

eastern pier is also damaged to a certain extent. At Bronte, four miles west of here, the destruction is very serious, the western pier is almost destroyed, and the docks are also damaged. Five fishermen's huts have been washed away and the schooner Lithophore is on the sands and will require to be dug out. The mouth of the harbor is filled with sand and drifted matter, making it impossible for vessels to enter.

THE EFFECTS OF THE GALE.

The gale that for the last two days has swept over the lakes has apparently spent its fury, and as was expected, has left in its trail the usual number of wrecks, though so far there has been no loss of life reported. In this harbor the damage has been confined to the wharves and boat houses, all the vessels having been safe alongside the docks during the worst of it.—*Toronto, 14th.*

There is still good sleighing in the mountains a few miles back of Murray Bay.—*May 15.*

The Saguenay River is reported as still frozen over.—*May 15.*

UNABLE TO GET THROUGH THE ICE.

HALIFAX, N.S., May 13.—A despatch from Port Mulgrove says that the steamer Melrose Abbey yesterday got clear of the ice in which she was drifting since last Saturday, and is now at anchor at that port.

The steamer Carroll, which sailed from this port for Charlottetown on Tuesday, arrived back this evening unable to get through the ice. She got as far as Cranberry Island, beyond Canso. On Wednesday morning the ice was found so heavy it was decided to return.

ONE HUNDRED ICE BOUND VESSELS.

ST. JOHN, N.B., May 18.—The bark Herman, at Newcastle, Miramichi, 17th, reports that there are about one hundred vessels fast in the ice, which is in great abundance around the Magdalens and Bird Rocks. She had a very difficult task to work through from one clear spot to another, and was accompanied by only one vessel bound for Shediac, which had been ten days in the ice.

Singularly dry weather with dry easterly winds in upper and lower St. Lawrence up to 18th May.

April Weather Records.

JACKSON, Miss., April 25.—The latest reports from Monticello put the death list from the cyclone at fifteen, and wounded, thirty, many of whom will die.

AT MACON, GA.

MACON, April 25.—A fearful cyclone struck the lower edge of Bibb county at 8 o'clock Saturday night, passing into Twiggs, Jones and Wilkinson counties, plowing a track 800 yards wide, and mowing down fences, farm buildings, etc. Samuel Grove, father of Samuel F. Grove, ex Republican member of Congress, living one mile from Griswold, was killed. Also Miss Lockhart, near Gordon.

AT SELMA, ALA.

SELMA, April 25.—A disastrous cyclone passed through the southern and eastern portion of Dallas county. About King's Landing three negroes were killed, and at Grave's Ferry two others were killed. Many at the latter place were seriously wounded, houses were unroofed and great damage was done to timber.

AT WILMINGTON, N. C.

WILMINGTON, N. C., April 25.—The tornado here Saturday night crossed the State, almost cutting a line through the timbers. One church, two saw mills, several dwellings, and a large number of other buildings were destroyed. One child was killed and two adults are known to be seriously injured.

CORRESPONDENCE.

"Honest men tell us of our faults. Knaves will not, and fools see neither our faults nor our virtues."

Lehigh, Iowa.

MR. VENNOR, SIR,—I have been watching and reading your precast of the weather in the *Commercial* and find them quite a help to me—a farmer. You have foretold our storms for the winter and spring months correctly. You will find money enclosed for BULLETIN. Respectfully yours,

W. C. GOODRICH.

Lehigh, Iowa.

ED. WEATHER BULLETIN.

Mechanicsburg, Penn.

SIR,—We must have you here at our grand gathering of the "Granges" from eight States, on the 26th of August next. Everyone wants to see you and hear you on the great weather subject, which you are handling in such a correct manner. "What Vennor says," is the only thing that will satisfy the farmers—Do try and come, you will not regret it.

Yours very respectfully,
A FARMER.

[I will endeavor to be present as I have already received a pressing invitation from the Editor of your "Farmers' Review," but should I fail so to arrange, I shall address you through my BULLETIN for September, which we expect to have ready by that date.]

Louisville, Ky., 5th May 9th 1882.

Henry G. Vennor, Esq., Montreal, Canada.

