



### MR. LAURIER IN ONTARIO.

#### He Vindicates His Position.

A Splendid Speech—Toronto Chartered by His Eloquence and Argument—The North-West Insurrection Reviewed—A Startling Incident.

Following are some of the principal points in the magnificent speech recently delivered by the Hon. W. Laurier in Toronto. From the published account it appears that the speech had a marvellous effect on those present, and completely captured the audience. The *Mail* management has been lashed into a perfect fury by the speech, as it will be seen from the portions given that it is a complete refutation of the slanders and misstatements that paper has been indulging in concerning the Province of Quebec and the position of the French people in their relation to the Dominion in general and the North-West insurrection in particular. Mr. Laurier was accompanied by the Hon. E. Blake and other leaders of the Reform party from various parts of the province.

After some preliminary remarks the hon. gentleman said:—

"For several months past the press of this Province, and especially of this city, has been sedulously sending the impression abroad, and time and again making the assertion, that there is in the whole French race of Canada an ever fermenting element of rebellion; that the French race are not loyal to the constitution of this country; that they will not submit to the duties of citizenship except in so far as they tally with their interests and prejudices; and if I am allowed, and I think I will be on this occasion, I will refer to my own individual standing when I am represented day after day as a traitor and a rebel. I am here this evening, my chief object in coming here to this city of Toronto was to meet these accusations, and they are daily addressed. And I am thankful, Mr. Chairman, and I thank Toronto for giving me the opportunity, which I now shall avail myself of, of meeting these charges and repelling them, as I hope, and I am sure I will repel them, to your satisfaction. There are several topics of great interest in which we are all interested, and of which I would like to address you. I am a French Canadian, but above all a Canadian; and these are common interests which make a common belief.

#### A REMINISCENCE OF OLD SCOTIA.

After alluding to the paucity of Federal Government to the French, the hon. gentleman proceeded:—

"I am free to admit this, and without any restriction, that previous to the year 1841, that is, to the granting of responsible government to the people of this country, every man of us, either in arms or in heart. But does it follow that because our fathers were rebels that their sons should harbor treason in their hearts? I am sure there must be in this audience an appreciation of the sentiments of those gallant Highlanders who fought by the side of Prince Charles at Culloden, against the British flag, which even then floated in all the lands of the earth. It is to the testimony of that hour that I appeal. Their course after the rebellion was over is a living witness to the fact that the most fervent loyalty can take the place of sullessness, and even rebellion. What was true, gentlemen, of the Scotch Highlanders, is true also of my fellow-countrymen, the French race in this country. The difference is that the Scotch Highlanders fought for a sentiment and my French fellow-countrymen fought for a principle. But before they rebelled against the Crown of England they had proved their loyalty to that country in more manners than one.

#### GOOD FAITH OF THE CONQUERED.

It is a matter of history that as soon as the great contest between Montcalm and Wolfe had been decided in favor of Wolfe, the French Canadians accepted unreservedly the state of things and became loyal British subjects. And twice in succession during the course of a few short years their loyalty was put to the test, and in what were they found wanting? The country was invaded twice by the Americans, and twice they were repelled, the French Canadians fighting as nobly to accomplish this as any British subjects of the time could have done. They repelled all the blandishments of the emissaries of the French Government in order to induce them to cast off British rule and throw in their lot with the American people. Why did they rebel? History is a witness of all their struggles against the British Crown. The only things they asked for were the rights of British subjects; and as soon as those rights were granted them—I repeat what I said before—they became what they are to-day, the most loyal subjects that England ever had. Sir, the attachment to British institutions is natural to men of your origin. It is a matter of tradition to you. It must be so, because their very nature is permeated with the associations and memories of the Old Land. Our attachment to the British Crown springs from another cause. Your attachment to the British Crown flows in your blood. With us our attachment to the British Crown springs from gratitude, it springs from the heart. We have learned to love British institutions

because in British institutions we have found more freedom than we would ever had had we remained the subjects of France (applause), and how many times in that great old city which I have the honor to represent, looking at the banner of St. George waving over her proud citadel, how many times have I said to myself that that flag represented the defeat of my countrymen, my ancestors, but at the same time recalled the thought that it was the flag of the most precious to the human race, the flag of liberty.

