle of compensation to persons prevented by law from carrying on their business was so just as to require very few words to support it. It might be said that such a resolution was premature while no prohibition measure was before the House, but the industries in question had been very seriously disturbed by the passage of the Scott Act in several counties and by the agitation for a prohibition law. There were over two hundred breweries in Canada. The capital invested was twelve millions, and they employed 2,500 hands. The business was practically prohibited wherever the Scott Act came into force. It was but right that when a man was deprived of his property for the general good he should be compensated. When a business had been carried on legally, and with the sanction of the Government, and had yielded a large revenue to the Government, he believed that those who had invested money in it acquired vested rights. It might be said that the right was only a permissive right, but he considered it as perfect as the right of those engaged in any other business. It was true it was carried on under license, but he held that the object of licensing was not to restrict the business, but to afford a revenue to the Government. The revenue derived from the liquor industry was very large. He believed it amounted to one-sixth of the total revenue of the country. Every member of this House who drew his pay drew a share of it from the revenue derived from that business. If prohibition was necessary for the general prosperity of the country let there be prohibition, but let compensation be given. Public morality, and especially commercial morality, would not be promoted by an act of spoliation.

Mr. Wells said he would have been better pleased had this resolution been referred to another reputable class of the community who had been hardly dealt with by this Parliament, namely, the Licensed Victuallers. Had he mover of this resolution presented simply the abstract principle without mentioning some special classes, Parliament would no doubt have sustained him. In a strict sense the property of brewers, maltsters or distillers was not taken away from them, but they were not allowed to use it for the purpose for which it was bought, and injury to them resulted. If a man's property was injured or the value diminished for public purposes, compensation was given. Was there any difference between such a case and the present one? A good many earnest men looked upon this as a matter of conscience, and they would not consent to compensation. He did not doubt the sincerity of those gentlemen, but they should ask whether this argument should prevail with the Parliament. But why should compensation be confined, as this motion provided, simply to brewers, maltsters and distillers? In the recent interview of the opponents of the Scott Act with the First Minister a remarkable petition was presented by the bankers and others interested in the value of property, who represented that they must lose heavily through the Prohibition Law. Why should not the loss of these men be considered? Temperance men denounced the brewers, distillers, saloon-keepers, tavern-keepers and all others engaged in the trade as the servants of Satan. But they were not the only sinners. If it were not for the moderate drinkers there would not be so many liquor sellers. They also, therefore, were responsible for this trade in a great measure. There were many of them in this House, and he was not sure but that they were presided over by one of these "moral lepers." The Government themselves, he thought, would like to run with the hare and hunt with the hounds on this question, and they were doing it, and doing it very well. He recognized that he was likely to offend some by the position he took, yet he was taking the course which he believed was right, not only in the interests of all affected, but in the interest of the temperance cause itself. He seconded the resolution, which he believed was good as far as it went, but which he thought should go further, and include all who were injured.

Mr. Orton, while admitting that the object aimed at by the temperance people was one which all right-minded people must favor, did not agree with their methods. He entered upon a long plea in favor of compensation, basing the claims for it on the general principle of justice. He did not believe in prohibition. The Scott Act had proven a failure. This Act tapped the foundations of the morality of the people, and menaced our common Christianity. (Great cheers and laughter.) If prohibition were brought into force in Canada the immigration of Germans, Norwegians and others from the continent would cease, and that from Great Britain would rapidly decrease. Still he would sink his own views and vote for prohibition if compensation were given.

Mr. Sproule supported the resolution.

Mr. Fisher moved an amendment, "That the time for Parliament to proceed to discuss the details of a law prohibiting the importation, manufacture and sale of intoxicating liquors for beverage purposes, will be the proper occasion on which to discuss the question of compensation to the manufacturers of such liquors as may come under the operation of such law." He said that no justification had been given for the present introduction of such a resolution. They had not shown that the House during the present session, or even the present Parliament, would be called upon to pass a prohibitory law. The resolution, even if carried, would not bind the people of Canada. It would therefore do no good and it might do harm by raising the hopes of those engaged in the business. It would tempt those engaged in the business to plunge more deeply into it, and if a time arrived when investments became scarce a large quantity of capital would be drawn into the business by the inducement of compensation. A large portion of the country would soon be under the operation of the Scott Act and if the natural law of supply and demand were allowed to work its course without interference the claim for compensation would constantly become less, but if the House pledged itself to compensation it would constantly increase.

