

toes, a few turnips, but very few man-golds; a moderate supply of peas, beans and barley, or soaked Indian corn may be added, also clover and green beans in the pods.

Nothing comes amiss to the sow. The great point is to give a variety, and not too much of one sort, especially roots. But after parturition roots may be more liberally given, especially cabbage in conjunction with other food, but immediately after parturition the diet should be sparing and cooling. In cold weather warmth and shelter are indispensable. Never allow a pig to bury itself in stable manure or catch cold by sleeping on the cold ground. For fattening pigs nothing beats one-third pea meal and two-thirds barley meal; if mixed with skimmed milk, steamed roots and potatoes they grow and fatten very fast. He fattened 200 pigs one season without losing any by disease. To promote ventilation they were all placed on sparred floors, and in hot weather they were treated daily with a shower-bath, which kept them very clean. He put straw on the floors in cold weather, and he says that pigs pay in manure better than most other animals. They should have salt and plenty of pure water.

#### Does Drunkenness Excuse Murder?

Murder trials of late have given rise to a variety of rules of law with regard to insanity produced either by intense passion, personal wrong or intoxication, securing the accused an acquittal outright or immunity from punishment for the commission of murder for which otherwise there exists no sort of palliation.

The Kentucky Court of Appeals has departed somewhat from the recently beaten track, and declared that drunkenness is no excuse for the commission of murder or any other crime. A case was recently tried in the Jefferson county Circuit Court, in which one Mathew Shonnahan was convicted for killing C. W. Montgomery, while in a state of intoxication. Shonnahan's counsel took the case to the Court of Appeals, on the grounds that the fact of defendant being intoxicated at the time should have been regarded as a palliatory circumstance, reducing the grade of the crime to manslaughter. The Court laid down the law as follows:

"But it seems to us that no man, unless he is so wanting in intellect as to make him irresponsible for his acts, would be so reckless of his own security as to announce his attention of becoming intoxicated so as to enable him to take human life or inflict punishment upon his enemy; but on the contrary men of violent passions and wicked designs would avail themselves of this very principle of law by becoming drunk in order to take the lives of their fellow men, with the consciousness, on the part of the offender, that his drunkenness would be the mitigating feature of his case. The recognition of such a rule of law is but an invitation to men of reckless habits to commit crimes; and while their punishment is by incarceration only in the State prison for a few years, the sober man, whose cause of revenge, and the desire to take human life therefor, is kept within his own breast, for the commission of a like offense, is made to suffer death. There is no reason or philosophy in a law that would hang the sober man for murder, and lessen the punishment of the man intoxicated for the same offense, because the latter had voluntarily placed himself in a condition by which he is induced to take human life.

"If one is insane, and while in that condition commits an offense, he is not responsible, from the reason that he is not enabled to know right from wrong; and if he kills he does not know that to take human life is wrong; or, as has been held, in cases of moral insanity, when, from the existence of some of the natural propensities in such violence, it is impossible not to yield to them. But voluntary drunkenness, that merely excites the passions and stimulates men to the commission of crime, in a case of homicide by one in such a condition, without any provocation, neither excuses the offense nor mitigates the punishment."—*Cleveland Plain Dealer*.

#### Could We Cope With Spain at Sea?

This is a fair question, and one that implies no disrespect to our own naval administration, or lack of confidence in our own elasticity. But it is well to consider, before going into a fight, the size and weight of one's antagonist, and even if one is certain that he can eventually floor him, to be careful and ward off all blows intended to be damaging. We need a fleet at Havana to protect American citizens. Good. Suppose that hostilities should break out and we should need a fleet of observation along our own coast? And suppose that we should find it rather difficult to concentrate, were it necessary, even the scanty naval force we are credited with?

The Spanish navy is admirably organized. The number of men inscribed on the naval conscription lists in 1870 was 66,000, all between eighteen and thirty years of age. The naval districts of Spain, &c., the districts from which sailors are conscripted,

are entirely among coast and seafaring populations. There were in active service in 1870, 7,354 sailors and 5,800 "marines" commanded by 1,100 officers. The navy ready for action at the end of the last year consisted of seventy-three screw steamers, carrying 734 guns, and thirteen sailing vessels, carrying 202 guns. Seven of the Spanish iron clads are of the staunchest English build. The *Victoria*, the *Numancia*, the *Arapiles*, are very famous in European waters.

At about the same time that these facts concerning the Spanish navy were published the Government of the United States announced that its naval force, "effective for immediate service," was 43 vessels, mounting 356 guns. The whole number of vessels was as follows: 46 iron clads, 96 steamers and 32 sailing vessels, in all mounting 1,386 guns, but actually ready only 356 guns. The forces at the immediate command of Spain certainly seem quite formidable as those with which we should undertake to maintain the dignity of the United States. But it would take quite an Armada to vanquish even the navy we possess to-day, for hearts of oak are in our men as well as our ships, and those men are

"Ready, boys, ready—  
To fight and conquer again and again."