A NOBLE SENTIMENT.  
The hon. gentleman then proceeded to speak of the insults that have been recently hurled at the French race as individuals as well as nationally:—

Mr. Laurier said, "I admit that we retain our language, our religion, and our characteristics, but I cannot see the justice of the reproach, and more, it seems to me that we would not have been worthy of any esteem or of the name of French Canadians if we had not kept sacred the memories of our forefathers; so, I repeat, I love England; I honor and esteem English institutions; I do not regret that we are now subjects of the Queen instead of France; but may my right hand wither by my side if the memories of my forefathers ever cease to be dear to my heart. It has been said also that English privileges and liberties have been encroached upon. That we want to put forward our own institutions and our language. I do not admit that reproach. It cannot be said of me that I want to do this and, I suppose, I am one of the greatest sinners; I am said to be anyway by the Tory papers. In answer to this charge I cannot do better than to refer to a speech which I made in the month of May at the Club National in Montreal, a society composed, as you probably know, of students. I spoke of the House of Commons at Ottawa, and of the procedure there, and I spoke as follows:—

"What I have told you will show that though the House of Commons, where there are about 40 French members, is exclusively an English assembly, the French language is the official language as is the English, but it is seldom spoken. The reason of this is that it is impossible to follow the speakers in the debates unless you speak the language of the majority. The remainder of the extract went to show that the French were an artistic people, and the force of circumstances in America was such that the English language was destined to become the most universal."

#### THE CANADIAN PEOPLE.

Mr. Laurier then proceeded to speak in strong terms against race and religious strife. He said:—

"We may not assimilate, we may not blend, but for all that we are the component parts of the same country. We may be French in our origin—and I do not deny my origin—I admit that I pride myself in it. We may be English, or Scotch, or whatever it may be, but we are Canadians; one in aim and purpose; and not only Canadians, but we are also members of the same British Empire. This fact, that we are all Canadians, one in our objects, members of the British Empire, proud of being British subjects and Canadians, is evidence that we can keep rid of race without any detriment to the nation. As Canadians, we have feelings in common with each other that are not shared by our fellow-countrymen on the other side of the water. As Canadians, we are affected by local and national considerations, which bind us together and so we are led to look back to the land of our ancestors and feel, with all that, to be no less good Canadians. These are the feelings of the race to which I belong, and on this question I am true to my race, I am true to Canada, I am true to England, and last, and for this I have often been reproached with being a traitor, I am above all true to the cause of liberty and justice.

#### THE STUDENT OF PRECEDENT.

Having said that he was French in race and instinct, Mr. Laurier proceeded to say that he was next an English Liberal, and more than this, that his principles were the outcome of the study of the history of England. He said:—

I belong to the school of those men who fill the pages of English history, who always faced the great to get the right. I belong to the school of Hampden, and Pym, of Russell and Somers, and of Burke. And of one who did not hesitate, we read, on one occasion to say to the Ministers of the Crown that they had not behaved as they should have towards the Colonies which were then in rebellion, and to say that they had provoked that rebellion, just as the Ministers at another time since have provoked a rebellion. I am not a traitor, but I say that no government shall ever trample over my living body. As long as I have the breath of life in me, as long especially as I have a seat in Parliament, it is the rights of any are trampled upon, be they French, Celtic or Anglo-Saxon, I would defend their cause with all the strength of my being. I am conscious that I could not do this alone; but this I could and I would do, in the face and in defiance of all opposing clamour. I would call upon the people of this country to stand by the oppressed against the oppressor.

#### THE NORTH-WEST REBELLION.

In a few well-timed remarks Mr. Laurier led up to those unhappy events which in the North-West led last year to such deplorable events, and said:—

