

to acknowledge its mistakes, and make as free and full a restitution as is possible under the circumstances.

C. E. THORNMARK.

WHY THE PRINTERS WANT AN EIGHT-HOUR DAY.

The Congregational ministers of Boston were discussing "The Ethics and Necessity of Labor Unions" on Jan. 29, according to a report in the Boston Globe. Henry Sterling, secretary of the Boston Typographical union, presented the ethical basis of trades unionism.

In reply to a question from the floor, Mr. Sterling said that in the issue between the Typothetae and the Typographical union the only one raised by the union was that of hours of labor, but that the employers had injected those of wages and open shop.

Mr. Sterling also said that the reason for the demand for eight hours was that "the average life of printers is short, caused by the intense concentration of mind necessary in the occupation of printers, and the conditions under which they work. There is a larger proportion of consumptives among them than in any other trade, and it is desirable that they get more outside air, so as to prolong life to its natural length.

"Hours have been cut in newspaper offices, with the consequence that the health of printers employed in them is far above what it was ten years ago. Therefore, the demand is first for health and life, and second for an opportunity for self-improvement.

"If you ministers really want to help in this movement in a practical way, the most efficient thing you can do is to insist that the books you buy have the union label."

CAPITAL PUNISHMENT.

Among a large number of recent magazine articles on capital punishment, but one was found which offered any apology for the practice. This one was written by the professor of "Moral Philosophy" in Cornell university. The professor favored capital punishment as a means of doing the victim good. This was said, not in the sense that a dead Indian is said to be a good one. The professor's idea was that the murderer needed this shock to make him sufficiently penitent and bring him back into harmonious relationship with his fellow beings.

Now comes another Christian scholar, the president of Oberlin College, who declares that the "question of capital punishment is not one that can be decided upon principles of abstract right and wrong."

If the question of capital punishment cannot be decided upon principles of abstract right and wrong, what question can be so decided? Can a thing be wrong in the abstract, and right in the concrete? If we are to ignore abstract principles in dealing with the murderer, why may we not set them aside when we trade horses or sell life insurance? Are there any "principles" of right and wrong? If so, when is a man bound to respect them? Might not the chicken thief plead that his trade is one that should not be judged by principles of abstract right and wrong? If the executioner is beyond the jurisdiction of morality, why not the thief?

Would society have more to fear from murderers if capital punishment were abolished? This is the only question left if there are no principles involved.

There has been no execution in Switzerland since 1879, none in Holland since 1860, none in Portugal since 1843, none in Finland since 1826. If the humanity of these states had resulted in a great increase of murderers, it would seem that they might have discovered the fact by this time, and returned to the blood-for-blood plan.

If life is less safe in Michigan or Maine than in Ohio or New York, statistics do not reveal the fact.

But no one who believes in the inherent justice of the universe, would expect to find that an institution which is wrong in principle could be expedient in practice. Tell me what is right, and I'll tell you what is practicable.

Judicial murder must brutalize men. It cannot beget a respect for life. The murderer is not to be hated. He, most of all, is to be pitied. We should look upon him in sorrow, not in anger. His crime does not give us the least warrant for injuring him. It rather puts us under greater obligation to do him good, because his need is great.

If the state is to have hangmen, would it not be appropriate to draft for that service the preachers who profess to be disciples of the Nazarene, and still defend the gallows? What right has a man to claim the name "Christian," who does not acknowledge the duty to return good for evil?

No man can believe in capital punishment when once he comprehends the truth of Victor Hugo's assertion that the slums are the product of so-

cial injustice, and that vice and crime are but the vomit of the slums. It is monstrous for society to condemn and kill the victims of its own stupidity.

Most criminals are more sinned against than sinning. Let the murderer be taken care of for the protection of the state and his own good. In our condemnation of his act, let us not forget our share of responsibility. The social wrongs, of which we are all guilty, chief of which is land monopoly, have filled our cities with the disinherited children of hunger and neglect, and these furnish our criminals.

Justice, not punishment, is the safety of the state.

HERBERT S. BIGELOW.

A PROFESSIONAL AUTOCRACY.

Portions of the witty address of the Hon. Grover Cleveland at the centennial anniversary of the Medical Society of the State of New York, celebrated in Albany, January 30, 1906. As reported in the Chicago Chronicle.

"For the purpose of our argument let us divide humanity into two sections—one composed of a few doctors and the other embracing the many millions of their actual or prospective patients.

"I appear for myself and these millions, and I claim at the outset that notwithstanding our large majority, the medical section of mankind has in one way or another curtailed the opportunity of freedom of thought and considerate hearing to which we are entitled by the laws of nature and of nature's God.

"We acknowledge that the world owes this minority a living. With a generous delicacy which reaches sublimity we are on their account not over-obedient to the laws of health and we sometimes pay their bills. When sick we submit with more or less humility to their orders. If we recover it is only to take our place on the waiting list, still subject to further advice. If we do not recover it is left to us to do the dying."

Mr. Cleveland acknowledged the great debt which humanity owed to the medical profession and the notable advancement that profession had made, but declared that it had not been made "without some corresponding advance in the intelligent thought and ready information of their patients along the same lines.

"We have come to think of ourselves as worthy of confidence in the treatment of our ailments, and we believe if this was accorded to us in greater measure it would be better for the treatment and better for us. We do not claim that