—*Ec.*

#### MILITARY USURPATION.

That the second occupation of Chicago by United States troops, which took place on October 20th, was wholly unauthorized and even continued against the protest of the state authorities is shown by the message of Gov. Palmer to the Illinois legislature. Gen. Sheridan had no authority for his action but the request of some private citizens and the consent of Gen. Sherman. Upon the protest of the governor, the President referred the matter to Gen. Sheridan as judge, although the latter was certainly unqualified to act in that capacity, both as a party to the controversy and as without the slightest authority in the State of Illinois.

Since the reception of the message by the Illinois legislature, two resolutions approving the action of the governor have been introduced into the lower house, and have been referred to a committee. One of these resolutions was moved by a republican, the other by a democrat, and it is hopefully presaged from this that the committee, regardless of political feeling, will favorably report one of these resolutions, that it will be triumphantly passed by the legislature, the governor's position supported, and Grant and Sheridan sharply rebuked for their interference.

Gov. Palmer observes that the President and Gens. Sherman and Sheridan evidently believe it a part of the duty of the United States to superintend the administration of local governments, and at their dictation to use the army for the protection of citizens. The idea that military power is superior to the laws and constitutions of states is growing dangerous, and the precedent established in the case of Chicago, if allowed to go unrebuked, will serve to increase the evil.

It would seem that this should be clear to all sensible men, but it is not, for the press and the people quite generally, prejudiced by the eminent services rendered by the army during the civil war, are unable to reason calmly, and the result is an almost universal disapproval of the course pursued by Governor Palmer—whom we do not believe to be instigated by jealousy, but by a patriotic zeal to prevent the encroachments of military power. His position is a strong and a wise one. All honor to the fearless and faithful governor of Illinois!—*Albany Evening Times*.

#### BIBLE REVISION.

We mentioned last week the first meeting of the American committee on the revision of the Holy Scriptures. These gentlemen were invited by Rev. Dr. Schaff, at the suggestion of the English revisers, that there might be a concurrence of biblical scholars in America and Britain in this work. The following is a list of those who have been invited to engage in this, and who have accepted the invitation:

##### I.—ON THE OLD TESTAMENT.

Rev. Thos. J. Conant, D. D., Brooklyn, N. Y.; Prof. Geo. E. Day, D. D., New Haven, Ct.; Prof. John DeWitt, D. D., New Brunswick, N. J.; Prof. William Henry Green, D. D., Princeton, N. J.; Prof. George Emlin Hare, D. D., Philadelphia, Pa.; Prof. Charles P. Krauth, D. D., Philadelphia, Pa.; Prof. J. Packard, D. D., Fairfax, Va.; Prof. Calvin Stowe, D. D., Hartford, Ct.; Prof. James Strong, D. D., Madison, N. J.; Rev. C. V. A. Van Dyck, D. D., Beirut, Syria (not yet heard

from); Prof. Taylor Lewis, LL. D., Schenectady, N. Y.

##### II.—ON THE NEW TESTAMENT.

Ezra Abbot, LL. D., Cambridge, Mass.; Prof. H. B. Hackett, D. D., Rochester, N. Y.; Prof. James Hadley, LL. D., New Haven, Ct.; Prof. Charles Hodge, D. D., Princeton, N. J.; Prof. Matthew B. Riddle, D. D., Hartford, Ct.; Prof. Phillip Schaff, D. D., New York; Prof. Charles Short, LL. D., New York; Prof. J. Henry Thayer, D. D., Andover, Mass.; Rev. Edward A. Washburn, D. D., New York; Rev. Theodore D. Woolsey, D. D., LL. D., New Haven, Ct.

A draft of a constitution for the American committee has been adopted. The British companies will submit to the American companies, from time to time, such portions of their work as have passed the first revision, and the American companies will transmit their criticisms and suggestions to the British companies before the second revision. A joint meeting of the American and British companies will be held, if possible, in London, before final action.—*N. Y. Observer*.

#### ENGLISH VIEW OF MORMONISM.

POLYGAMY SANCTIONED IN THE BRITISH EMPIRE.

"Monadnock," the London correspondent of the *New York Times*, writes to that journal upon the subject of Mormonism and the light in which it is regarded in England, as follows:

