

When Christ as a Divine Being or as a man divinely commissioned, dies out of the popular faith, what then? Who shall comfort the hearts that mourn? Who shall assure us that virtue has a reward or that there is any such thing as virtue? Who shall stimulate the love of brotherhood or move men to works of benevolence? Who then would strive to raise the world from its beastly degradation?

The history of nations proves that even a religion mixed with error is better than no religion. The question is often asked, "Is history going to repeat itself? Is society approaching a condition analogous to that which existed immediately preceding the downfall of the Roman empire?" Perhaps the words ascribed to Prince Bismarck are true, "Active military regulations are a social as well as a political necessity of the times."

For many years past it has been the custom of German and British writers to refer to France as the most sinful of nations. And from the fact that the French population has increased but little of late years, an inference was made very detrimental to the good reputation of the French people. The statistics that have lately been published in Austria, in Italy, and Great Britain reveal a state of things scarcely better. Amid the pretensions of advancing civilization who will dare to say that the faith of woman or her love of home is as great as it was fifty years ago? The evils of infidelity and unbelief are never so apparent as when their effects are seen in the female character. When home ceases to be attractive to woman and children cease to be considered a blessing, then indeed is society on the high road to ruin. The statistics lately published concerning the death rate in Liverpool is sufficient to lead to reflection. It is said that of three hundred and eighty-four children that died there lately under the age of one year, only sixty-five had been fed at the mother's breast. The other three hundred and nineteen had been fed on artificial food, and worse, still many had been placed under the care of strangers. Is it possible that four-fifths of Liverpool mothers are incapable of nursing their own offspring? Or is it possible that fashion and love of ease, the gay party or the theatre had such allurements that they no longer heeded the wailings of their little ones? Is it possible that hundreds, aye thousands, of women are so infatuated with other pursuits that they will neglect their innocents, and leave them to a lingering death, rather than remain outside the giddy whirl of so-called society?

If the statistics that have been published lately are true, there is certainly less love of home and more of deadly though perhaps not apparent dissipation than at former periods. Modern science and methods of life seem directly tending to the degeneration of the race.

J. H. WARD.

EUROPE, Sept. 2nd, 1889.

Lesson in book-keeping—Never lend them.

THE QUARSELLE CASE.

The prosecution closed in the Quarselle examination last evening. A mass of evidence has been taken which, when boiled down, amounts to this:

Mrs. Quarselle was a subject of epileptic fits. Herself and husband had been to Montpelier on Saturday, August 24th, shopping, as they usually did every Saturday. They returned just before sundown. The husband was not drunk, as reported, but had taken a drink of whisky. The ward Teacher was at the house when they came, and as usual called the family together, and it seems that Mrs. Quarselle had something to tell, but as she talked the Swedish language, which the Teacher did not understand very well, by consent of all the matter was deferred until another time.

The Teacher then left and shortly after—but a few moments—Mrs. Quarselle came from around the house, threw down an empty strychnine bottle and stated that she would soon be dead. Her husband and a young lady twenty years of age, who had lived with them about eight years, were present, but they did not seem to believe it. Almost immediately they all sat down to supper, and after drinking some coffee and eating some food, Mrs. Quarselle exclaimed, "I am getting stiff," and caught the girl Elm by the arm. The girl got frightened and ran to the nearest neighbors, about eighty rods distant. The husband ran after her to bring her back, as he says, to boil some milk and counteract the poison, they then believing she had taken it. The girl was loth to return, and Quarselle took her by the arm to compel her. When about half way back a neighbor met them. A short altercation ensued and the girl went with the neighbor.

Quarselle rapidly returned home. In a few moments he was seen at the well with a dipper, and then excitedly returned to the house. Two boys were unloading wood at not more than a rod from the house. They saw him at the well and spoke to him, but he did not appear to notice them. On the wood being unloaded, which could not have taken but a few minutes, the boys went to the door, which was open all the time, and saw Mrs. Quarselle lying on the floor, dead as they supposed, and Quarselle by her side. The Teacher had not been gone more than half an hour while all this transpired.

The evidence shows that when Mrs. Quarselle had the fits referred to, her husband's treatment was to get cold water, bathe her temples and feet, and rub the latter with a brush. Her right shoe and stocking were off, and the dipper and brush were lying on the floor by the body. The features were all natural, no distended nostrils, swollen tongue or staring eyes, as in deaths by strangulation; yet Quarselle was accused of choking his wife to death. A huise on either side of the larynx, as if made by a hand in grappling the throat, appeared on the neck the next morning. There was

no disarrangement of the clothes or the hair, and no evidence of a struggle. The defendant claims that as soon as he got back from trying to get the girl, his wife lay before him on the floor. He rubbed her hands and feet with a brush, but to no purpose; and, thinking she had taken strychnine and was dead, in his delirium he swallowed half an ounce of chloroform and laid down beside her, where he was found. A great quantity of vomit was on the floor, but whether from the man or woman no one knows. Did she take poison and throw it all up, as no evidence of it could be found in the body? No test of the vomit was made for poison. The only evidence against the man consists of the bruises on the neck and the expert testimony of Dr. Hoover. Quarselle and his wife are said to have always lived happily together.

Hart and Son made and argued a motion today for a discharge of Ellen Elm, and J. C. Rich has filed a motion to dismiss as to Quarselle.

PARIS, Idaho, Sept. 14.

THE ESTRAY LAW.

There is a question of great importance to the public, especially stockmen and farmers, that I would like to call your attention to. Since the ruling of Judge Judd declaring the selling of stock for damages unconstitutional, we as farmers are left virtually at the mercy of the stock-owners. I must say, too, that I am satisfied that the point is well taken, but it is evident that we cannot remain in this condition. We must as farmers have some reasonable protection for our crops from animals running at large. It seems to me our law-makers will have to try again. While it is not at all desirable to sue in court for damages where you know the owners of stock, even this remedy is out of the question entirely where the owners cannot be found. In this case the farmer is powerless to do anything to save his crops. This is the way I understand it.

The question is what can be done that would give something near evenhanded justice in the matter? I have a few ideas that I thought I would make known to the public if you think them worthy of space in your valuable paper. I will lay down this proposition to begin with: That except the poundkeepers be empowered to sell stock for damages it is useless to talk of protecting the farmers from damages in any other form. This method is also the best way in my opinion. But Judge Judd says that property cannot be taken without due process of law. Very true. But he did not say that estray animals, declared such by law, could not be sold. As the law stands now animals can run three years, the owner not known, before they become estrays.

While this might do in a county where there was little farming and plenty of range for stock, it would be ruinous where the conditions were reversed. It seems to me that there might be laws made that