authority of Her Majesty the Queen. They did not rebel through any feeling of disloyalty to the British Crown or dislike of British institutions. They rebelled without any plan or order of proceeding. The reason they rebelled is simple enough, and the reason is this: that the menest worn that crawls upon the earth, when trampled upon, will endeavor to recoil and strike back; and I say that the guilt of the rebellion does not rest with those who provoked them, but with those who provoked them. I say that the Government is responsible for it. I charge this against the Government, and I will endeavor, I think I will not fail, to prove that the Half-breeds were denied for several long years rights and justice, rights which were admitted as soon as they were asked by bullets. I charge against them that they have treated the Half-breeds with contempt, with undignified disdain; I charge against them that they will not listen to their prayers; I charge against them that they drove them to despair, that they drove them to the madness, to the rashness, to the crime which they afterwards committed. I have no doubt there are parties here who believe this language is too strong. I repeat the charge gentlemen, and I put myself altogether in your judgment. You will admit with me that one of the most precious gifts which we enjoy under the constitution is the right of petition. It has always been one of the undoubted privileges of the realm of England that whenever one of Her Majesty's subjects deems himself aggrieved in any particular he has the right to approach the throne, to petition the sovereign, and to explain his grievances whatever they may be. The Half-breeds availed themselves of that right. For seven long years they sent into Ottawa petitions, memorials, representations of every kind, setting forth their grievances. For seven long years they never received anything like an answer. But now to-day we are told by the government and by the friends of the Government that the Half-breeds had really no grievances; that though they petitioned they petitioned for frivolous objects. They commenced by denying that there were any petitions. Mr. Chapleau some time ago wrote a letter saying that the Half-breeds had never made any representations; that if there had been any representations they would have been listened to. At the very moment when Mr. Chapleau was writing that letter, there was evidence in the Blue Books that seventy different communications had, during a period of seven years, been sent by Half-breeds to Ottawa. But now they cannot stand upon that ground. They cannot now deny that petitions were sent. But now they say that representations were made but that they were frivolous. Frivolous! Perhaps, indeed, to the Government, who every day were distributing thousands and thousands of acres of more valuable land to their minions and friends, the grievance of the poor Half-breed who was asking for his pet-y patch of land was a frivolous grievance. But to the Half-breed that was his all. And, sir, let the grievances of these men have been ever so frivolous, they had a right to an answer. And the moment that, petitioning as they did, they received no answer, that moment, even if their grievances had been frivolous, they became real. And I say now, what excuse can be given for that conduct? For seven long years the Half-breeds petitioned and never received an answer. At last they received an answer. As last a promise was made, made to a delegation sent in 1853; but as I shall show you hereafter, that promise was broken; the word pledged by the Government was violated. It is to be wondered at that the heirs of these men become embittered; that they had faith in the Government; that they had faith in the conclusion that for them, at Ottawa, there was no justice and no hope; and that at last they resorted to the last argument, which is always resorted to by men who have exhausted every other means of getting justice. But some will perhaps say, "Oh, but those who speak on behalf of the Half-breeds are carried away by their feelings; they do not represent facts; they exaggerated the faults of the Government. I say that in this rather the state of things disclosed by the petitions is even worse than I have yet made out. I charge this against the government, that not only did they refuse to answer the prayers that were sent them by these people, but I charge against the Government that they actually concealed the true state of facts, the petitions that were sent to them; that they actually concealed that from the public at large, and from the representatives of the people at Ottawa. This is a strong charge to make, and I deliberately charge against the Government that they concealed information upon that subject for several years. And again, in regard to this statement, I place myself upon your judgment."

#### THE TEST.

Mr. Laurier then read from the journals of Parliament to prove that the present opposition had again and again endeavored through Mr. Blake to obtain papers bearing on the condition of the Half-breeds, but that the orders of the House were not obeyed.

Two sessions elapsed before the order of the House was complied with, before the papers ordered were produced. What had we displayed before us here? I put it to the intelligence and fairness of every man not biased by party prejudice. Was it apologetic negligence or wilful concealment of information? If it was not apologetic negligence or wilful concealment of information, what was it? And whether it was one or the other; whether it was neglect or wilful concealment, I say it was criminal. If my language is deemed too strong, let Ministers themselves explain. Let them say what qualification is to be given to their conduct. That is not all. Those papers produced on the 5th of May, 1853, after the rebellion had broken out, were not produced spontaneously by the Government. They were wrung from the Government by the persistence of Mr. Blake. After the rebellion had broken out there was a general cry

for information. Every man wanted to know who were the Half-breeds and what they complained of. Mr. Blake made himself the voice of the public upon this occasion. Day after day, after the news of the Duck Lake fight had come to us, Mr. Blake stood up asking the Government to bring down those papers for which he had asked two years before, and all other papers that would throw light upon the subject. Day after day it was refused. It was only by dint of great perseverance that the Government was actually induced to bring down some papers, not all. We know now that some of the most important papers have been suppressed and never brought down to the House. "What were the grievances of the Half-breeds?" "What had they to complain of?" "What were they asking for?" Simply this. They were asking to be treated in the same manner that the Half-breeds of Manitoba had been treated and nothing more and nothing less. The Half-breeds of Manitoba had been given titles for the lands which they occupied. The Half-breeds of the North-West demanded the same thing. The Half-breeds of Manitoba had been given a special grant of land for what we call the extinguishment of the Indian title; the Half-breeds of the North-West demanded the same thing. And not only did they demand these things, but the white settlers demanded it for them, the North-West Council demanded it for them, and it was refused. It was for seven long years refused. It was granted, when the Half-breeds had made their demand with their guns in their hands. Then, for the first time, the Government complied with their demand.

