

"But I want a chance to argue my side of the case," said Peck.

"No, he vins," stoutly asserted the judge. But Peck commenced to talk and gradually his talk led up to the case, and before the judge knew it Peck was arguing the defense. The judge listened closely, and when Peck had finished he said:

"You vins de case."

"But you have already decided in my favor," said the other lawyer.

"Dat's all right. I reverse my first decision. Dis man vins," and the judge stuck to his last decision and Peck won his railroad case.—Topeka State Journal.

THE AMERICAN REGULAR CAV- ALRY.

All of our men are physically as large as life guardsmen, and what they lose in contrast by lack of gold and pipe-clay, and through the inferiority of their equipment and uniform, is made up to them in the way they ride a horse. A German or English trooper sits his horse like a clothes-pin stuck on a line—the line may rise or sag, or swing in the wind, but the clothes-pin maintains its equilibrium at any cost, and is straight, unbending, and a thing to itself. The American trooper, with his deep saddle and long stirrup, swings with the horse, as a ship rides at anchor on the waves; he makes a line of grace and strength and suppleness from the rake of his sombrero to the toe of his hooded stirrup. When his horse walks, he sits it erect and motionless; when it trots, he rises with it, but never leaves the saddle; and when it gallops he swings in unison with it, like a cowboy, or a coxswain in a racing-shell.—Richard Harding Davis, in Scribner's.

"LIFE" ON AN INDEMNITY.

"Life" is, perhaps, a little slow about realizing the inevitability of all the sequences of our war, and it confesses that it cannot see any sure moral grounds for exacting or proposing to exact an indemnity in money from Spain. It can easily understand the sentiment in this country that Spanish rule in Cuba was atrocious enough to be worth ending by force; it can understand that the iniquity of Spanish rule in the Philippines seriously complicates the proposition to give those islands back to Spain. But why, when we have taken Spain's colonies away from her, we should feel that we have a moral right to demand that she should pay us for our trouble, it does not understand at all. Of course, there

must be terms of peace. Of course, we shall keep all the ships we have captured, and perhaps demand possession of any others that may still be afloat; but to ask for money, too, really seems not only grasping but somewhat perplexing. No one of sound mind believes that war was forced upon us. We forced war on Spain. Our reasons seemed to us to be good, but they were our reasons. We cannot blame Spain for not accepting them. We will fight the war through and do all we intended, and probably a good deal more. We will free Cuba, doubtless take and hold Puerto Rico, and make some kind of dicker about the future control of the various Spanish islands of the Pacific. But an indemnity we will hardly get out of Spain whether we demand it or not, except in the form of outlying real estate. . . . Distinctions of mine and thine get sorely mixed in war time, but the rudiments of conduct must survive even war.—Editorial in New York Life.

HEROES OF THE DEEP.

An extract from an article with the above title, by Herbert D. Ward, published in the Century for July.

The beautiful harbor of Gloucester stretches from Norman's Woe to Eastern Point, and the fish that enter are daily measured by the hundred thousand weight. . . . The great fishing fleet holds nearly seven thousand souls under its gurried decks, and every one of these has faced, as a matter of course, dangers that would give the average reader many a nightmare, if he could experience but a touch of their reality. What novelist would think of sketching the story of a dried codfish? What novelist could do better?

It is always with a vague regret that we read the sagas, and are thrilled by the vikings's exploits. It seems as if the deeds of daring had gone by forever, and as if the heroes of the deep were a myth of the past. Absorbed in the Norse romance, we forget that the vikings were only pirates, and that they dared for slaughter and for booty. If the Gloucester of to-day had only existed then, what heroic saga would it not have inspired! For to risk life for glory, or riches, or rescue, or love is in the heart of every man to do; but to risk life for a bare existence, for other people's profit and for an anonymous end partakes of that commonplace sublimity which does not form the favorite plot of poets, although once in awhile it is the subject of a daily paragraph.

For the vikings are not dead. From Portland to New Orleans our harbors

are full of them. They lounge upon our wharves, and we do not recognize them. They loiter on our streets, and we know them not.

SENATOR HOAR ON IMPERIALISM.

In one of the strongest speeches of all of the strong speeches made by him, Senator Hoar has pointed out that, in order to realize imperialism, we must revolutionize our form of government, and permit ambition, avarice, glory, power and wealth to take the place in the minds of our people, as controlling motives, of justice, freedom, kindness, love of country, love of home, public spirit, education, humanity and charity. It is not, he insists, a mere change of government policy; it is a change of national existence and national ideals, the first step, but a long one, toward the destruction of the American republic. He announces that this policy is one which he proposes to resist to the death, and that, in his opinion, through the advocacy of it, "the people of the United States are confronted at this moment with the most serious danger that they have encountered in all their history, unless we except the danger that slavery would be extended over the whole country, or the danger that the rebellion would succeed."

Here is a solemn warning and pledge given by the senior senator of Massachusetts in the congress of the United States, in a speech of almost unparalleled weight and force. In making this declaration, there can be little doubt that Senator Hoar believed he was echoing the cool, sober views of a majority of the citizens of Massachusetts. Clearly, if he is right—and there is no reason to think that he is wrong, for the advocates of imperialism are daily proclaiming that their views are those which are to control national action—it behooves the people of this state to do all that lies in their power to uphold their senior senator, and endeavor to make Massachusetts influence in opposition to a pernicious change as strong and effective as possible.—From Editorial in Boston Herald of July 16.

GOVERNOR ALTGELD ON OUR NA- TIONAL DEVELOPMENT.

