

## FORMER KIRON RESIDENT DEAD

Mrs. Christina Skarm Passes Away at  
the Home of Her Daughter at  
Lafayette, Minn.

**BURIAL TOOK PLACE AT KIRON**  
Attained the Age of 92 Years—Leaves  
Four Sons and One Daughter  
to Mourn Her Death

Kiron, Aug. 17 (Special to the Review)—Mrs. Christina Skarm passed away on last Saturday evening, August 7th, at the home of her daughter and son-in-law, Mr. and Mrs. Charles Winstrom, at Lafayette, Minnesota. Mrs. Skarm was a former resident in this locality, where she resided for a number of years, leaving this locality when her son-in-law and wife moved to Alcester, S. D., where after a few years they moved to Sioux City, and after a few months resided moved to Minnesota, where her last years were spent. She was born in Falkoping, Skaraborg Lan., Sweden, January 14, 1823, and had reached the age of 92 years 6 months and 23 days, when death closed her earthly career. In the year 1888 with her husband they came to America locating in this locality. In the year 1905 on the 21st of June her husband passed away. In this locality for the past twenty-three years she has been cared for by her daughter, Mrs. C. Winstrom, and as she has been an invalid the greatest part of this time Mrs. Winstrom and husband have been called upon to give their untiring care and aid to her, which they did most cheerfully, and partially contracting pneumonia which caused her death, in which illness was but of a short duration. She surely had attained a good long life and was willing to change the scenes and surroundings of this life, for the life and rest beyond. On Monday a short funeral service was held from the Lutheran church at Lafayette's, which was attended by a goodly number, who were acquainted with her and the family. The remains were shipped to Kiron for burial in the Lutheran cemetery by the side of her husband. The remains were accompanied by Mr. and Mrs. C. Winstrom, Mr. and Mrs. Fred Skarm, and Mrs. Chas. Skarm, the latter going up on Monday morning to visit her grandchild, having learnt of the death. A short funeral service was held on Wednesday afternoon conducted by Student Martin. She leaves four sons, Fred and Chas. Skarm residing near Odebolt, Alfred Skarin, of Sac City, G. B. Glumgren, of Nottingham, Minn., and one daughter, Mrs. Chas. Winstrom, of Lafayette Minn., and one sister in Sweden. Another good ripe life beyond forever freed from the cares and sufferings of this world.

C. S. Hammond, writing to the New York Tribune from Fostoria, Iowa, says that "Wilson is the only asset the democrats have" This is doubtless true—and it argues the bankruptcy of the democratic party. The country cannot afford to pin its hopes upon so slender a chance as that which is bound up in one man only.

At the close of business, Saturday, August 7th, the net balance in the general fund of the United States treasury was \$65,744,940 as compared with \$131,627,458 on the same date two years ago, under republican laws. The deficit for the present fiscal year from July 1st to August 7th was \$18,452,290.

"Dry" states are reported to be puzzled to determine what constitutes "near beer." May we aid them? "Near beer" bears the same relation to the beverage as ordinarily brewed that Secretary Redfield's "prosperity" does to the real article.

## VISCOUNT HALDANE.

His Conflict With Lloyd-George,  
Decried by British People.



Photo by American Press Association.

## Arms Exports to Continue, Austria Told

Can't Twist Law to Help Teutons, U. S. Replies--Rejects Vienna's Proposal--Demand Held Inconsistent with Kaiser's Acts

Washington, D. C., Aug. 15—The state department tonight made public the reply of the United States rejecting views set forth by the Austro-Hungarian recent note, declaring that transportation of war munitions from the United States to Austria's enemies was conducted on such a scale as to be "not consonance with the definition of neutrality."

Though friendly in tone, the note flatly denies the Austro-Hungarian contentions and recalls that that country and Germany furnished munitions of war to Great Britain during the Boer war when England's enemies could not import such supplies.

It insisted that the American government is pursuing a strictly neutral course and adhering to a principle upon which it would depend for munitions in the markets of the world in case it should be attacked by foreign power.