Mr. Foster said it had been common in past years for the opponents of prohibition to belittle the movement. The numbers and influence of the prohibitionists had been augmenting, and the present resolution showed that prohibition could no longer be ignored. It showed that, whether prepared for death or not, those engaged in the traffic knew that death must come. He wanted a full and fair discussion of the matter, though he did not think the present was the time to decide it. He did not think a contingent resolution like this was the usual course. If passed the consequence would be to invite an increase in the amount of the capital invested in this business from twelve millions up to thirty or forty millions, and so to invite them to lay on the shoulders of the people the burden of an immense sum for compensation. There was one thing about this motion with which as a temperance man and prohibitionist he was much pleased. It was an admission that those who desire compensation had no legal ground on which to base a demand for it. This resolution, he thought, was not a fair, open, manly one, and in saying so he meant no disrespect personally to the mover. It called for compensation only for certain parties, whereas the great plea for compensation had been that there were so many trades and interests connected to those of the distiller, brewer and maltster.

At this point in the speech a page advanced and placed on Mr. Foster's desk a glass of beer. He smiled and directed it to be returned to the donor. The House laughed, and Mr. Foster followed the example.

The debate on Mr. Kranz's resolution, for compensation to the brewers and distillers was resumed by Mr. Foster, who said that the resolution was a class resolution, claiming compensation for the brewers and distillers only, of whom there were only 130 in the whole Dominion. It was a very unguarded resolution. A prohibitory resolution might not be introduced for one or two or ten years. It was now a question whether there were such things as vested interests in the liquor trade, but the passage of the present resolution would put an end to all doubt. It would authoritatively declare that there were vested interests, and so an encouragement would be given to the extension of the business. The resolution went either too far or not far enough. It declared the principle that the brewers and distillers were in justice entitled to compensation. If this principle were sound, where was the justice of refusing compensation to the employees of the brewers and distillers, to the farmers who supplied them with grain, to the railway companies which derived profit from the trade, and to all those who acted as agents in distributing liquors?

Mr. Jamieson agreed with the view taken by the member from Brome (Mr. Fisher). The question was a very important one, but it was not proper to be considered until a prohibitory measure was before the House.

The amendment moved by Mr. Fisher was carried on a vote of 105 to 74. The following is the division list:

YEAS—Messrs. Allen, Allison, Amyot, Armstrong, Auger, Bain (Wentworth), Baker (Missisquoi), Baker (Victoria), Barnard, Bechard, Bell, Belleau, Bernier, Blake, Blondeau, Bourassa, Bourbeau, Bryson, Burpee (Sunbury), Cameron (Huron), Cameron (Inverness), Cameron (Middlesex), Campbell (Renfrew), Cartwright, Casey, Catudal, Cimon, Cochrane, Cockburn, Colby, Cook, Daoust, Davies, De St Georges, Dickinson, Dundas, Dupont, Edgar, Fairbank, Farrow, Fisher, Fleming, Forbes, Foster, Gagne, Geoffrion, Gigault, Gillmor, Gordon, Gunn, Hackett, Harley, Hay, Hickey, Hilliard, Holton, Homer, Innes, Jackson, Jamieson, Jenkins, Kaulbach, King, Kenny, Kirk, Landry (Kent), Langevin, Laurier, Lister, Macdonald (King's), Mackenzie, Mackintosh, Macmaster, McMillan (Vaudreuill), McIsaac, McLelan, McMullen, Mills, Montplaisir, Mulock, Paint, Paterson (Brant), Platt, Ray, Reid, Rinfret, Riopel, Robertson (Shelburne), Scriver, Shakespeare, Somerville (Brant), Somerville (Bruce), Sutherland (Oxford), Taylor, Temple, Townshend, Trow, Vail, Vanasse, Wallace (Albert), Watson, White (Renfrew), Wigle, Wilson, Yeo—Total, 105.

