

States, and the measure proposed is in the interests of home industry. Of course Mississippians may have to pay more for their cotton goods or more in taxes, but then the money will remain in the State. The labor of the State will be better employed—perhaps. And when the infant industry is built up and grows to a mighty giant it will cease to ask for aid from the taxpayers—*perhaps*. To the protectionist the scheme must appear “perfectly lovely.”

It is not generally known that the country has another war on its hands—a fierce, relentless, bloody strife in which the list of casualties far surpasses that of the American army in the Philippines. Five hundred victims annually is the estimate of the loss of life in this bloody conflict.

The cause of the war is the same that has provoked the more spectacular international conflicts—*viz.*, the greed for land. It is a war of conquest, and springs, as most wars have sprung, from our treatment of land as private property. The territory in question, the fierce debatable ground, is situated for the most part in the States of Colorado and Nebraska. It is a war of cattle kings and sheep herders and settlers. The cattle kings have fenced in and appropriated to their own use tracts of government land which are said to be equal in area in some cases to many a German principality. The settler who claims homestead rights here does so at his peril. He is looked upon by the cattle king as his enemy, and from the time he selects his site and pitches his tent he must be prepared to defend by night and day his dearly bought right to make his home on government land. Then follow mysterious murders and more mysterious disappearances; midnight raids; hired assassins lay in wait; the red flames of burning homesteads lighten the heavens; the settler may waken to find the denizens of his sheepfold cruelly poisoned or shot. All this is war—war at its worst; war due to a cruel and stupid policy—to that cause fruitful of wars and misery—contempt of human rights.

Well, the government now proposes to change all this; not in the right way of course, and blunderingly, as is its way. It probably means more war. Appropriately enough, John S. Mosby, the famous Confederate cavalry leader, now a special agent in charge of United States lands, has been selected for the work of tearing down these fences erected in defiance of the law, and largely for speculative purposes.

But why should these fences be torn down? Why should not the government instead of letting its lands be scrambled for, instead of attempting to regulate conditions of settlement, declare that none of this land shall be alienated, that as much of it as now remains shall be subject to lease on the payment of the annual rental value. The portions now enclosed can remain enclosed. What the cattle kings require for actual use will be all they will care to keep, and the fences will come down; there will be no longer a profit in fencing off what they cannot use for cattle ranges or for other productive purposes. Nor will the coming of other settlers be a provocation to strife; on the contrary, it will be a source of gratification. There will be no more wars for the possession of land, and this fierce domestic feud will cease, this bloody chapter in the history of our blundering land policy come to an end.

The Mayor of Buffalo, in his last message to the Council, says:

“I find upon inquiry and examination that three of the second class cities of the State levy an assessment upon personal property, as follows: Syracuse, \$8,948,461; Rochester, \$8,698,834; Albany, \$7,599,650. The assessed valuation of personal property in Buffalo is less than any of the three cities named, being but \$7,547,000. As the population of this city is over three times as great as Syracuse or Albany, and over twice as great as Rochester, it does