Attention is directed to the fact that Austro-Hungary and Germany before the war produced a great surplus of war munitions and sold them throughout the world, "especially to belligerents," and that "never during that period did either of them suggest or apply the principle now advanced by the imperial and royal government."

Washington, D. C., Aug. 15—Following is the full text of the American reply to Austro-Hungarian note regarding exportation of arms and ammunition from the United States to the allies:

The Secretary of State, to Ambassador Penfield:  
Department of State, Washington, D. C., Aug. 12, 1915.—Please present a note to the royal foreign office in reply to its note of June 29, in the following sense:

The government of the United States has given careful consideration to the statement of the imperial and royal government in regard to the exportation of arms and ammunition from the United States to the countries at war with Austro-Hungary and Germany.

**CAN'T SIDESTEP INTERNATIONAL LAW.**  
The government of the United States notes with satisfaction the recognition of the imperial and royal government of the undoubted fact that its attitude with regard to the exportation of arms and ammunition from the United States is prompted by its intention to "maintain the strictest neutrality and to conform to the letter of the provisions of the international treaties," but is surprised to find the imperial and royal government implying that the observance of the strict principles of the law under the conditions which have developed in the present war is insufficient, and asserting that this government should go beyond the long recognized rules governing such traffic by neutrals and adopt measures to maintain an attitude of strict parity with respect to both belligerent parties.

**DEMANDS UNJUST TO NEUTRALS.**  
To this assertion of an obligation to change or modify the rules of international usage on account of special conditions the government of the United States cannot assent. The recognition of an obligation of this sort, unknown to the international practice of the past, would impose upon every neutral nation a duty to sit in judgment on the progress of war and to restrict its commercial intercourse with a belligerent whose naval successes prevented the neutral from trade with the enemy. The contention of the imperial and royal government appears to be that the advantages gained to a belligerent by the establishment of a system of nonintercourse with the victor. The imperial and royal government confines its comments to arms and ammunition, but if the principle for which it contends is sound, it should apply with equal force to all articles of contraband.

**APPLIES TO ANY TRADE.**  
A belligerent controlling the high seas might possess an ample supply of arms and ammunition, but be in want of food and clothing. On the novel principle which is now advanced, a neutral duty, neutral nations would be obliged to place an embargo on such articles because one of the belligerents could not obtain them through commercial intercourse.

But if this principle so strongly urged by the imperial and royal government should be admitted to obtain, by reason of the superiority of a belligerent at sea, ought it not to operate equally as to a belligerent superior on land? Applying to this theory of equalization, a belligerent who lacks the necessary munitions to contend successfully on land ought to be permitted to purchase them from neutrals, while a belligerent with an abundance of war stores or with the power to produce them should be debarred from such traffic.

**WOULD INVOLVE GREAT CONFUSION.**  
Manifestly, the idea of strict neutrality now advanced by the imperial and royal government would involve a neutral nation in a mass of perplexities which would obscure the whole field of international obligation, produce economic confusion and deprive all commerce and industry of legitimate fields of enterprise already heavily burdened by the unavailable restrictions of war.

In this connection it is pertinent to direct the attention of the imperial and royal government to the fact that Austro-Hungary and Germany, particularly the latter, have during the years preceding the present European war, produced a great surplus of arms and ammunition which they sold throughout the world, and especially to belligerents. Never during that period did either of them suggest or apply the principle now advanced by the imperial and royal government.

**CITES GERMANY'S FORMER ACTS.**  
During the Boer war between Great Britain and the South African republics, the patrol of the coasts of the neighboring neutral colonies by British naval vessels prevented arms and ammunition reaching the Transvaal or the Orange Free State. The allied republics were in a situation almost identical in that respect with that in which Austro-Hungary and Germany find themselves at the present time. Yet, in spite of the commercial isolation of one belligerent, Germany sold to Great Britain and other belligerents hundreds of thousands of kilos of explosives, gunpowder, cartridges, shot and weapons, and it is known that Austro-Hungary also sold similar munitions to the same purchaser, though in small quantities. While, as compared with the present war, the quantities sold were small (a table of the sales is appended), the principle of neutrality involved was the same. If at that time Austro-Hungary and her present ally had refused to sell arms and ammunition to Great Britain on the ground that to do so would violate the spirit of strict neutrality, the imperial and royal government might with greater consistency and greater force urge its present contention.

