

Agriculture, &c.

Low headed Fruit Trees.

In trimming fruit trees, we should always be careful to secure the trunk from the rays of the summer sun. Solar heat, by being long permitted to come in contact with the bark, is said to scald the circulating fluids, and thus cause many of the diseases which affect fruit trees in this climate. The foliage only should be fully exposed to the influences of heat, for that is capable of bearing it unharmed, and even to profit by it, when most intense. It has been asserted by distinguished terraculturists, that trees which are permitted to branch out low—say three or four feet from the ground—are rarely attacked by "fire-blight," "frozen-sap blight," black spots, or other diseases of the bark or limbs.

There is also another advantage attending this practice. The soil is kept lighter, looser, and more free from weeds, and there is no necessity of mulching. The high winds pass, also, almost harmless over the trees, and have not power to twist, rack and break the branches, or to detach the fruit, as they do where the branches aspire, and are exposed. A writer on this subject says: "The trees will be much longer lived, more prolific, beautiful and profitable. They are more easily rid of destructive insects, the fruit is much less damaged by falling, and the facilities for gathering it are much greater; there is less danger in climbing, and less danger of breaking the limbs. The trees require less pruning, scraping and washing—if the two latter are thought necessary, and the roots are protected from the scourge of the plow, which is too often allowed to tear and mutilate them."

The proper shape for fruit trees is that of an umbrella reversed. When this shape is communicated by pruning, the foliage is more freely exposed to the action of the solar rays, and to the air, which ought always to have a free circulation among the foliage and fruit. By communicating a conical form to any tree, although it may be rather more graceful and elegant in its effects upon a landscape, we certainly injure it in many ways, if looked upon as an object of profit. The fruit of apple trees which grows on the interior limbs, where the surrounding foliage and branches prevent the sun's rays from penetrating, and where the direct influences of heat are never felt, is, to a certain extent, insipid; it does not mature thoroughly, and will not keep so long or so perfectly as that which grows on the outside branches, exposed to the sun and wind. It also varies so much in shape—and especially in color—that we have known two plates of apples selected from the same Baldwin tree, one of which was pronounced by a skillful fruit-grower to be the Baldwin, and the other plate another variety!—N. E. Farmer.

BEAN MEAL FOR PIGS.—In England, on the continent, the practice prevails quite extensively, of feeding pigs and young swine on bean-meal. The beans are ground the same as corn or wheat with us. The *Mark Lane Express* says on this subject:

"A subscriber wishes us to inform him what is the best food for fattening pigs? I have myself tried nearly every description of food, and have never found anything to produce so much weight, or so fine meat, in a given time, as bean meal. Some pigs fed with food mixed with fine toppings, weighed, at six months old, two hundred and eighty pounds, and the pork was allowed to be extremely tender. I last year tried to fatten hogs on grey peas alone, giving them milk to drink. The animals took on fat rapidly, but did not acquire so great weight as those fed on bean meal." The legumes are all of them excellent food for swine.

When peas and beans have got wet and mouldy to an extent which render them unfit for culinary purposes, they should have scalding water poured over them, and after being allowed to dry, be reduced to meal for swine. The action of the hot water will at once remove fungi or mould, and render them sufficiently sweet to ensure their being eaten by the animals.

TOP-DRESSING GRASS LANDS IN AUTUMN.—Our attention was recently called to a piece of grass land upon which some interesting experiments had been made in top-dressing. The piece consisted of two or three acres, had been under-drained, plowed, seeded to grass, and the whole of it in every respect treated alike with the exception of the time of top-dressing it. The same quantity and quality of manure was applied to one part as well as another, and yet the difference in the time of applying the manure made a difference of a hundred per cent. in the crop!

On one portion of the field, the dressing was applied last fall—but we did not learn whether it was before the ground had frozen or not. The manure was made very fine by frequent overhauling—and spread directly from the cart—not deposited in heaps. On the remaining portion the dressing was applied in the spring, as early as it was safe for the team to pass over the sward without cutting it up much, and where the dressing was applied in the fall, there was double the amount of grass that there was on the spring-dressed portion!—N. E. Farmer.

