

AGRICULTURAL NOTES.

The following was one of the rules of practice adopted by a good farmer of the past generation:—Pay a hand if he is a poor hand, all you promise him; if he is a good hand, pay him a little more—it will encourage him to do still better.

A farmer in Pennsylvania who thoroughly underdrained his land says the money thus used paid him better than if he had invested in bonds or bank, or railway stocks, as his capital is doubled every five years.

DESTROYING CATERPILLARS.—An excellent remedy, which has been used on a large scale in Southern France, consists in a dilute solution of sulphide of potassium, at the rate of about one part in five hundred. The infested plants are to be sprinkled with the decoction by means of a garden syringe, and it is said that vegetation is not the least injured by its application.

HOW TO WATER HORSES.—One writer says, never water immediately before or after feeding. I say that if a horse is thirsty, always give him drink, and he will thank you for it. I have often seen horses put in the stable at noon for an hour or two and not eat a pound of hay or grain, but looking wistfully for water, and then their careful owner, who would not let them have water when warm, will come to give them enough to kill, and drive the remainder of the day on two buckets of water and no feed. Ten chances to one his horse gives out with him or gets sick before night. Now, I say, give the horse water if he is ever so warm; give him a swallow, rinse out his mouth and nostrils, give him a bite of hay, in a short time a little more water, but not too much. If he is watered several times, a little at a time, until he is satisfied, he will not drink more than half what he would if you let him gulp it down all at once.—*Cor. N. Y. Tribune.*

FEED FOR PRODUCING MILK.—The *Practical Farmer* says: It is well settled in the opinion of all our best dairymen, that bran greatly promotes the milk secretion in cows and it is fed almost universally. About equally mixed with corn meal is the usual proportion. This mixture seems to promote both quality and quantity of milk.

From several sources we hear that buckwheat bran is a great milk producer, and it is now being used considerably among our Chester county dairymen, in about the same proportions as the other.

Thomas Gawthrop, near West Grove, Chester county, also by repeated trials with his own cows, has fully satisfied himself that they do as well with corn and cob meal and bran as with pure corn meal and bran. The amount of nutriment in corn cobs is so very small that this result will have to be explained on the supposition of the ground cob, acting to promote digestion by distending the stomach. The presence of bulky material being necessary to promote distension and fill up the stomach of ruminating animals, before perfect digestion can be accomplished, is frequently lost sight of. Hungarian grass is also found for milch cows to be rather superior to the ordinary run of hay. The last year or two, Hungarian grass has loomed up wonderfully in the estimation of our dairy farmers; and a large scope of land will be sowed with it the coming season. It matures for cutting in about sixty days, and produces two to four tons per acre—the latter of course on good soils. Three pecks to the acre is the usual allowance of seed. Where a good hay market is convenient, this substitution of Hungarian grass for common hay in home feeding will be a clear additional source of profit.

DESTRUCTION OF THE CODLING MOTH.—It is generally conceded that the worst enemy we have to contend with in apple-culture in this region is the codling moth. Our trees grow well and flower well; the fruit sets as abundantly as a healthy tree ought to set fruit; but the "worm" comes along by-and-by, and ultimately nips all our hopes of fruit.

During the past few years reports have been made of the quantities of codling moths which have been caught by using wide-mouthed bottles of sweetened liquid as traps for

the purpose. These hung in the trees are said to get filled with insects in the course of a single night, and among the number largely of the codling moth. On the strength of these reports we have recommended in times past attention to such a simple manner of destruction. We observe however that Missouri's devoted and enthusiastic entomologist, Prof. Riley, is satisfied that if any are caught in this way they are too few to have much influence, and besides a large number of insects which are really beneficial to the fruit-grower, he thinks are destroyed at the same time, so that the profit-and-loss of the account shows no gain at any rate. Mr. Riley, however, goes farther than this and shows what seems to be a much better plan. He says that there are two broods of young every year. That the first brood leave the apple before it falls generally, and in the night time crawl down the stem in order to reach the ground in order to undergo transformation. If a band of old bagging be placed around the tree, and left there for a few weeks, they go into this nest instead of the ground and may then be readily destroyed. A permanent roll of bagging can be used by having an elastic rubber and hook to fasten it to the tree. We suppose the pupa can be destroyed in these permanent bags by dipping them into a boiler of hot water.