NAYS—Messrs. Abbott, Benoit, Benson, Bergeron, Bergin, Billy, Bosse, Bowell, Burns, Caron, Chapleau, Costigan, Coughlin, Coursol, Curran, Cuthbert, Dawson, Desaulniers (Maskinonge), Desaulniers (St. Maurice), Desjardins, Dodd, Dugas, Ferguson (Welland), Fortin, Gaudet, Girouard, Grandbois, Guibault, Haggart, Hall, Hesson, Hurteau, Irvine, Kranz, Landerkin, Landry (Montmagny), Langevin, Lesage, Livingstone, Macdonald (Sir John), Macmillan (Middlesex), McCallum, McCarthy, McDougald (Pictou), McDougall (Cape Breton), McGreevy, McNeill, Massue, Moffat, O'Brien, Orton, Ouimet, Patterson (Essex), Pinsonneault, Pope, Pruyn, Robertson (Hastings), Rykert, Scott, Small, Springer, Sproule, Stairs, Tasee, Tupper, Tyrwhitt, Valin, Wallace (York), Weldon, Wells, White (Cardwell), White (Hastings), Williams, Wood (Brockville)—Total, 74.

At 6 o'clock the Speaker left the chair.

After recess,

Mr. Charlton, in moving the second reading of the Bill to provide for the better observance of the Lord's Day, by prohibiting Sunday excursions in certain cases, spoke at some length. He said that there was a higher law than that of the statutes by which all statutes must be judged. Human Legislatures had no right to enact laws which set at naught that higher law. Part of that higher law was the observance of the Sabbath. All Protestant Churches were united in their declarations in favor of Sabbath observance, and if they turned to the utterances of the prelates of the Roman Catholic Church they found recognition equally unmistakable. In support of this view he quoted the utterances of Pope Leo XIII., Archbishop Taschereau, Cardinal McCloskey and other dignitaries, strongly enforcing the duty of Sabbath observance, most of them embodying special denunciations of Sabbath excursions and picnics. He gave the views also of several Protestant divines of the different denominations. He contrasted what was known as the "Continental Sunday" with the day as usually observed in British America. On the continent of Europe the people went to mass in the morning, but the rest of the day was devoted to the world, the flesh, and the devil. Horse racing, picnics, excursions, drinking and dissipation characterized the day. The tendency in such a country morally was down. One way of showing this was by the record of the illegitimate births. In London they were 4 per cent. In Paris and in Brussels 34 per cent., Vienna 54 per cent. In some cities of the States the Continental Sunday had been introduced, in Chicago, St. Louis, Cincinnati, for instance, and in those places the deaths by violence were more numerous than in the worst governed countries in Europe, except Italy and Spain. He did not think Sunday excursions were conducive to rest and health, and believed they were often productive of riot and drunkenness. The testimony of employers was to the effect that church-going workmen were better workers than those who spent their Sundays in excursions. Sunday excursions robbed certain classes of employees, such as steamboat crews and railway hands, of their Sabbath rest. They were apt to lead to riot and crime. They disturbed the peace and good order of the places visited, and they paved the way for the general abolition of the Sabbath. The Bill was intended to prevent only Sunday excursions by boat or rail, going and returning the same day.

Mr. Chapleau opposed the Bill as interfering with the liberty of the subject in a matter which should be left to his own conscience, and also took the ground that it was a matter for the Provincial or municipal authorities to deal with.

Sir John Macdonald said he thought the constitutional objection taken by the Secretary of State was a good one, and that it was a matter of Provincial jurisdiction. If the Bill made the infringement a crime it might be argued that it was within the Federal jurisdiction, but at present he thought it was beyond the jurisdiction of the Federal Parliament.

The motion for the second reading was lost on a division.

General Gordon's Views of Death.