#### NORTH-WEST EVICTIONS.

You have heard the statement made by Ministers of the Crown, by members of Parliament and by the press, that not one single Half-breed has ever been ousted from his land. Ministers have made the statement; members of Parliament have repeated it; the press has repeated it until it has become a stock phrase in Tory literature. Well, I can understand members of Parliament and the press repeating the statement. They accept the assertions of the Ministers. But as to the Ministers making that assertion I am sure I cannot understand it, unless in trying to convince others they have convinced themselves. You have, perhaps, heard of the story of the Frenchman who wanted to play a joke on a friend. It was in Marseilles, and he said—"If you go to the harbor you will find a whale." The friend disbelieved him at first, but finally went to the harbor, telling people whom he met, until quite a large crowd was gathered to see the whale in the harbor. The joker who started the story after all there is something in it. "I will go and see if there isn't a whale in the harbor." (Applause and laughter.) When I read the speeches of Mr. Thomas White, Mr. Thompson and Mr. Fester, telling the people of this country that not one single Half-breed had been dispossessed of his land, I often think of that story. I think that in trying to convince other people they have convinced themselves. They are very cunning. They say, "We challenge the Opposition to show that a Half-breed has been dispossessed. They have confidence in the fact that it is their privilege to say what papers shall be brought down, and what shall be concealed. But I accept the challenge to prove that a Half-breed has ever been dispossessed of his land. Messrs as they have made the Blue Book, there is enough to show that the assertion is true; that not only were more than one Half-breed dispossessed, but that upon the policy which was adopted by the Government the whole population was liable to be evicted one by one. This is the charge that I make. Now you have often heard the ministers say that not one Half-breed was dispossessed. Let me at once call your attention to the following extract from a letter written by Father Andre to the North-West Council in June, 1851:—

"I beg of your indulgence to be obliged to make you acquainted with a grievance of mine, which, however, will give you an idea of the state of things calling for a prompt remedy. I hold at Duck Lake a tract of land of about 200 acres, of which I have been in peaceful possession for over seven years. The land was fenced in, and cost me a good deal of money, and was always respected as the Catholic missions' property at Duck Lake. I was one of the first settlers at that place, and through my exertions the settlement increased rapidly, and nobody ever troubled me in my lawful possession of that land until last March, when a man by the name of J. Kelly jumped my claim, and notwithstanding my protestations claimed the land as his own, and put the frame of a house upon it, depriving me in that manner of half my property. And this is not the only occurrence of the kind at Duck Lake."

Now, gentlemen, that may have been an ordinary case of trespass, such as might happen in any country, and there would have been nothing more to say; but I say this, and this is what I can prove, that this trespass was made upon a state of things sided by a Government, and which Government never redressed, having often been applied to.

#### SACRED REBELLION.

The hon. gentleman then reviewed at great length the Northwest troubles, and in justification of the efforts of Riel and Dumont, referred to history and concluded a magnificent speech with the following peroration:—

Before I proceed any further let me quote the language which was spoken upon one occasion by the great Earl of Chatham, the greatest man of his day, the man who first started England in the 18th century in that career of victory and glory which she has been following ever since. Let me tell you what he once said. The American colonies to the south of us were then in open rebellion, fighting the British Government. Lord Chatham, old and feeble, came to the House of Lords one day, upbraided the ministers for being the cause of that rebellion, telling them that they had no right to tax people that were not represented in the

British Parliament; that it was an act of tyranny on their part. He said, "If I were an American, as I am an Englishman, while a foreign troop remained in the country I never would lay down my arms! Never! Never! Never!" If the editors of the good loyal Tory newspapers of Ontario had been living in that day what would they have said of that remark of Lord Chatham's? For my part, gentlemen, I am a loyal subject—(loud applause)—but I have the courage of my convictions—(renewed applause)—whether they are right or wrong. I believe those men were goaded to revolution; but when they rebelled they committed a crime against the peace. I was not born on the banks of the Saskatchewan, but on those of the St. Lawrence, and when the rebellion broke out to my Sovereign and I knew my rights as a citizen and my duties as a subject of Her Majesty. When the volunteers were called out, the Government for the first time in this whole matter did its duty. The rebellion had broken out and had to be suppressed. The Government had to be sustained. I sustained it.