Some do the same with straw bands; and others merely screw loose shingles together—the principle in all being the same namely, to furnish a hiding-place for the little "worms." This will effectually do for the first brood, and we suppose the last one, which comes down with the fallen apples, must beset to by gathering up the fallen and worthless fruit.

There will still be the objection so often made when these remedies are proposed—what use is it for one to destroy his insects, they will only come from one's neighbors? But it has seemed to us that these arguments are little more to be regarded than in the destruction of rats or mice. But who ever hesitated to set a trap in his cellar because a mouse might come from his neighbor's in search of his trapped and departed friend? The argument, if of any worth, is in favor of missionary work. It will urge to induce our neighbors to go and do likewise. Indeed there is nothing so valuable to a whole neighborhood as a good example. Let them see that you are destroying thousands of codling moths in this way, and with hardly any trouble, and it is a rare chance if many come long from the neighbor's orchard.—*German town Telegraph.*

Plural Marriage.

Some time ago a letter was published in this paper, dated at Lowell, Massachusetts, and containing a petition to the Legislature from many unmarried women in that city, favoring the passage of a law allowing plural marriage under specified conditions. This remarkable document was commented upon by nearly every newspaper in the land. Boldly, but with pathetic detail, it presented the picture of the lonely lot of women for whom the word "home" has no significance. It set forth the hopelessness of their struggle for a bare subsistence, while society, with stern, monogamic edict, closed the door upon their joyless lives, and bade them remember that in heaven there is neither marrying nor giving in marriage. The publication of this document called out a very large number of letters from various quarters, entering eagerly on the discussion of woman's matrimonial grievances. The majority of writers professed their willingness to try almost any lot rather than that of "single blessedness." The correspondence served its purpose in showing how deeply the minds of women are interested in this social problem.

And now the same question has come up for discussion in England. It seems to have had its origin in the visit of Persia's polygamic king. Not only obscure newspapers are facing the question, but journals that represent society and that go into the hands of cultured men and women, discuss it. Says the *London Saturday Review*: "The reason of the welcome given to the Shah by the leisured classes is clear. Society is governed by the necessity of providing occupation for its unmarried members. Unmarried women form the majority of every

household, and nothing checks their steady increase from decade to decade and from year to year. It is only natural that the mother of a large and increasing family should find her symbol in the Shah. Just as Dr. Primrose represented the quintessence of monogamy, so the Shah represents the polygamic element, and suggests the one conceivable method of providing for our surplus female population."

It cannot be said that the *Saturday Review* is merely jesting, for that eminently conservative and elegantly cynical journal is not given to jesting on the unpopular side of the great social question. It draws a dark enough picture of English society, and urges that plural marriage is the only available cure for the difficulty. The language employed by this organ of the cultivated conservative classes in England would hardly have been tolerated a dozen years ago, even in sport or irony. And its recommendation is made with a full knowledge of the fact that Mormon missionaries have gathered their largest harvest of recruits from English fields. There is something terribly significant, if not ominous, in such a recommendation coming from such a quarter. The question naturally arises, What is the solution of this vast social problem? The difficulty stares us full in the face. The discontent of large numbers of our women—and women, too, of no little culture and refinement—is a fact that cannot be winked out of sight. They have hearts that hunger, that starve, for a sympathy and affection they have not found and are not likely to find. They are lonely, and need a companionship that has not appeared. They are solitary, but no home offers to satisfy their longing. They are human, with all the deep and sacred instincts of womanhood struggling in their hearts, but unappeased. And the modern man thinks less and less of marriage, lives more and more at the hotel, becomes the *habitué* of the club, and buys his comforts as he buys his clothes. The difficulty, so far as the women are concerned, is too real and unjust to be whistled down the wind. Those who write to us refuse to be comforted by commonplaces or silenced by sneers. But who shall give them what they ask for? How shall their natural and legitimate wants be met? The questions are easier asked than answered. But the earnest, repeated asking may bring the satisfying solution in due time. It is something to see that relief cannot be found in this or that particular direction.—*N. Y. Graphic.*

The Medical System.