There is a certain amount of curiosity here in the higher classes, and stronger interest in the lower class, from which the Mormons have been largely drawn; but English notions on the marriage question are rather loose. In the first place more than half the population of the British Empire live under laws which sanction polygamy, and people do not see why you should not be as tolerant in Utah as they are in India. Then it really does look a little like persecution, and the practice of packing juries, as was formerly the custom in Ireland, where no Roman Catholic was allowed to sit on one, is not now approved. A man must be tried by a jury of his peers, and how can a man with only one wife be considered the peer of a man with a dozen? There is no equality about it. Bigamy, and so on, is so common an offense in England that it is little considered and lightly punished. If the other wife, or wives, consent to the arrangement, there can be no conviction, or only a nominal punishment. Here the offended wife must prosecute. If she refuses, there is no case for a jury. So long as the ladies are agreed, a man could have as many wives here as in Turkey—and, by the way, what does the Turkish Ambassador think of these prosecutions? Some of the ladies of my acquaintance are very charitable to the Mormons. Some, I must say, are rather venomous, but as persecutions strengthen whatever people really believe in, false or true, it seems a pity to give Mormonism such a tonic, or have the old tragedy of the Albigenes repeated in the mountains of Utah. It was an experiment and might have failed and died out of itself. It is quite possible that persecution, even to fire and blood, may give it longer life. The Mormons of every stripe I have seen are fanatics, and fanatics will generally fight. If I am not greatly mistaken, you are far from having seen the last of it. When the New York Ring, and political corruption, generally, is done for, it will be time enough to deal with Brigham Young and his parody on the Patriarch in the Rocky Mountains.

#### A CORDIAL WELCOME TO IMMIGRANTS.

The value of the foreign element in our population is not well understood. It is the common belief that immigrants bring with them nothing; that they leave home because they have failed to earn a subsistence there, and hope to gain a competence in this land, which they have been told flows with "milk and honey." The conclusions in this regard are all wrong. A very large proportion of our immigrant population are skilled laborers. Deducting the women and children, who pursue no occupation, about forty-six per cent. of the whole immigration have been trained to various pursuits. Nearly half of these are skilled laborers and workmen who have acquired their trades under the rigorous system which prevails in the Old World, and come here to give us the benefit of their

training and skill without re-payment of the cost of such education. Nor are the farm laborers and servants destitute of the necessary training to fit them for their several duties, while those classed as common or unskilled laborers are well qualified to perform the labor required, especially in the construction of works of internal improvement. Nearly ten per cent. consists of merchants and traders, who doubtless bring with them considerable capital, as well as mercantile experience, while the smaller number of professional men and artists, embracing architects, engineers, inventors, men of thorough training and a high order of talent, contribute to our widely extended community not only material, but artistic, esthetic, intellectual, and moral wealth.

With regard to the ages of these immigrants, only 25 per cent. are under 15 years of age, and less than 15 per cent. over 40, leaving upwards of 60 per cent. who are in the prime of life at the time of their arrival, ready to enter at once into their several industrial pursuits. As to the proportion which subsists between the two sexes, it appears that, as might have been expected, the number of the males largely preponderates over the females. This proportion varies with the different nationalities, the females constituting, as has been stated, with the Chinese only 7 per cent, while of the Irish it is over 45 per cent, and of the whole number about 40 per cent.

Recurring to the money value of an immigrant, it may be stated that the sum of \$1,000 has usually been regarded as the average worth of each permanent addition to our population, an amount somewhat too large, but yet an approximation to the true value. Mr. Kapp, one of the Commissioners of Emigration of the State of New York, who has given much consideration to the subject now under review, assumes the average value to be \$1,125.

The opposition of partisans to the influx of immigrants is the height of folly. We need them for the development of our immense territory, and the man or party which throws an obstacle in the way of their coming, is an enemy to the prosperity of the nation.

—*N. Y. Star*.

#### Addendum to Wendell Phillips on Courts.

We will add to Mr. Phillips's illustration of the working of the witness-bullying practice in our courts, an incident which came under our own cognizance. A lady applied for a divorce, basing her claims on a course of drunkenness and ill-treatment on her husband's part, extending over many years. The preliminary steps were taken, and with the mass of evidence which she could present there was no question of her petition being granted, but two of her daughters, who had just arrived at early womanhood, had been notified to appear for the defence; and the wife and mother, happening to be in the court when a female witness whose reputation she knew to be spotless was being tortured and having her character blackened by the brutal and shameless (and unchecked) questioning of a "gentleman" of the bar, at once withdrew her suit, declaring that she would rather suffer all her life than have her daughters compelled to submit to such infamous treatment.

This witness-bullying is for the jury, not the bench; and it is successful in exact proportion as the witness is timid and of good reputation. The woman whose reputation is lost cares nothing for a lawyer's insinuations or open assertions that she is not an estimable character; it is the virtuous woman who becomes confused, embarrassed and terrified by the insults of the "legal gentlemen," and who while thus tortured hopelessly muddles a story which, fair, gentlemanly questioning would perhaps have left perfectly clear and straightforward. But the end of the lawyer is gained and the presumed aim of the law is defeated—a witness is punished and a criminal is set free. With a bench of upright judges to decide on the evidence as well as the law, such practices, disgraceful alike to our boasted civilization and to manhood, would be much less frequent; the incentive to them would be gone. Intelligent magistrates would know the relative value of testimony given by a witness when cool as compared with that elicited under the agencies of a "gentlemanly" cross-examination, and would give to each its proper weight, which juries of ignorant blockheads (and such juries are no rarity) are unable to do; and the insulting and bullying of witnesses being of no further use, would in a great measure cease.—*New Hampshire Gazette*.