#### THE LIBERAL PARTY.

As a party offered no opposition to the Government in this matter until the back of the rebellion had been broken and all danger was passed. Then, when the law had been vindicated, came the time to arraign the Government, and I took another step also. I say it was my view and not that of the whole Liberal party. It was a matter upon which everyone took his own side, and my view was that since the rebellion had been provoked clemency should have followed in the steps of victory. This is the course which I took. It is not the unanimous course of the Liberal party on this question. Every man according to his own conscience, and I acted according to my own conscience. Sir, convinced as I am that these men were in the right; that they were defending their just rights; that they had been driven to crime by the Government, I again expressed my convictions upon that subject in as strong language as was at my command. I knew that I had been the cause of scandal to the numerous tribe of Tory editors who have lashed their brains most unmercifully in order to bring against me some grand sentence of scorn and indignation. My native land is not only the Province of Quebec, where I was born, but it extends all over the portions of this continent covered by the British flag. My kind are not only those in whose veins flow the blood that flows in my veins. My kind are all those of whatever race or creed who on this continent live under the protection of the British flag, and you will certainly all agree with me that it is the purpose of God that all races who are covered by the British flag shall be equal before the law, and when we find a Government ill-treating a poor people, simply because they are poor and ignorant, we resent it. When we find them violating that it behoves us to freely fight for it with all the means that the constitution places at our hands.

#### FR. J. SPEECH IN IRELAND.

DEMANDED BY THE PROTESTANT HOME RULE ASSOCIATION—CHURCHILL'S CRITIC OF POSITIONS.

DUBLIN, Dec. 13.—The Protestant Home Rule Association of this city had a meeting to-day and adopted a resolution in favor of Fr. J. speech, open air meetings and fair play to Catholics. Magistrate Clarke in a speech said Lord Randolph Churchill had no faith in the Conservatives, yet he had not the courage to leave them, believing it better to reign in hell than to serve in heaven.

#### THE GERMAN ARMY BILL.

THE COMMITTEE CONCLUDE CONSIDERATION OF IT—THE PRUSSIAN MINISTER MAKES ANOTHER SPEECH.

BERLIN, Dec. 13.—The committee on the new military bill have concluded to a general debate on the measure. It was decided to allow the bill to be read the first, at second time, and then to discuss the clauses separately. At the meeting to-day the War Minister declared that any statement from the Imperial Government referring to the country's foreign relations could only be made known in a responsible form in a public sitting of the Reichstag. The Imperial Chancellor himself, if he were present at the sitting of the committee, would refrain from explaining in detail Germany's relations with other powers. The Government's possible action could not be revealed without prejudice to the German policy of peace, and the situation was not yet sufficiently ripe to be debated publicly. If the motives which led the Government to declare urgency for the measure failed to satisfy the committee, Prince Bismarck could disclose nothing more because he saw that further information might injure the interests of Germany. The *North German Gazette* refutes the assertion of the *Tagblatt* and other papers that the demand for additional army credits constitutes an admission that German interests are affected by the Bulgarian crisis. The demand, the *Gazette* says, simply means the German army, in comparison with the forces of other powers, has become unmercifully weak.

#### A FRENCHMAN'S FEAT.

HE TRIES TO WALK ACROSS NIAGARA RIVER IN A PAIR OF SHOES OF HIS OWN INVENTION.

NIAGARA FALLS, Dec. 13.—Alphonso King, a young Frenchman, recently accepted a bet of \$3,000 that he could not walk across the Niagara river, a distance of 100 feet in a pair of shoes of his own invention. On Saturday, accompanied by a few friends, he went down to the ferry landing and prepared for the trip. The shoes used are shaped like a fish and are thirty-two inches long by eight inches wide. They are provided on the bottom with paddles, which are made so as to make a smooth surface when the feet are pushed forward. Three men in a boat went along to assist King by the whirlpools. King

moved along all right for a third of the way when he struck a swift current and was thrown forward on his face. Those who witnessed the feat are of opinion that the shoes could be made practically in ordinary waters.

#### THE WALLS OF JERUSALEM.

INTERESTING DISCOVERY MADE IN BREAKING GROUND FOR A HOTEL AT JERUSALEM.