ELLEARSVILLE, Mo., July 31, '73.
To the Editor of the Democrat:

A few months ago Mrs. Storey, of Chicago, fell sick, Dr. Johnson was called to cure her, drugged her for a fortnight, and then like millions of other poor sufferers, she died. Her husband, well convinced that drugs, not rheumatism, killed her, has so declared to the public, charging, however, the sad result more to the recklessness of the doctor than to the destructive nature of his remedies. Having myself lost father, mother, sisters and four dear children by the same medical science—"falsely so called"—and having fifteen years ago repudiated the same, and kept my family of ten members secure from death since, and desiring much that others may learn to do so likewise, I seek to publish the following propositions:

1. As the faculty of Chicago have avowed, Dr. Johnson is not to blame for following the usual course in his treatment of Mrs. Storey. If the medicine destroyed her, then like medicine has destroyed thousands similarly afflicted, and, if persisted in, will destroy thousands more.

2. It is, if possible, yet more certain that the usual and well established treatment did not cure her. Is it not just as true that it will not cure cases like it? And yet the faculty of Chicago, and it is presumable, elsewhere, endorse it. Then cases of rheumatism like Mrs. Storey's under allopathic rule, are to perish!

3. Is it not a fair presumption that if the usual treatment in rheumatism fails to cure, but ends in death, the same system will fail in other diseases? The faculty, nor their books, nowhere except rheumatic carditis from their list of

curable diseases. If drugs cannot, as they give them, cure this, can they any more surely cure other diseases?

4. Hence, how can any sane person, in view of such stubborn facts, resist the testimony of the eminent men we quote below?

AMERICAN PHYSICIANS.

"Our remedies are unreliable."—[Prof. Valentine Mott, M. D.]

"Of all sciences, medicine is the most uncertain."—[Prof. Willard Parker, M. D.]

"We are not acquainted with any agent that will cure consumption."—[Prof. Alonzo Green, M. D.]

"Cod-liver oil has no curative power in consumption."—[Prof. Horace Green, M. D.]

"The administering of our powerful remedies is the most fruitful source of deranged digestion."—[Prof. E. R. Peaslee, M. D.]

"Of the essence of disease very little is known."—[Prof. S. H. Gross, M. D.]

"Mercury has made more cripples than all wars combined."—[Dr. McClintock.]

EUROPEAN PHYSICIANS.

"The science of medicine is founded on conjecture, improved by murder."—[Sir A. Cooper, M. D., F. R. S.]

"I have no faith whatever in our medicines."—[Dr. Bailey, London.]

"Thousands are annually slaughtered in the quiet sick room."—[Dr. Frank.]

"Every dose of medicine is a blind experiment."—[Dr. Bostwick.]

"The medical practice of the present day is neither philosophy nor common sense."—[Prof. Evans, Edinburgh.]

"So gross is our ignorance of the physiological character of disease, that it would be better to do nothing."—[Magendie, France.]

To all this I simply add:

5. That diseases are the natural results of violated law, mostly by unhealthy food, and in over quantities. To dislodge this our bodies act the best they can. This action we call disease, as sneezing, coughing, vomiting, purging, etc. Fight it with a drug too often worse than the original cause, and you double the task of expelling the foe, and greatly enhance the danger of death. Sick people need all the elements of health even more than the well. Hence, that which will sicken a well person, can never make well a sick one. One disease can never cure another, as Allopathy implies. Hence our attack should be, not on the men who are erroneously taught to give drugs, but on the false system which so teaches. W. P., of Dr. Trail's School.—*Missouri Democrat.*

PIOCHE NOTES.

The following are from the *Record* of Aug. 2—

Yesterday evening we were blessed with a light shower of rain, coming from the northeast, and making the air cool and agreeable. The rain seemed to be falling in the mountains to the north and east nearly all the afternoon.