**PRACTICE LONG RECOGNIZED.**  
It might be further pointed out that during the Crimean war large quantities of arms and military stores were sold to Russia by the Persian manufacturers. During the recent war between Turkey and Italy, this government is advised, arms and ammunition were furnished to the Ottoman government by Germany, and that during the Balkan wars the belligerents were supplied with munitions by both Austro-Hungary and Germany. While these latter cases are not analogous, as in the case of the South African war, they nevertheless clearly indicate the long established practice of the two empires in the matter of trade in war supplies.

In view of the foregoing statements, this government is reluctant to believe that the imperial and royal government will ascribe to the United States a lack of impartial neutrality in continuing its legitimate trade in all kinds of supplies used to render the armed forces of all belligerents efficient even though the circumstances of the present war prevent Austro-Hungary from obtaining such supplies from the markets of the United States, which have been and remain, so far as the action and policy of this government are concerned, open to all belligerents alike.

**AMERICAN SAFETY AT STAKE.**  
But in addition to the question of principle, there is a practical and substantial reason why the government of the United States has from the foundation of the republic to the present time advocated and practiced unrestricted trade in arms and military supplies. It has never been the policy of this country to maintain in time of peace, a large military establishment

**Primitive Life.**  
To the conservative philosopher the experiences of summer vacationists in their cottages, bungalows and camps seems rather futile. They will leave a comfortable home, all fitted with the machinery of modern civilization and carry water long distances, eat food poorly cooked on broken stoves or camp fires and sleep on hard beds.

The experiences of the summer sojourner in getting services performed by the native population are both humorous and exasperating. If you want a stove repaired or a window screen built, you must hunt up your workman and dog his footsteps until you land him. Life in remote country districts does not promote the habit of haste. "Never do today what you can put off until tomorrow," is a common motto. It promotes serene and philosophical living. But it exasperates the man from the city trained to instant action, and he curses rural life and all its ways and works.

Yet the ability to live a more or less primitive life with comfort and satisfaction is a good test of physical and nervous health. The person who can't come down to a tent and a camp fire is too dependent on the over-elaborate machinery of civilization.

Now that John D. is buying statues, he probably would be willing to pay New York City a fair price for Liberty Enlightening the World. A lamp in her hand, she would make a fine advertisement of oil.

or stores of arms and ammunition sufficient to repel invasion by a well equipped and powerful enemy.

It has desired to remain at peace with all nations and avoid any appearance of menacing such peace by the threat of its armies and navies. In consequence of this standing policy, the United States would in the event of attack by a foreign power, be from the outset of the war, seriously if not fatally embarrassed by lack of arms and ammunition, and by the means to produce them in sufficient quantities to supply the requirements of defense. The United States has always depended on the right and power to purchase arms and ammunition from neutral nations in case of foreign attack. This right which it claims for itself, it cannot deny to others.

**MUST HAVE AN OPEN MARKET.**  
A nation whose principle and policy it is to rely upon international obligations and international justice to preserve its political and territorial integrity might become the prey of an aggressive nation whose policy and practice it is to increase its military strength during time of peace with the design of conquest, unless the nation can, after war has been declared, go into the markets of the world and purchase the means to defend itself against the aggressor.

The general adoption by the nations of the world of the theory that neutral powers ought to prohibit the sale of arms and ammunition to belligerents would compel every nation to have in readiness at all times, sufficient munitions of war to meet any emergency for the manufacture of arms or munitions sufficient to supply the needs of its military and naval forces throughout the progress of a war.

**WOULD NECESSITATE CONSTANT VIGIL.**  
Manifestly, the application of this theory would result in every nation becoming an armed camp, ready to resist aggression and tempted to employ force in asserting its rights rather than appeal to reason and justice for the settlement of international disputes.