"God knows what my anxiety was. Not for my life, for I died years ago to all ties in this world and to all its comforts, honors and glories." It was on Sept. 11th, 1877, when on his expedition to Shaka, 560 miles southwest of Khartoum, with four companies of indifferent troops, to break the neck of slave raiding in its very den, that Gordon wrote these characteristic words, which may be fitly quoted at a time when there is too much reason to fear he has actually laid down his life for those he had vainly striven to save. They breathe precisely the spirit with which Gordon always regarded life and death. "God has given you," he says, writing to his friends, "ties and anchors to this earth, you have wives and families; I, thank God, have none of them, and am free. * * * You are only called on at intervals to rely on your God; I am obliged continually to do so. I mean by this that you have only great trials, such as the illness of a child, when you feel yourself utterly weak, now and then. I am constantly in anxiety. The body rebels against this constant leaning on God; it is a heavy strain on it; it causes appetite to cease. Find me the man—and I will take him as my help—who utterly despises money, name, glory, honor—one who never wishes to see his home again, one who looks to God as the source of good and controller of evil, one who has a healthy body and an energetic spirit, and one who looks upon death as a release from misery. If you cannot find him, then leave me alone." That instinctive clinging to life, which is natural to all men, Gordon seems to have overcome as completely as Ignatius Loyola, or John Wesley, or Cromwell's Puritans. When his poor Soudanese lambs pressed him on every side with their complaints, he wrote: "I must not complain if they have no thought of what I have already gone through. There is only one issue to it, and that is death, and I often feel I wish it would come and relieve me." One can hardly doubt that if Gordon was in fact stabbed as he left the palace he had so bravely he held for twelve months, he saw in the dagger only an instrument of deliverance. In every reference to death, it was with him the great "release." "I value my life as naught, and should only have weariness for perfect peace."

A Laughing Plant.

This is not a flower that laughs, but one that creates laughing, if the printed stories of travellers are to be believed. It grows in Arabia, and is called the laughing plant, because its seeds produce effects like those produced by laughing gas. The flowers are of a bright yellow and the seed pods are soft and woolly, while the seeds resemble small black beans, and only two or three grow in a pod. The natives dry and pulverize them, and the powder, if taken in small doses, makes the soberest person behave like a circus clown or a madman, for he will dance, sing and laugh most boisterously, and cut the most fantastic capers, and be in an uproariously ridiculous condition for about an hour. When the excitement ceases, the exhausted exhibitor of these antics falls asleep, and when he awakes he has not the slightest remembrance of his frisky doings.—*Vick's Floral Magazine.*

A Pensacola, Fla., negress has just given birth to four children. Another in the same city comes to the front with triplets.

ONTARIO LEGISLATURE.

The debate on new Parliament buildings continued.

Mr. Broder contended that the Government wished to keep the question of new buildings as one between the city of Toronto, the Government and the Opposition. He charged the Commissioner of Public Works with not being serious when he proposed the grant of $500,000 for new Parliament buildings, as he well knew that that sum would be insufficient.

Mr. O'Connor—I don't propose to give a silent vote, representing, as I have the honor to do, perhaps the largest rural constituency in the Province—a constituency in all probability as important as any other constituency, and concerned on this matter as much as any other in the Province, with the possible exception of Toronto. It appears to me that the erection of new public buildings ought not to be looked on as one affecting only the city of Toronto. It is a direct Provincial question, and not at all a city of Toronto question. Were it merely a question affecting the city, I would vote against the erection of new Parliament buildings. I am of the opinion of John Sandfield Macdonald, and I don't see what the city of Toronto have done for Reform that the Reform party should go out of its way to do anything for the city of Toronto. Let Toronto look at their own friends whom they have supported so many years for the favors that they want. It is decidedly a strange state of affairs when we find, when a matter comes up in which the city of Toronto is so closely concerned, that the gentlemen who should be friends of the city are the persons most anxious to deprive Toronto of the benefits arising from new Parliament Buildings. There is no doubt at all in my mind that new buildings are necessary. The able speech and strong arguments of the member for Hamilton convince me completely, and he made out his case almost perfectly that new Parliament Buildings are required, that the present buildings are not fit for their purpose, and that they are not appropriate for this assembly. If all the differences between the Dominion and the Province were settled, then such a question could be dealt with in a different manner, but as affairs are I would not take a single risk for the purpose of benefitting Toronto. New Parliament Buildings are a necessity, and so in order to test the sincerity of the leader of the Opposition and so as to prevent him by his amendment evading a vote on the straight question, I propose to move the following amendment to the amendment:

All the words after the first word "that" in the amendment be omitted, and instead thereof there be inserted the following—there be added to the original motion these words: "And this House is prepared to consider any reasonable scheme for the erection of new Parliament and Departmental Buildings."