DEAR SIR,—I mailed you two daily papers published here, each one having an article in reference to your weather theory, they are *pro* and *con* articles. There seems to be no foundation in either of them, for the remarks made, they seem to be under the impression that the public requires them to say something or every subject that comes before the public. It would be bad policy to argue on any subject for fear one or the other would be in the wrong, so they are like the two Irishmen, who got shipwrecked and drifted to an unknown island, and after landing and getting a little recuperated, Mike says to Pat: "Do you know what country this is we are in?" Pat says "no, I'm blown if I do, but I'm against its government." And that seems to be one of the reasons which our C. J. gives for opposing your theory. He don't really know anything about it, but is against it because the other paper favors it, for he cannot disguise the fact from himself that your May predictions have been verified in this section, and when we have meteorology reduced to a science we will have less ignorant editorials, and less superstition among our sailors, as Buckle says: "sailors are more superstitious than soldiers because they are dealing with an element they do not understand, as their success depends largely on the condition of the weather; a subject they are in profound ignorance of in regard to its future actions. Whereas the soldier has the earth to deal with, and earthquakes are the only phenomena in that element, and that is so seldom and always forewarns, and it is to be hoped that meteorology will be reduced to a science, so that editors as well as sailors can speak of it in an intelligent manner. I have been taught that the current of wind passes around the left hand side of the cloud, and that the right hand banks of all rivers are the highest, and that the vines in growing around trees all go around the left hand side of the tree, except the rattan, which will occasionally prove an exception to the general run of nature; have also been taught that our clouds make up in our lake regions (western lakes) and pass over our continent down to Vera Cruz, Mexico and empty themselves, and in returning back to the western lakes they form the figure eight in completing the trip across the continent, and that the most violent winds of this continent blow off at Cape Hatteras, and from that point of land projecting out in the sea. And still I know nothing of the future of the weather, but I think nature has laws and fixed laws, for us to learn and study. If we will become acquainted with them we must study them.

Yours,
A. R. S.

J. W. writes us from Toronto as follows:

"*Apropos* of readers. I have heard of one old lady who read your records of the January weather of 1876, all the time believing they were your predictions for 1877, coming down to the day of reading she looked out and saw you were a 'false prophet.' So she threw the book down in sovereign disgust and called you a humbug. This occurred more than 400 miles west of Montreal. It required some skill to show her the error she had fallen into. Hundreds of your critics and commentators, and not a few of your panegyrists will be about as just and rational in their deliverances as my octogenarian friend."

VALUABLE HINTS.

H. G. Vennor, Esq., Montreal.

DEAR SIR,—In my last letter I said that I regarded my charts but as feeble expositors of the course of our weather, and that our changes of temperature were mainly if not exclusively ascribable to the changes of our wind directions. I think no one can glance over my wind letters without detecting this fact. Even in our summer months the rule holds good, as all our gardens too painfully experience in our occasional early June frosts. In fact, in no part of even our warmest summers can the wind blow freshly for 24 hours from the north-west, without bringing on us a dangerous visitation of Arctic temperature.

Early thunder storms, with heavy rains, are very apt to be speedily followed by stormy north west winds; and I think all well marked rain and snow storms have similar sequels. It is not necessary to this conjuncture that the rain or snow fall should come down on our own heads. The precipitation may take place hundreds of miles from us, and yet we must undergo the penalty of the atmospheric disturbance. During the late American civil war, I paid close attention to the reports of rain storms occurring in Virginia and other parts, and I was thereby enabled to account for many spells of cold northerly winds which had not their normal antecedents in Ontario. Not unfrequently I saw a high upper run from northward, whilst below we were in a comparative calm, or had a gentle current from S.W., or some other mild point. During the winter of 1877 I several times realized the same fact and thus was enabled to account for a lower temperature than the direction of our surface wind should have indicated.

Have you a met with many persons who note our upper currents? I have not; and yet it is this we should seek for our *diurnal predictions*, or, as you more justly designate them "*suggestions*." This morning at 9:30 my thermometer was down at 22° yet soft, large-flaked snow began to fall. Our surface wind had been for 36 hours from N.W. to N. by W. My thermometer now at 1 p.m., is only up to 29°, battling against the late depression. The surface wind is from S. but is nearly nil. The snow that has fallen on the plank sidewalks has all melted, though we are 3° below the freezing point. My barometer which had risen from 29.70 yesterday to 29.83 this morning, is now descending. What is your "*suggestion*?" Looking at charts of back years for these dates, we might guess a snaky creep along to a rain fall, to be followed by a COLD DIP by the 23rd to 25th, and it would not be entirely abnormal to have a fog and a thunder-storm. When, however, we run our eyes over the charts for '71, '2, '3, '5, and '7, we are admonished to the advisability of predicting with a safe loop-hole proviso.

I am well aware that I have not been philosophising on the weather or the seasons from the same data that you have been following. I have not had either your opportunities or your courage. I think your plan of regarding extended periods and large alterations, is the right one for your purpose; yet I regard mine as collaterally useful, especially with the view of preventing our committing ourselves closely to dates, or to exactitude in the monthly numbers of cold or mild spells. Why should our weather follow a stereotyped monthly course? Surely if certain rises and dips come around within 4, 5 or even 8 days of the dates in past years, and we should have 3 in some months and but two in others, we may look upon them as fairly in season; and if a thaw duo in January does not set in before February, seeing that such things have occurred before (as witness 1857—almost 1865—do '75 and '77) why should prediction