Perceiving, as it does, that the adoption of the principle that it is the duty of a neutral to prohibit the sale of arms and ammunition to a belligerent during the progress of a war would inevitably give the advantage to the belligerent which had encouraged the manufacture of munitions in the time of peace, and which had laid in vast stores of arms and ammunition in anticipation of war, the government of the United States is convinced that the adoption of the theory would force militarism on the world and work against that universal peace which is desired and purposed of all nations which exalt justice and righteousness in their relations with one another.

**RIDDLES AUSTRIA'S CONTENTIONS.**  
The government of the United States, in the foregoing discussion of the practical reason why it has advocated and practiced trade in munitions of war, wishes to be understood as speaking with no thought of expressing or implying any judgment with regard to the circumstances of the present war, but as merely putting very frankly the argument in this matter which has been conclusive in determining the policy of the United States.

While the practice of nations, so well illustrated by the practice of Austro-Hungary and Germany during the South African war, and the manifest evils which would result from a change of that practice, render compliance with the suggestions of the imperial and royal government out of the question, some assertions appearing in the Austro-Hungarian statement as grounds for its contentions cannot be passed over without comment. These assertions are substantially as follows:

**WHAT AUSTRIA CONTESTED.**  
1. That the exportation of arms and ammunition from the United States to belligerents contravenes the preamble of The Hague convention No. 13 of 1907.

2. That it is inconsistent with the refusal of this government to allow delivery of supplies to vessels of war on the high seas.

3. That according to all authorities on international law who concern themselves more properly with the question exportation should be prevented when this traffic assumes such a form or such dimensions that the neutrality of a nation becomes involved thereby.

As to the assertion that the exportation of arms and ammunition contravenes the preamble of The Hague convention No. 13 of 1907, the government presumes said reference is made to the last paragraph of the preamble which is as follows:

**ONE LOOPHOLE TO LAW.**  
"Seeing that in this category of reasons, these rules should not be altered in times of war by a neutral power except when the occasion has shown the necessity of such change for the protection of the rights of that power."

Manifestly, the only German comment that would change the rules laid down by the convention, one of which it should be noted explicitly, declares that a neutral is not bound to prohibit the exportation of contraband only in as far as it is necessary to protect its own rights. The right and duty to determine which this necessity exists rests with the neutral, not with a belligerent. It is discretionary, not mandatory. If a neutral power does not avail itself of the right, a belligerent is not privileged to complain, for in doing so it would be in the position of claiming for the neutral power what is necessary to protect that power's own rights. The imperial and royal government cannot but perceive that a complaint of this nature would invite just rebuke.

**AMERICAN NOT NAVAL BASE.**  
With reference to the asserted inconsistency of the course adopted by this government in regard to the exportation of arms and ammunition and that followed in not allowing supplies to be taken from its ports to ships of war on the high seas, it is only necessary to point out that prohibition of supplies to ships of war rests upon the principle that a neutral power must not permit its territory to become a naval base for either belligerent. A warship may, under certain restrictions, obtain fuel and supplies in a neutral port, once in three months. To permit merchant vessels acting as tenders to carry supplies more often than three months and in unlimited amount would do the work of the rule and might constitute the neutral territory as a naval base. Furthermore, this government is unaware that any Austro-Hungarian ship of war has sought to obtain supplies from a port in the United States, either directly or indirectly. This subject has, however, already been discussed with the imperial German government, to which the position of this government was fully set forth Dec. 14, 1914.

**CITES GERMAN ENVOY'S STATEMENT.**  
In view of the positive assertion in the statement of the imperial and royal government as to the unanimity of the opinions of text writers as to the exportation of contraband being unneutral, this government has caused a careful examination of the principal authorities on international law to be made. As a result of this examination it has come to the conclusion that the imperial and royal government has been misled, and has inadvertently made an erroneous assertion. Less than one-fifth of the authorities criticize the idea of nonexportation of arms. Several of those who constitute this minority admit that the practice of nations has been otherwise. It may not be inopportune to direct particular attention to the German ambassador, Paul Eulicke, who states that at the beginning of a war, belligerents have never remonstrated against the enactment of prohibitions of trade in contraband, but adds:

**WOULD BE UNFRIENDLY ACT.**  
"Such prohibition may be considered violations of neutrality or at least as unfriendly acts, if they are enacted during a war with the purpose to close unexpectedly the sources of supply to a country which heretofore had relied upon them."

