

The corn grew taller and remained much greener throughout the season, while the north portion of the field presented many dry tassels and undeveloped ears.

On the South Pascoe corn fields the beneficial effect of the shelter of the grove is noticeable for at least one hundred yards to the north, but this is largely offset by the fact that ten to twelve rows of corn next the grove are badly dwarfed by the shade of the tall cottonwoods. An excellent little grove is that on Division G, consisting of young catalpas and a close row of willows. The beneficial effects upon the corn to the north are quite noticeable almost to the ditch, a distance of about two hundred yards.

The first thirty to forty rows of corn on the south of the Dailey are strikingly better than any other portion of the field, although the soil is practically the same, and the good effect of the shelter is noticeable almost half way across the field.

The only place where a beneficial effect upon a beet field could be detected was upon the Wisner immediately to the north of the grove at the south-east corner of the field.

As the main consideration with us here in Nebraska is to minimize the devastating effects of the hot south winds which generally prevail during a dry time, the one great purpose of our tree plantations should be to check the force of these winds and as far as possible keep them off our fields. Bearing this in mind, three points—the form, condition and position of the plantations—were kept in view throughout the observations and their relative effects carefully noted. These three points were found to be of the greatest importance in determining the extent of the beneficial effects produced.

Tall trees, such as those of the Pascoe grove and the rows about the Horse Pasture, seem to be of doubtful benefit in that the good they do is largely offset by the amount of shade they produce, and having long clean trunks the wind sweeps over the ground almost unobstructed. Low, spreading trees, such as the willows on North Mills and the small grove on Division G are almost ideal shelters. Their growth is quite close right down to the ground and they are not tall enough to keep sunlight from the crops near by.

As regards position, only those groves and tree rows situated to the south of fields were observed to be of any benefit as shelters, and this will be found to be the case in almost any season of drouth, as the only winds to be feared at such times come from a southerly direction. Large groves will check and cool off winds to a very considerable extent even though they are trimmed high and comparatively clear and open, but single or double rows of trees must be

quite dense from the ground up if they are to be of any material benefit.

From the foregoing observations it is very apparent that what is wanted to protect crops is not so much large square groves, but rather close rows of small trees extending east and west along the south of fields and trimmed so as to present the shape of an inverted "V" when viewed from the end. Such rows will offer the greatest resistance to winds and cast the least amount of shade upon the crops growing alongside.

The amount of room taken up and the shading done by tree rows between fields is a matter of considerable importance and may largely offset their beneficial effects as windbreaks.

Respectfully submitted,

A. T. WIANCKO,

Experimentalist.

August 29, 1901.

#### PRAYERS.

EDITOR CONSERVATIVE:

Ever since THE CONSERVATIVE made its debut I have read with renewed interest its columns each week. In fact now I inquire as anxiously as the male side of the house, "has THE CONSERVATIVE come?" It is positively a treat in this age of wire pulling and political machinations to now and then be introduced to a thoroughly independent journal where political, economic and sociological questions are discussed without any candidate to "boost" or political axe to grind. I repeat that it is refreshing—refreshing on account of its rarity. I was somewhat surprised when your journal launched upon the religious sea, for my observation corroborates my experience that of all seas that of religion is the most tempestuous. The time was when I kept close to shore, but for the last few years I have literally followed the words of the Master to His disciple "Launch out into the deep."

But I cannot say that in every instance I have verified the statement "And ye shall catch a full draught of fishes." On many, many voyages I have been thankful that the waves did not engulf me. Although weather-beaten I have been happy to get back to shore where I could bask upon the dry sands and recover my senses!

Prayer—the efficacy of prayer—should we pray for rain, are subjects that have evoked discussion in your columns of late. With all respect to the various writers I have been much edified, more perplexed and most amused by the theories propounded. As you have asked for opinions on the matter, I take it for granted that you will not deem it egotistical for me to come to class meeting and give in my experience.

As the question has shaped itself one does not have to doubt the efficacy of true prayer in order to doubt the efficacy of the prayer for rain. My experience

is that they are not parallel cases. Still the term prayer in its general sense is such a sacred subject, if my own child told me that to pray for rain uplifted his spiritual perceptions and expanded his conceptions of God, I would not dare be so unwise as to discourage the exercise.

I would no more pray for rain than I would for sunshine or for a storm to cease or for an earthquake to alter its vibrations. Every child is taught the journey of a drop of water from the sea back to the sea again. I do not doubt that by concussion where the atmospheric conditions are disturbed a sudden rush of water might be brought together and of necessity be precipitated. To wish for rain, to sincerely desire the sunshine to come out is all the form of prayer that I could entertain on that subject.

But would not that be a selfish prayer—for in a certain sense prayer is the sincere desire of the heart. Like Hagar of old I might be a wanderer into the desert and so consumed by heat as to agonize for water. I surely would not expect to look around and find a flask of the liquid. So in praying for rain I would do violence to my reason and my knowledge of God to be found in any congregation assembled to invoke some personal being enthroned on a misty shrine somewhere in the sky, thereby believing that I could wheedle Him into disturbing the elements of His Universe so as to send rain on the corn in Nebraska.

I have seen vast fields of rice in North and South Carolina submerged until the harvest was useless. No one prayed for the rain to cease. I thoroughly believe in prayer if by thought-meditation, the sincere desire of the soul, we mean prayer. Anything that could come within the scope of mentality I should not feel an unanswerable prayer—it might be unreasonable and even evil.

Anyone who is at all familiar with the fundamentals of psychology knows full well that thought is power and that thought always answers its own prayer as every effect follows a cause. Except by a mad-man no rash act is performed. Every noble deed, every dastardly deed is but the natural outcome of thought. It may take weeks or years for consummation. Thought is the builder of character, the architect of destiny. One can well understand why the exalted Christ waited thirty years before accomplishing His great mission. In the sense of mind, I would meditate upon, sincerely desire to affect one whom I loved and would expect an answer. While I do not accept the tenets of Christian Science I prove daily that their fundamental principle is true to me, that mind possesses a wonderful power over the body. If it had not been for this truth physical suffering would have been my earthly portion.

When God is regarded as Supreme Intelligence, the All Mind, with Him all