different from dying of *mere old age*; and for practical purposes, it is most material to draw the distinction.

If no evidence exist to show that *wild* plants suffer from mere old age, we cannot admit such a property to be incident to those which are cultivated. It would indeed be a waste of space to dwell further upon this part of the argument.

What are called facts, the real value of which we shall presently discuss, have been adduced to prove that if plants do not die of old age in a wild state, yet that they incontestably do wear out when artificially multiplied by division. In opposition to this it is sufficient to quote the White Beurre Pears of France, which French writers assure us have been thus propagated from time immemorial and which exhibit *no* trace of debility; or the Jerusalem Artichoke, already named; or the cultivated Vines, of which the very varieties known to the Romans, have been transmitted by perpetual division, but without deterioration or decrepitude, to our own day.

Although we regard the notion that *races of plants wear out*, as utterly baseless and visionary, we are by no means opposed to certain conclusions at which writers adopting that erroneous hypothesis, have arrived. We admit that their statements are in many instances correct. We have nothing to offer in the way of objection to their experiments: it is only against their false reasoning that we are obliged to protest.

Mr. Knight found that diseased apple trees produced diseased discendants, and that the evil of the parents went onwards to their children from generation to generation; and therefore he concluded that the apple trees were dying of old age.

A writer of elaborate articles in the *Morning Herald*, Mr. Townley, infers, because the gooseberry growers of Lancashire, find the weight of their fruit diminishes, "after the varieties have been cultivated some time," that, therefore, these varieties are dying of old age—and he has expended no inconsiderable quantity of learning in attempting to fit this speculation to the Potato. So impressed, indeed, is he with a conviction of its truth, that he recommends people to be sent to Peru, or wherever else the Potato grows wild, in order to get seeds and tubers of vigorous wild plants. And all this is imitated by a shoal of persons who catch up the idea, and forthwith write letters to newspapers, or men in office, or rush into pamphlets, with all the complacency which invariably attends an ignorance of facts, or even of sound principles.

It is very singular that not one of those writers who have of late been fatiguing the public eye, should have perceived that the very few facts on which they rely, are susceptible of a much more simple interpretation than that given by Mr. Knight and caught up by themselves. It is marvellous that they should have imagined that the common sense, (to say anything of the science,) of the intelligent cultivators of the present day, should accept for truth such an extraordinary exhibition of false reasoning. One would think that all death or disease was exclusively the consequence of old age.

It has been well known from all antiquity that if vigorous children spring from vigorous parents, so also is a diseased and debilitated progeny the sure issue of parents weak in body and mind.

The obvious interpretation of the apple tree and gooseberry bush cases, which have so perplexed the minds of the little patriots of our day, is this: a tree is allowed, from some cause or other, to become unhealthy; a part cut from it and put upon another tree, carries its disease with it; when again divided, the disease is again propagated; and this will go on so long as the unhealthy plants remain exposed to the circumstances which originally caused their bad health. But, change those circumstances—keep off the cause of the evil, and the evil will gradually disappear, as has actually happened in the instances mentioned in our last, which are a conclusive answer to the whole wearing out hypothesis.

These are the just views of Mr. Garden, of Glenae, to which we alluded last week. "We may for a time," says this gentleman, "raise species, of diseased plants, and employ these as the seed (sets) of the next crop. Nothing can be more manifest than that the offspring of diseased parents will participate in their disease, and even be incapable of cure, or of becoming the seed of a healthful crop on any soil. * * It is evident that diseased plants may be more easily cultivated on a healthful and fresh soil than on one which is diseased and run out. * * But the *abundance and healthfulness* of the crop are two very different things. It is well ascertained that seed potatoes (sets) taken from fields where potatoes have been seldom cultivated, are less liable to fail than those raised on fields which have produced *many* potatoe crops. The latter *forced* in diseased or exhausted fields, are unfit for seeds (sets) in any situation."

Nothing can be more true. The health of the potatoe crop is not with any certainty to be increased by raising new varieties from seeds. The result of that operation may be better or worse, according to the health or constitutional peculiarity of the individual from which the seeds were gathered, or according to the way in which those mysterious influences which cause constitutional difference operate while the young seedling is passing through the processes of organization. We all know that some seedlings are tall, others dwarf, some early, others late, some robust, others delicate, some extraordinarily rich in starch, others defficient in that product; and we can never tell beforehand, with any certainty, what peculiarities a given seedling will possess. The idea, therefore, of renovating the potato crops of Europe by raising them from seed, is a dream. What is really wanted, and what *must* be better attended to, is the renovation of the crop by a skilful cultivation of the potatoes we already have.

What we, then, would advise potato growers to do, is not to indulge in a vain hope that seedling potatoes will be any better than what they now have; but to adopt the practice of raising potatoes for sets upon a different principle from those for the table. To treat the latter as they now do, but to grow the former in poor, light land, where there shall be no excessively rapid growth, and no great produce, but yielding small, compact potatoes, thoroughly organized, thoroughly ripened, and therefore thoroughly healthy—will be a guarantee of all the freedom from disease, which in the nature of things is to be expected, and a far more rational means of renovating the potato crop than running to Peru for seed not half so good as our own. —*English Paper.*

CORN LAWS.

We copy the following from a late number of the *Mark Lane Express.* The propositions advanced are worthy of attention, though we do not subscribe to all of them.

It is not true that cheapness and abundance are synonymous terms.

It is not true that high prices signify scarcity.

It is true that in England the price of agricultural produce and labour is higher than in other countries generally.

It is true also that all other countries differ more or less one from another in respect to the price of agricultural produce.

It is not true that where the price is lowest there is the least approach of famine.

It is nearer the truth that where the price is the highest, on an average, their is the least danger of famine, especially when that higher price, as in England, results from the attainment and possession of greater wealth.

It is not true that *that* higher price *has been* produced by the "restrictive" system pursued against the importation of foreign products.

It is true, nevertheless, that the removal of all "protection" would destroy that higher price.

That higher price is the consequence of the advanced condition of the country and its greater comparative wealth.

That wealth is now represented by a sound and abundant circulating medium, and therefore will be stable and durable.