

Iron Range for a distance of about thirty miles, when we reached a station on the Wisconsin Central Railway. The last-named distance was almost altogether through a growth of maple and basswood, occasionally interspersed with hemlock-spruce.

Now and then we came in contact with white pines which, if they were scarce in numbers, were excellent in quality. As far as we could learn, there was a good deal of low, swampy, and inferior land in the state of Wisconsin, on the section between the rivers running into the Mississippi and those entering into Lake Superior.—*Forestry Journal*.

### Preparing Corn Ground in the west.

On a large part of the western prairie regions corn is by far the most important crop. Except for the first two or three years after the sod is broken, it is the most certain, and the most remunerative. There is no way to ensue a crop the same year that the ground is opened; but when breaking is done quite early, as soon as vegetation starts, and the seed is put in the sod with a spade—or, better, with a horse-planter having a "sod" attachment, a moderate crop may frequently be obtained. On certain soils, and in wet years, sod corn sometimes yields thirty bushels per acre; but this cannot be counted on with certainty. A much surer way is to break the sod as usual, and follow the breaking plough with a smaller stirring plough, which throws up a strip from the bottom of the first furrow. This subsoil can be torn to pieces with the harrow to form a good mellow surface-bed. Corn planted in this way, with a planter, will yield an average crop without any cultivation. In hot, moist seasons the yield will be large.

In preparing land for corn, farmers differ in opinion as to whether it is better to gather and burn vegetable rubbish, cornstalks, and the like, than to cut it up with a stalk-cutter and plow it under. The latter urge that the stalks and stubble covered by the plow enable the land to stand drouth better and that rotting in the ground they help to increase its fertility. The former argue that this rubbish furnishes harbor for insects during winter, and that burning the trash kills large numbers of these, and destroys many seeds of weeds. It is claimed, too, that some of the stalks which are plowed under remain near the surface and interfere with the regular operation of the planter, the runners rising nearly or quite out of the ground when passing over them, and then dropping too deep for a time. Where the listing machine is used it is absolutely necessary to rake and burn all trash on the surface. Some readers of the *American Agriculturist* may not be acquainted with this peculiar machine for planting corn. It looks like a right and left-hand plow with the land sides placed together, forming in fact a stout shovel plow. It is usually drawn by three horses and throws up a furrow on each side. Just under the inside is a sort of miniature subsoil plow, or stirrer, which tears up and mellows the soil in the bottom of the furrow. In the machine most used about here the planting apparatus is separate from the furrowing part, and follows after it, drawn by

a different team; but sometimes they are united in one.—Farmers differ as to the merits of the two methods. The truth seems to be that in warm, dry springs, on land free from trash the combined implement works admirably, especially for late planting after the ground becomes warm, since it allows the plowing and planting to go on together. It is by all odds the cheapest, as two men with four horses will, with the combined implement, plow the ground and plant five to seven acres of corn per day.

In Nebraska and Kansas there is some difference of opinion as to the comparative advantages of fall and spring plowing for corn, with a large preponderance in favor of the former. When land is moist enough in autumn to plow well, it is usually if not always best to plow it then; but if so dry that it cannot be well plowed, leave it until spring.

Whether the plowing should be deep or shallow depends upon the kind of soil. On deep, black soft loams, corn roots will penetrate as readily into the subsoil as into the plowed portion, and little is gained by stirring it, though an occasional deeper plowing, even in soft loamy soil exposes fresh portions to the atmosphere, and develops more plant food. For stiffer subsoil, packing easily, it pays to plow deeper to pulverize and aerate them.

Where deep plowing is the rule, its advantages will be most striking in dry seasons. In 1874, a very dry year in Nebraska, there were in Sarpy County two corn fields, side by side, each containing about sixty acres. The soil was the same, plowed and planted at the same time, and cultivated substantially alike except that one was plowed seven to eight inches deep, the other three to four. The former yielded about forty bushels per acre, the latter showed only an occasional ear, and yielded not over six or eight bushels per acre. Taking one year with another, on all prairie uplands, it is safe to plow pretty deeply. Yet it must be admitted that in some cases good fair crops of corn have been raised by planting between the old corn rows, and not plowing the ground at all.—For fall plowed ground it is frequently necessary, and always desirable, to cultivate it before planting. This is usually done with the common four-shovel corn plow. The pairs of shovels are spread as far as possible apart, and on returning, two shovels are made to run between the marks made going the other way, and the other two run outside, thus stirring all the ground. This cultivation keeps down weeds until the corn gets a start, and loosens up the surface soil so that it warms better and starts the corn sooner. After thus cultivating, it pays to barrow once across the cultivator marks, and many good farmers roll before planting.—*American Agriculturist*.

### Woman's Rights as Taxpayers.

The people of this country have just indulged in the pleasure of voting. One large class, however, remained away, either cooking, gossiping or engaged in other ways. The day of female suffrage is not yet, and for aught that we can see, is as far off as ever. In truth, the agitation on that subject, which was begun many years

ago, has in a large degree died away, nor is it likely to be soon revived.

There is one aspect of the question, however, which does not fade out of sight. There are a great many women in this country holding property and paying taxes thereon who have no voice nor influence with respect to the use of the money thus paid. In our large cities, this is particularly noticeable. Heavy taxes are levied on them as on others, and yet they are silent concerning municipal expenditure. Now, it is unquestionably true that a very large class in the cities who pay no taxes and have no property are interested in making expenditures as large as possible in order to obtain the largest supply of work. Thus two classes are diametrically opposed to each other. The taxpayer who is in favor of public economy, and the receiver who is in favor of the largest public expenditure.

In the last number of the *Westminster Review* there is a short and readable article entitled, "Women: Ratepayers' Right to Vote." The writer, among other things, says: "There is a great injustice in the regulation by which she is excused none of the rates or taxes for which women are liable, and yet is shut out from the privilege of self-government, the right of being consulted concerning the expenditure of the public money which she has provided, and of voting for or against laws which affect her life or property."

General as the opposition is to permitting women to exercise the right of suffrage, the wrong done to them by thus depriving them of any right or power to determine what disposition shall be made of the money drawn from them by way of taxation weighs heavily on thoughtful minds. Is it not possible to give them the right to act through another? It is unwise for them to act directly themselves! Surely if their resources are to be drawn away from them for public uses, they ought in some way to act with respect to its disposition.—*Banker's Magazine*.

### Recent Legal Decisions.

**RAILROAD COMPANIES—RIGHT OF WATER-USER.**—An interesting decision, to the effect that the titles of railroad companies to their rights-of-way depend upon the use of those ways for railroad purposes, has just been rendered by the New York Supreme Court. In 1862 the Troy & Boston Company bought, dismantled and abandoned several miles of railroad, parallel with its own line in Rensselaer county, N. Y., formerly owned by the Albany Northern Company and its successors. This real estate was taken possession of again without hindrance by the farmers from whom it had been originally appropriated. Fifteen years later the Boston, Hoosac Tunnel & Western Company entered on the old right-of-way, and made it part of its own line, which competes directly with the Troy & Boston. The Troy & Boston then sought to eject its rival, claiming at the same time \$1,000,000 damages on account of the occupation of the property by the Boston, Hoosac Tunnel & Western Company. After litigation, the complaint of the Troy and Boston Company was dismissed on its merits, and