CARE OF GRINDSTONES.—No grindstone should be exposed to the weather; it injures the wood-work, and the rays of the sun harden the stone, so that, in time, it will become useless; neither should it be allowed to run in water, as the part remaining in it softens and wears away faster than the other side. The water should be dropped or poured on. Greasy or rusty tools should be cleaned before grinding, or they will choke up the grit. Keep the stone under cover. These rules will save the farmer much vexation and expense.

The Decision of the British Government on the Trent outrage.

Some of our readers may have read the following article from the *London Times* of the 30th ult., as however it contains an excellent summary of the present quarrel between Great Britain and the United States Government, and sentiments on the subject so well worthy of consideration we copy it entire.

The Cabinet met yesterday to deliberate on the steps which should be taken to obtain satisfaction for the recent outrage on the British flag. On so momentous an occasion we cannot doubt that every point was discussed with the utmost care, and that the decision was not arrived at without a full consideration of the possible consequences. Among the members of the present Government are men of the greatest experience and the most profound learning. Lord Palmerston has been engaged in political life for half a century, and has conducted the foreign affairs of this country during an age pregnant with revolutions and dynastic changes. Lord Russell has all his life made constitutional history and law his study, and his opinions may always be counted upon in favour of national and individual liberty. It would have been difficult to find at any period a more profound knowledge combined with a more judicial mind than are united in Sir Cornwall Lewis, and in the Lord Chancellor the Government has an adviser whose reputation as a jurist is second to none in Europe. Furthermore, it may be stated that the Cabinet has continually availed itself of the assistance of the Law Officers of the Crown, and that the course it has resolved upon is in accordance with their mature and reiterated opinions. The public will therefore feel in supporting Her Majesty's Government they do but assert a claim that is founded in truth and justice. We may say, then, that the Cabinet has come to the conclusion that the act of the Captain of the *San Jacinto*, in seizing passengers on board a British vessel carrying them forcibly away, is a clear violation of the Law of Nations, and one for which reparation must be at once demanded. In all probability the next steamer will carry out a despatch, instructing Lord Lyons to demand reparation for the ill-advised act of the *San Jacinto* in seizing Messrs. Mason and Slidell while under the protection of the British flag. Should this just demand not be complied with, we cannot doubt that Lord Lyons will, under the instructions of his Government, withdraw with the British Legation from Washington.

We believe that the Cabinet has taken a view of the matter which will be satisfactory alike to the patriotism and the reason of the country. Without questioning the right of a belligerent vessel to stop and search our merchantmen for contraband of war, our Ministers entirely deny the claim which was asserted in this case, and which would permit a foreign naval officer to take persons at his own discretion from under the British flag, on the pretence that they are rebels or citizens of a hostile State. The law which governs the stopping, the seizing, the judging, and the condemning of neutral merchant ships is clearly laid down, and being, at the best, highly oppressive to neutrals, it must be strictly adhered to. This law, even when interpreted by the harsh practices of a bygone age, contains nothing which can justify the carrying off of persons in the position of Messrs. Mason and Slidell, who were at the most civil servants of the hostile Power, and were travelling from one neutral port to another in a neutral vessel. If the Government of Washington holds that the Confederates are belligerents, then it is bound by the laws of war, which treat only military and naval persons travelling for belligerent purposes as contraband, and even in that case direct that the contraband character shall be duly established in a Prize Court. If, on the other hand, it declares that Messrs. Mason and Slidell were seized as rebels by virtue of its Municipal Law, then the right of asylum has been clearly violated. Indeed, on the latter plea the Federal Government might station a sloop in the Channel to board the Dover and Folkestone steamers daily, and carry off every Southerner who might be found. The principle on which our Government rests its demand is, that a British ship must—until her violation of neutral right is fully proved—be held to be British ground as much as if she were an actual piece of British soil, and the right to protection of all persons on board as valid as if they were on British territory. Now, no such violation has been proved, or has been sought to be proved, against the *Trent*, and consequently the seizure of the four persons who were forcibly dragged from her decks was entirely illegal.