This war is creating new conditions. It is starting new currents which we cannot stop, and upon which we must launch our boat if we would not be left behind. The man who launches his boat upon the river will be carried to the sea; the man who refuses to do so will remain behind. This mighty nation is stirred, and is going to move along the line of its natural development toward the goal of the

greatest usefulness and the greatest power. Providence designed this nation to be the supreme mistress of the western hemisphere, and we must steer our vessel toward this haven. While the democracy shaped the policy of this country we had close commercial relations with all people, and the time is near at hand when this will again be the case. We must dig and absolutely own the Nicaragua canal. It is essential to our progress, to our safety and to our convenience. For our own safety and advantage we must, in the course of time, as they become ripe for such a step, acquire the West Indian islands, to round out our south-eastern boundary and perfect our republic. We must have harbors all over the earth for the accommodation of our fleets, of our navy and of our shipping.

These things are in the line of our natural development and progress. They do not involve the establishment of a corrupt colonial system. They will be in line with the policy pursued by all of the great democrats who gave this republic the American continent. On the other hand, we must prevent those wild schemes of conquest and plunder which contemplate the establishment of a colonial empire on another continent and under conditions which must result in injustice and in gigantic scandals, schemes which, instead of adding honor to our flag, would pollute it in the estimation of mankind; schemes which would involve us in endless difficulties and wars, and which in the end could not give us any advantage over and above that which we would get by simply securing intimate commercial relations with these countries. Our motto must be "the natural development and supremacy of this continent," but opposition to spoliation and conquest." "A mighty Anglo-Saxon republic, not a mongrel conglomeration."—Speech at Democratic State Convention, July 2.

ADVANCED DEMOCRATIC DOCTRINE.

Ex-Governor Altgeld, of Illinois, who is one of the most brainy men among the modern radical democracy, delivered a speech at the late democratic state convention of his state, which has importance from the character and influence of its author. He lays down a course of action for the future, which he holds to be "in line with the policy pursued by all the great democrats who gave this republic to the American continent." It comprehends the acquisition of the

West Indian islands, "in the course of time, as they become ripe for such a step," but is against "wild schemes of conquest and plunder, which contemplate the establishment of a colonial empire on another continent, and under conditions which must result in injustice and gigantic scandals." Our national motto must be, he says, "the natural development and supremacy of this continent, but opposition to spoliation and conquest." Here is the doctrine outlined previously by Mr. Bryan, indorsed and formulated by a more powerful mind. It may afford the key for the future to the democratic party. Governor Altgeld is unquestionably a thoughtful man in statesmanship, however there may be dissent from some of the ideas he has advanced. He is much nearer being great in point of intellect than many who have opposed him have been in the habit of conceding.—From Editorial in Boston Herald of July 16.

GOV. ALTGELD ON BOLTING.

The interests of the half million democrats of this state are greater than those of any individual, and while it is necessary that the majority shall govern, that democrats shall support their ticket, when it is put up according to democratic methods, it is also a fundamental principle of democracy that the voters shall have a voice in selecting candidates, and wherever they are deprived of a fair opportunity to express that choice, there the nomination is not a democratic nomination. And it is another fundamental principle of democracy that no party can compel a man to support a criminal for office. I do not for one moment dispute the fact that if the democrats of any legislative district want to elect a boodler to the legislature it is their privilege to do it, but they must not be compelled by any trickery to submit to having a representative who is not their choice. The law has provided, in every case, that where the voters of a party are not satisfied with the nomination that has been made, they can put up another candidate by petition, and I want every democrat in this state to hear me, when I say that in every case in which a man who is regarded by the public as a boodler forces himself upon the ticket, through machinery or trickery, there the democrats must be given an opportunity to say at the polls whether they want him or whether they do not want him. And in every such district it is the duty of men who want to perpetuate free institutions, who want to save the foundations of liberty, who want

government to be something more than a mere machine to rob the people, it is the duty, I say, of all such men to see to it that this boodleism is brought to an end. Two years ago in forming our lines we threw off the parasites and the deadheads, and the more we threw off of this element the more vigorous and powerful we became. We have a little poison in our blood yet.—Speech at Democratic State Convention, July 12.

THE BISHOP OF LONDON ON THE RELIGIOUS CARE OF YOUNG MEN.

This is a matter which greatly interests the younger clergy. They are always willing, the bishop tells us, "to discuss with the greatest earnestness and zeal how to get hold of young men"—meaning usually young men of the working class. They have the clearest possible conception of what such a young man ought to be, and the bishop has been greatly struck with the high standard which underlies this conception. But his attitude towards this conception is wholly one of acceptance.

"I have reduced," he says—and we can well believe him—"conference after conference to nothing by saying: 'Well, I suppose that when you were at school at the age of 17 the attitude that you had towards your school chapel and all the religious privileges that were there offered to you was what you have expected as natural from the working lads of East London.' I am afraid that this remark has been followed by a gasp and a gulp on the part of the speaker, and that he has sat down without having anything else to say."

That is precisely the sort of warning that the younger and more enthusiastic clergy need. They "too much tend to deal with boys in the abstract, with the ideal boy, without considering sufficiently the real boy." And one great corrective to this omission would be "a little recollection of our own boyhood"—and, we may add, of our own contemporaries in, and long after, boyhood.

Where religion is concerned classes are very much alike. Descriptions of working-class irreligion often bear a striking resemblance to what we know of irreligion among professional men. The difference is that this latter phenomenon is not described. The function of the professional and the upper classes generally in the community is to subscribe to missions for spreading religion in the slums, and the clergy are fain to regard this in the light of