The government of the United States deems it unnecessary to extend further at the present time, a consideration of the note.

Neutrality is opposed to the prohibition of national exportation of arms and ammunition or munitions of war to belligerent powers during the progress of war.

(Signed) LANSING.

## FARMERS URGED TO BUILD SILOS

Silage More Valuable As Milk Producer Than More Concentrated and Expensive Feeds.

**CAN BE USED THROUGHOUT YEAR**

Dairymen Can Use Silage So As to Take the Place of Pasture During Hot Summer Months.

Due to the exceedingly wet season there will undoubtedly be a great deal of immature corn this year. The silo is a source of saving this crop and should be included among the buildings on every low farm.

We find by analysis that over 50 per cent of the food value is in the stalk and leaf. If only the ears are gathered we are securing but half the value of our crop. In other words, if the farmer has 50 acres of corn worth \$20.00 per acre, for the ear alone he secures \$1000 worth of grain or 60 per cent of the crop. He leaves the other 40 per cent or \$666 worth in the field all course would be impossible for all of the corn to be placed in the silo, but if only 25 per cent was made into ensilage it would mean a great deal to the farmers of the United States.

Again, if we compare the value of silage and corn stover, we find that the latter is only one-half as good as the former. The stalk and leaves are preserved in the fodder, but it is seldom that animals will eat the stalk. It becomes dry and brittle and is not palatable, especially to milk cows. By doubling the feeding value of the corn plant, we are enabled to double the number of animals which can be fed from that crop.

Silage as a milk producer compares very favorably to the other more concentrated and more expensive feeds. It is a very palatable, succulent food and can well be called the substitute for pasture. We are all aware of the increase of milk flow when cows are turned to pasture in the spring, after receiving nothing but dry feeds for six months. The milk cow is a sensitive animal at hard work and therefore should be provided with the best food possible. The succulence furnished by silage acts as a spur to the appetite of the cow and causes her to relish her food in winter as well as in summer.

At the Ohio station several years ago the substitution of silage for grain in the ration proved very successful. Silage was used to take the place of over half the grain and proved much cheaper. The silage ration produced milk for 68 cents per 100 pounds and butter fat at the rate of 13 cents per pound. The grain ration produced milk at \$1.05 per hundred and butter fat for 22 cents per pound. This made the profit per month with the silage feed \$5.85 and those of the grain feed \$2.46, or more than doubled the income per cow. If the same method of feeding was applied on the farm, undoubtedly the same results could be obtained.

For many summers, previous to this one, the pastures have been very poor owing to dry weather in July and August. At this season the milk flow drops and is difficult to be restored. The dairymen should have something to take the place of grass at this time and the use of silage crops or silage is the only substitute. Silage crops are good, but as a rule require too much labor. They must be cut every day and hauled to the cows. Besides this is necessarily a great loss in being obliged to feed the crops before they fully mature and after they are over ripe.

Chas. L. Hill, of Guernsey fame, says that he feeds silage 365 days in the year and he furthermore advises that his cows eat their silage with relish even when they are supplied with rich pasture grass.

**Pours Acid on Sister's Eyes.**

Audubon, Aug. 14—A distressing incident occurred at the home of Mr. and Mrs. Wm. Blohm, southwest of Audubon, when their two and a half year old son poured a quantity of carbolic acid into the eyes of his six-month old sister who was asleep on the bed. This took place while the mother was working up stairs. The boy had also been asleep, but had awakened. The mother had given the baby eye treatment on several occasions in the presence of the boy. This medicine was standing on a kitchen cabinet, to which he gained access by climbing onto a chair. Near this bottle was also a bottle of carbolic acid. He poured a quantity from each bottle into the baby's eyes. It was not until the acid had done its terrible work that the baby awakened and her frantic screams brought the mother down stairs. She at once discovered what had taken place. Physicians rushed to the home and rendered what assistance they could, but it is feared that the sight in at least one eye has been completely ruined. The baby's face and mouth were also burned. It is yet too early to determine how serious the wounds will be, but the attending physician has confidence that the sight of one eye can yet be saved.