Mr. Neelon looked at the question as one entirely removed from politics, and considered that the Government should not take any responsibility more than as ordinary members they all took. All the members of the House were equally responsible for their own votes, and he should vote for new buildings in full view of his responsibility, and as quite ready to answer for his vote to his constituency. He was going to vote for new buildings because he believed they were necessary, and because, on the assurance of the Government, there was a sufficient surplus to warrant the work being undertaken.

Mr. Wood was prepared to support a proper scheme when it came down in a proper manner, through the constitutional channels by means of which government was carried on.

Mr. Waters thought it would be stultifying himself in his own estimation and in that of those who sent him here if he voted against the motion of the hon. member for Hamilton, because five years ago he supported a motion for the erection of Parliament buildings. He was of the opinion that they were needed then and he was so still. While the member for East Toronto was in favor of the erection of new buildings, and he believed would sincerely co-operate with the Government, the policy of the leader of the Opposition was against the erection of new buildings when he was in the west. He (Mr. Waters) at the first meeting during the last election in his own riding, had the honor of meeting that hon. gentleman, and he held forth strongly the fact that he (Mr. Waters) had supported the erection of new buildings.

Mr. Morris stated that he was going to vote for the amendment of the hon. member for Bruce, and repeated his statement that the Government were fully charged with the responsibility. Constitutionally the leader of the Opposition had taken the proper course.

Mr. Awrey—The present question is one which ought not to be approached from a party standpoint, or with personal feelings. Representing a rural constituency, yet I have sufficient faith in the intelligence of my constituents to believe that they are prepared to sanction the erection of new buildings—buildings suitable for the wants of the Province, and commensurate with the importance of Ontario. Hence I give my assent to the proposition now before the House. I believe that the Legislature in 1880 gave a proposition of the kind now before the House, when the leader of the Opposition took the ground that the people had not been consulted, and that they should be consulted. Since that time they have been consulted, and as the people can only give their own opinion through their representatives, then the Government is right in taking this manner of ascertaining what the wish of the people is. I believe there is a consensus of opinion in the Province that it is necessary to construct new buildings. I believe that these buildings are not a credit to the Province of Ontario, for Provinces with far less resources, in a much poorer financial position, and having no such influence in the affairs of the Dominion, have buildings which reflect credit upon them and Canada. Ontario alone of all the others able to build a suitable Parliament House, alone financially unembarrassed, alone with a surplus, the most energetic, with the prospect of an increased revenue from enlarged territories, certainly this Province is entitled to buildings of creditable proportions and architectural beauty. The charge has been made that the Government has abnegated its functions, but this should not be made by hon. gentlemen opposite, for if we look at the Government at Ottawa we shall find that when it comes to the submission of an Insolvency Law, affecting the whole Dominion, and dealing with the interests of all our merchants, the question is referred to a committee. And so upon the Boundary report and the License question, these were submitted to a committee, and we have never heard from hon. members opposite that the Government has abnegated its functions in this respect. This Government must assume the responsibility of the matter; the scheme must be submitted to the House on the responsibility of the Government, and every member of the House who votes for the motion will be quite as free to criticize the plan as if he voted against it. The resolution in my mind does not express the position any too strongly, and I don't think that any one who has read it carefully and is expressing his honest conviction upon it, can refuse to vote for it.

Mr. McMahon could quite understand the position of the members for Toronto, and he would not be surprised at them being highly pleased in supporting a vote for $500,000 more than has already been voted. They all knew that new Parliament Buildings were necessary. Taking everything into consideration he should support the amendment by the member for Bruce.

Mr. White took five years ago the position that he was about to take now, namely, that the rural constituencies are not favorable to the project of new Parliament Buildings and that the people should be consulted before new buildings should be erected.

Mr. Meredith had no hesitation in repeating his statement as to his position that when the Government came down with a definite proposition he would give it a fair consideration on its merits.