John Peoples, who was to have appeared before Justice Stoutenburgh on Thursday evening, to be sentenced for assault on a woman, is supposed to have gone to "fresh fields and pastures new," and forfeited his bonds of \$500. Fare thee well, Oh! Peoples, and when thou art far away—we pray thee stay there. Oh, remember this spot where thou didn't win thy many laurels, and remember too that when thou dost come back, the judges of the land will greet thee and the high officers of the country will go forth to receive thee with open arms, and protect thee from the gaze of the vulgar and the plots of the wicked, within their great castle of stone and iron. May many more like thee follow on thy way, for indeed thou hast done much for the people.

— An old gentleman in Maine is preparing for the good time to come. He has caused to be erected in the cemetery a gorgeous monument to the memory of himself and his wife, setting forth their virtues, etc., and leaving the dates of their deaths to be filled in whenever those events may happen. It is said that his chief delight consists in watching the throngs of gaping rustics assembled around the monument to admire its beauty and ponder over its sculptural adornments.

—"The drain of emigrants to America," says the *Limerick Reporter*, "is absolutely alarming. The people are leaving the country in crowds; a respectable, well-dressed, intelligent and orderly population are abandoning their country in countless numbers."

— Tobacco smoke, says Carlyle, is the one element in European manners (and he might have added American) in which men can sit silent together without embarrassment, and where no man is bound to speak one word more than he has actually and veritably got to say.

— A notion seller was offering a Yankee clock, finely varnished and colored, with a looking glass in front, to a lady not remarkable for personal beauty. "Why, it's beautiful," said the vender. "Beautiful, indeed! why a look at it almost frightens me," said the lady. "Then, marm," said Jonathan, "I think you had better take one that hain't got no looking-glass."

— This is the season when the good young man always offers to carry the sun umbrella of the first good-looking young lady friend whom he meets, and walks under its shelter, gazed at enviously by all the other men whom he meets, while his fair companion trips gracefully in the outside edge of the shade, and is uncomfortable but happy.

— The *Memphis Appeal* does not indorse dueling, "because its stockholders believe it is in violation of the law of God, and should be condemned by society." Its editors, however, while not pretending to dispute the moral code of their financial backers, denounce as "little cowardly blackguards" those "who are too pious to fight, but mean enough to insult gentlemen."

— Boston is considerably excited over the rumor that Gilmore—the famous Gilmore, he of the tremendous jubilee—is to depart and hie him to Gotham. He will take his band with him, for his ambition is said to be to institute popular concerts, *a la* Julien, but of a higher class of music. He designs to have a mixed programme—some highly artistic works, and some pieces more easily appreciated by the multitude.

— It is an illustration of the way we are getting on in public morals that Judge McCue, one of the directors of the Brooklyn Trust Company, that has come to grief through the defalcation of its president, holds that Mr. Mills was not "dishonest," but "committed the too prevalent error of using other funds than his own, with the hope and with the intention of making them all right." The *New York Times* comes to the natural conclusion that Judge McCue's rendering of the eighth commandment should be "Thou shalt not steal—except with the hope of returning." And yet the man who avows this atrocious doctrine is Judge of the Brooklyn City Court, which has concurrent jurisdiction with the Supreme Court.—*Ex.*

— The Rev. —, of Erie, Pennsylvania, is an energetic worker, but as yet he has failed to convert a certain wealthy stockholder in various mining enterprises. Talking to him the other day, he said: "Mr. —, you are getting your fortune by investing in mining stock; now I want you to take some stock in the golden streets of heaven." The reply was a continuance of the metaphor: "Well, I guess I won't invest to-day; I've lost considerable on that North Shore tin investment; and who knows but that the country you refer to may be 'salted' too?"

— Brains of idiots have usually been found quite small—often less than half the ordinary weight, and in some instances less than one-fourth. But in a list of crania contained in a recent work by Dr. Flint, one idiot is shown to have had a brain that weighed 54.33 ounces; two others had brains weighing a little more than 48 ounces; the brain of another, of "the lowest degree of intelligence," 46.56, and that of one "below the condition of a brute," 44.3 or less than four ounces below the normal weight of the human brain. The cranial cavity was measured by Morton in 623 instances; the largest, 114 cubic inches, was that of a German; the smallest, that of an Australian, only 58 cubic inches.