Over in Europe they destroy a city, and then fine it a few millions for getting in the way. So much rain has fallen in many sections that no one can use the high price of water as an excuse for drinking rum. It is believed the Russians will stop running by the time they reach Asia.

## THE GOVERNMENT WARNS HUNTERS

Misunderstanding Has Arisen Over Fact That State Laws Do Not Conform to Federal Laws.

**MIGRATORY BIRD LAW ENFORCED**

Sportsmen Warned That Federal Regulations for Protection of Wild Fowls Must be Observed.

Washington, D. C., Aug. 16—With the approach of the open season for shooting wild fowl, the United States department of agriculture is warning sportsmen that the federal regulations as amended Oct. 1, 1914, will be strictly enforced. Some misunderstanding has arisen from the fact that various state laws do not always conform to the federal regulations. This is regarded as unfortunate, but in such cases the department must insist upon the observance of the federal regulations.

The department will consider any recommendations submitted in good faith for amendment of the regulations, but will hold no public hearings thereon, nor will it amend the regulations prior to Oct. 15, 1915. It is the purpose of the department to conform the regulations to the wishes of the majority of sportsmen so far as it can be done and at the same time give wild fowl the necessary protection.

Federal regulations divide the United States into two zones, zone No. 1, the breeding zone, includes the states of Oregon, Idaho, Colorado, Nebraska, Iowa, Illinois, Indiana, Ohio, Pennsylvania and New Jersey, and all states north of them. Zone No. 2, the wintering zone, includes all states south of those named.

The regulations prescribe seasons as follows:

**Open Seasons, Migratory Birds, Zone 1**  
Waterfowl, September 1st to December 16th.  
Exceptions: Massachusetts, Rhode Island, October 1st to January 1st; New York, Connecticut, Pennsylvania, Oregon, Washington, Idaho, October 1st to January 15th; New Jersey, November 1st to February 1st; Minnesota, North Dakota, South Dakota, Wisconsin, September 7th to December 1st.

Rails, Coots, Gallinules, September 1st to December 1st.  
Exceptions: Massachusetts, New Hampshire, Rhode Island, August 15th to December 1st; Connecticut, Michigan, New York, Long Island, September 16th to December 1st; Minnesota, North Dakota, South Dakota, Wisconsin, September 7th to December 1st; Oregon, Washington, October 1st to January 16th.

Woodcock, October 1st to December 1st.  
Exceptions: Connecticut, Massachusetts, New Jersey, October 10th to December 1st; Rhode Island, November 1st to December 1st; Pennsylvania, Long Island, October 15th to December 1st.

Shore birds, Black Brant and Golden Plover, Jacksnipe, Yellowlegs, September 1st to December 16th.  
Exceptions: Maine, Massachusetts, New Hampshire, Rhode Island, Long Island, August 15th to December 1st. New York (except Long Island), September 16th to December 1st. Minnesota, North Dakota, South Dakota, Wisconsin, September 7th to December 1st.

Oregon, Washington, October 1st to December 16th.  
Insectivorous birds protected indefinitely. Bandtailed pigeons, cranes, swans, curlew, smaller shore birds and wood ducks protected until Sept. 1, 1918. Rails in Vermont and woodcock in Illinois also protected until 1918.

Shooting prohibited between sunset and sunrise, or at any time on sections of upper Mississippi and Missouri rivers after Jan. 1, 1915.

Shooting prohibited between sunset and sunrise, or at any time on sections of upper Mississippi and Missouri rivers after Jan. 1, 1915.

## JUDGE ELBERT H. GARY.

Steel Magnate Predicts Early End of the War.



Photo by American Press Association.