We hear there is a possibility that the seizure was the act of the American commander, and was not expressly directed by his Government. Lieut. Fairfax, of the *San Jacinto*, said, we are informed, on board the *Trent*, that his commanding officer acted on his own responsibility. We fear, however, that the Federal Government had deliberately determined to seize the Southern Commissioners. That the *James Adger* came to Southampton with the intention of stopping the last West India steamer was stated at the time and cannot now be doubted, and we are informed that Gen. Scott has declared, since his arrival at Paris, that the seizure of the Southern Commissioners had been the subject of Cabinet discussions at Washington long before he left. In confirmation of this opinion we may add that, though the Federal Government has a Consul at Havana, and though the fact that Messrs. Mason and Slidell were about to leave for England in an English steamer was well known, yet no intimation was given to the English company that these passengers were looked upon as contraband of war, or otherwise subject

to seizure. The object of the Washington authorities was apparently not to prevent the sailing of their enemy's Envoys which they had an opportunity of doing by warning the English steamer at Havana that their presence on board would subject her to seizure and forfeiture by a Prize Court; it was to get possession of the Envoys themselves, and for that purpose they made no remonstrance, as, as they were bound to do, against taking them on board, but secretly planned the outrage for which we are now asking reparation.

How necessary it is to uphold our strict rights in this controversy will be seen by a recent occurrence at Panama. While the Federal Captains are asserting their right to seize Secessionists on board neutral vessels, Federal Generals are asserting their right to hold their prisoners on neutral territory. The *Orizaba*, a steamer from San Francisco to Panama, had on board three gentlemen who were "suspected of Secessionist principles." General Sumner, commanding the United States land forces in the Pacific, arrested them the day before the steamer reached Panama, and determined to carry them across the Isthmus. The three gentlemen demanded the interference of the New Granada Governor to protect them in neutral territory, and the Governor sent to demand their release. This was declined by General Sumner peremptorily. The police officer, "with a force of 40 men, could not, of course, offer resistance to 500 United States troops, and General Sumner was at liberty to take his prisoners with him." The Governor protested, but in vain, and the Minister of New Granada will probably be as unsuccessful in his remonstrances at Washington. Here it will be seen there was no question of an enemy's Envoy, or of persons engaged in the military service of the enemy. The prisoners were mere suspects, who were thus carried by main force through a neutral's territory in spite of an official demand for their liberation.

All that now remains for us is to adjure the Government and people of the Northern States to do us justice in this matter. They must by this time know us and our unwillingness to draw the sword against them, or to take any part in their unhappy quarrel. Indeed, our patience and long-suffering have not improbably led to the series of insults of which the outrage on the *Trent* is the last and most offensive. We have maintained the most rigid neutrality in their dispute; during the year which these troubles have lasted, the Americans cannot complain of a single unfriendly act on our part; and at this moment we are permitting our industry to suffer in deference to a blockade so ineffective that it is daily violated. We appeal, then, to the moderate and enlightened of the Northern people. Let them be assured that the pretensions which their Government has made cannot be allowed by any State which respects its own dignity, or even its own safety. Let them be assured that the forbearance of this country has not been dictated, as their ignorant politicians tell them, by any dread of their power, and that, though we can disregard much petulance, we will not sit down under an injury.

Correspondence.

For the Christian Messenger

Letters to a Young Preacher.

LETTER XXIII. CHURCH DISCIPLINE: IMMORAL CONDUCT.

My Dear Brother,—

That immorality must not be tolerated in a Christian church is certain. If any members are guilty of it, they must be called to account by the church to which they belong, and be either reclaimed or excluded. (1 Cor. v. 11—13. Gal. vi. 1. 2 Thes. iii. 8. Rev. ii. 2.)

As it devolves on the pastor to instruct the disciples in this duty, as well as others, the question will naturally arise in the mind, By what process is one who is reported or supposed to be guilty of immoral conduct, to be brought before the Church for the investigation of his case?—No specific rule or direction can be found in sacred writ with reference to this matter, apart from that which relates to personal offences, namely, Matt. xvii. 15—17. The natural inference there is, that the same law, which is very explicit and minute, applies to both; and consequently, that the same course of procedure should be pursued in each. Indeed, as an immoral action is an offence or trespass against the whole Church, it is necessarily an offence against every member. Moreover, so far as I can see, no other rule could have been given that would be preferable.