Hon. C. F. Fraser—As far as the responsibility of the Government is concerned it makes no difference whether the motion is carried or not. The Government never suggested in any shape or way that this motion should be submitted; we never, either directly or indirectly, suggested that such a resolution should be put upon paper, but even if we had I contend that it would not have been any unusual course of procedure. The Government at Ottawa is in the habit of seeking the opinion of the House in this manner upon questions, and I venture to say that it would not be anything unusual if the Government at Ottawa had sought to obtain the opinion of the House upon the question of compensation to distillers and brewers by a motion by a private member. Let us consider what was done in 1880. A good deal has been said about what was done then, and that it is not necessary to make a new affirmation now that new Parliament Buildings are necessary. In answer to this I say that we have a new House, and what the House might think then it might no think now. After the lapse of five years the Government said not to go on without asking the opinion of the House, when practically nothing has been done in the meantime under its resolution of 1880. Again, when the House has expressed its opinion, will the responsibility be cast on the Government to carry out the wish of the House?

A division was taken on the amendment to the amendment by Mr. O'Connor with the following result—52 yeas, 30 nays:

YEAS—Messrs. Awrey, Badgerow, Balfour, Ballantyne, Baxter, Bishop, Blezard, Caldwell, Cascaden, Chisholm, Clarke (Toronto), Cook, Dill, Dowling, Dryden, Ferris, Fraser, Freeman, Gibson (Hamilton), Gibson (Huron), Gillies, Gould, Graham, Gray, Hagar, Harcourt, Hardy, Laidlaw, Lees, McIntyre, MacKenzie, McKim, McLaughlin, McMahon, Master, Metcalfe, Morin, Morris, Mowat, Murray, Neelon, O'Connor, Pardee, Phelps, Rayside, Ross (Huron), Ross (Middlesex), Sills, Snider, Waters, Widdified, Young—52.

NAYS—Messrs. Baskerville, Blythe, Brereton, Broder, Carnegie, Clancy, Denison, Ermatinger, Fell, French, Hammell, Hart, Hess, Hudson, Kerns, Kerr, McColman, McGhee, McKay, Meredith, Merrick, Monk, Morgan, Mulholland, Preston, Robillard, Ross (Cornwall), White, Wilmot Wood—30.

Good Model for a Snow-Plow.

I made a snow-plow a few days since in less than half an hour that has saved its cost several times over already, in time that would otherwise have been spent in shovelling paths. It is shaped like a letter A. The sides are pine boards, twelve inches wide and six feet long. The inside edges at the front are bevelled to unite in a point, while the rear ends are four feet apart. A strong cleat is nailed horizontally to the inside of each side, three feet from the front end to support the cross-bar or brace. This is of one and a half inch plank eighteen inches wide, cut to the right length and angle to fit. A hole for a clevis-pin four inches from the front and three from the top completes the plow. This is lighter than is generally made, planks being more often used. But, if well nailed, the above will be found amply strong with the additional advantage of being light and easy to handle. I use a whiffletree, a short chain and a clevis. I regulate the draft by lengthening or shortening the chain. I use one horse; stand on the cross-bar and ride except when turning around. In very heavy snow it may be necessary to go more than once in a place. Hitch a horse to it the first thing in the morning after a fall of snow, and in fifteen minutes you can make clean wide paths to the barn, corn-house, clothes-line, road, sidewalk, etc., and will find it much pleasanter than wading around the snow or spending hours of time in shovelling paths.—*Cor. Mirror and Farmer.*

Peach Tree Pests.

Mr. William Armstrong, a practical fruit grower of Niagara township, publishes the following hints on ridding peach trees of the insect pests which infest them: "Last spring I went over all my young peach trees three times (15,000), destroying hundreds of spring insects. Later on I applied a wash to protect them from the summer and fall insects, which was found to be very helpful. During the coming summer I will experiment on what may be found to be the cheapest and best receipt for syringing the trees to protect them from insects. To insure success in peach growing, I believe the following may be found useful: The best of cultivation each year up to the 15th of August, after which on no account disturb the ground near the roots. Head back each year. Increase the fertility of the land each year so that when the trees bear there will be nourishment to sustain the draw on the tree. Use the following: Barn yard manure, unleached ashes, or potash, lime, salt, bone dust or sulphur. Syringe the trees two or three times in the season to protect them from the ravages of insects.

We had better appear what we are than affect to appear what we are not.