It is to Sir Charles Warren, the present First Commissioner of Police, who, as Captain Warren, acted for the Palestine Exploration Fund, that we owe our first glimpses of "Underground Jerusalem." He told us in exact figures of the great depth of rubbish which had gathered in the valleys, and which, in spite of the filling up, are still visible in the ancient city. The work of Sir C. Warren cleared up some points that were formerly doubtful, but much remains of work. There are many problems regarding the topography which can not be solved until excavations are made. The points requiring light to be thrown upon are the exact positions of the walls and the Holy Sepulchre.

The questions have not only a historical and archaeological interest, but the whole world has naturally a deep anxiety to know the exact truth regarding them. Present excavations can be carried on; the Prince refuses all applications for permission to explore where digging might at present be done, and it is only when the foundations of a house require the clearing away of the ground that chance brings something to light. Such a chance lately taken place. A new hotel had to be built near the Jaffa gate—this was the Mediterranean Hotel, which, as visitors to Jerusalem will remember, formerly stood not far from the Damascus gate. The spot where this took place may be described in the words of the account which has come home—it is "at the head of David street," not named directly from the Royal Palace, but from the Tower of David, which stands at the end of it. Here, in clearing out the foundations, old walls, canals and cisterns were laid bare; but the most important discovery was made in a depth of fifty feet. Here was found the remains of an old wall, which is supposed to have been one of the ancient city walls, and almost all the authorities are agreed it is the "second wall" of Josephus, which has been so long sought for. About thirty yards of this wall were uncovered. Two courses, and in places three courses, of the stones remain in position. These stones are large and similar to those in the Tower of David. The line of the wall begins directly opposite the tower and runs to the north, trending slightly to the west. So far it follows a line parallel to the present wall running from the Jaffa Gate to the north-west corner of the city. The interest attaching to this wall is peculiar.

A great many people believe that the Holy Sepulchre does not stand on the site where it is now, but that it was never there at all, which has been proved in the Garden of Joseph of Arimathea. Dr. Robinson was not the first to express such a view on this subject, but he has done so largely on it in his work on Jerusalem; Captain Conder before for Gophers, and Col. Conder, the round mound "David's Gate" outside of the Damascus Gate, General Gordon, who lived some months in Jerusalem immediately before going to Khartoum, and David's time exclusively to the story of this subject, who accepted the knob of rock at the Damascus Gate as the most probable position. The connection existing between the Holy Sepulchre and the second wall comes about in this way: The excavation took place "without the gate." Now the second wall is supposed to be as old as the time of Hezekiah, and his existence at the time of the Saviour's sojourn on earth is not doubted. The Holy Sepulchre is at present in the very middle of the city. The city may have grown round it in eighteen centuries, but if this second wall could be traced so as to inclose the spot within its circuit it specially excited anxiety would be at once destroyed. The most sacred shrine of the Christian church would be looked upon as a delusion, as only a fight for an empty nutshell. This will show the interest which attaches to the few feet of ancient masonry which have been discovered at the head of "David street" in Jerusalem. The thirty yards of wall are not enough to decide the point; it would require, perhaps, to be traced one hundred yards further to know whether it went off to the west and included the Holy Sepulchre, or turns to the east so as to leave the shrine "without the Gate." A continued exploration is impossible, as the space is all built over to the north. Under these houses lies the secret which has such interest and importance. There for the present it must remain, and we must wait till the time comes when some other houses has to be rebuilt, and the digging of the foundations may give us another glimpse of the significant wall.—*London Daily News.*

#### THE POWER OF A TON OF COAL.

How many of the general public have any idea of what a ton of coal will yield at the gasworks, while, burned in the usual pattern of domestic grates, the principal products are smoke and dust? It will yield 10,000 cubic feet of gas, 1,500 lb of coke, 20 gallons of ammoniac water (valuable manure) and 140 lb of tar. The tar, when destructively distilled, will yield, in round numbers, 60 lb of pitch, 1 lb creosote, 14 lb of heavy oil, 6 lb of naphthalene, 5 lb of naphthalin, 2 lb of naphtha, 2 lb of alizarin, and 1 lb of aurine (valuable dye), besides phenol (carbolic acid), benzol, aniline, toluimide, anthracene, and toluene (from which the new sweetened saccharin is made). When coal is burned in domestic stoves, the ammonia, the tar, and its valuable derivatives, are completely lost. Should not such a fact hasten the general use of gas stoves, and of coke, where fire is absolutely necessary?