It may be thought by some, that in a case of alleged immorality there is no need of any preliminary steps; but that the supposed transgression should be reported immediately to the Church, and dealt with, if present, or if absent, that a committee should be appointed to visit him, and require his attendance at a subsequent meeting, to answer to the charge. By such a course, however, much harm and great injustice may be done to the accused, and serious injury to the cause of Christ. If present, being unexpectedly assailed in public, he would be very liable to be irritated, and to become alienated from his brethren. If absent, and innocent, the

slandrous report, thus publicly communicated and received, will probably be diffused far and wide, to the irreparable damaging of his reputation, and to the grieving and disaffecting of his mind: and groundless reproach will be cast upon the denomination, and upon the professors of godliness at large. No man would be willing to be so treated in like circumstances; but every one would desire to be first visited in private, and apprized of the report. The Saviour's golden rule, "As ye would that men should do to you, do ye even so to them," applies here. (Luke vi. 31.) It is, therefore, indispensable that recourse should first be had to private visitation. This affords the accused an opportunity to deny, confess, or explain. If the visitor be not satisfied, he should, as in a case of personal trespass, call in the aid of experienced and prudent brethren. Should these deem it needful, the matter must be brought before the Church. The accused will then have no reasonable ground of complaint; and the charge may be calmly considered, and a correct judgment be passed upon it.

But the question here occurs, Whose duty is it to take the first step? This can not be consistently regarded as devolving upon the pastor. Unquestionably he ought to visit transgressors, and to "reprove, rebuke, exhort," (2 Tim. iv. 2.) in the discharge of his pastoral duties; but he should not be needlessly subjected, on every occasion, to the displeasure of persons attending on his ministry. It would, moreover, be exceedingly incongruous for a judge, whose business it is to preside in court, instruct the jury, and pronounce the sentence, to act as the accuser of one charged with a crime. The position of a pastor is in some measure analogous. (1 Thes. v. 12. Heb. xiii. 7, 17. 1 Pet. v. 2, 3. Rev. i. 20.) He should, therefore, by no means be required or expected to act as the accusing party. Every member ought to feel a personal responsibility to labor for Christ, and especially to aid in preserving and promoting the purity of the whole body. The honor of God, the prosperity of Zion, and the salvation of souls, are most deeply interested in this matter. When, therefore, any brother hears an unfavorable report respecting another member of the Church, and has reason to fear that it is true, or, if false, is liable to injure the character of the accused, he should go, without naming it to another, directly to the party, and deal kindly but faithfully, as in a case of personal offence. In our Covenant we have all solemnly obligated ourselves to do this. (Lev. xix. 17. Prov. ix. 8. Heb. iii. 13. James v. 19, 20.)

In a case wherein misconduct is known to only one, or a few individuals, confession to those who know it should be deemed sufficient; and it ought to be communicated no farther. (James v. 16. Prov. x. 12. 2 Sam. i. 20.) But if it be a public transgression, the visitor, or visitors—no matter how many—should induce the guilty party to make an open confession, with promise of amendment, and reparation, if any person has been injured. Hereupon a Church under a right influence will readily forgive one that has been "overtaken in a fault," and "restore" him at once to full fellowship. (Gal. vi. 1.) Flagitious crimes, however, such as incontinency, theft, false-swearing, &c. demand immediate exclusion, according to the apostolic direction, "Put away from among yourselves that wicked person." (1 Cor. v. 11—13. Numb. xii. 14, 15.) The "clearing" of the Church from all appearance of conniving at iniquity, the ultimate good of the transgressor, and the warning of others, demand this course. (2 Cor. vii. 11. 1 Cor. v. 5. 2 Tim. v. 20.) But sedulous efforts ought to be put forth to reclaim excluded persons; and when they evince penitence, and make all the amendment in their power, they should be restored. (James v. 19, 20. 2 Cor. ii. 6—8.)

If a pastor perceive that none of the brethren discharge their duty toward transgressors, but that these are suffered to remain undisciplined, I would advise that he should urge upon the Church to appoint a standing Committee, whose special duty it shall be—not to the exemption of others from it—to attend to this matter, visit alleged offenders, and report to the Church when necessary.

May you, my beloved young Brother, ever avoid all appearance of evil; and be successful in the prevention of immoral conduct; or, if any cases occur in the church under your charge, by judicious counsel aid in having them scripturally treated!

Yours in gospel bonds,

CHARLES TEPPER.

Aylesford, Dec. 6th, 1861.

Tasso being told that he had a fair opportunity of taking advantage of a very bitter enemy: "I wish not to plunder him," said he, "but there are things I wish to take from him; not his honor, his wealth, or his life, but his ill-will."