

out a close guess on most anything you please—vaudeville, song and dance, "Trovatore," old-time ballad or constitutional law. I put in: "Brewer on Government by Injunction," and this chip flew out:

SONG OF THE JUDGES.

We're believers in the fiat of Injunction,
In corporations, money and the pelf;
Put the dollar o'er the man without com-
punction,
And lay the man himself upon the shelf—
But there's that blamed old charter of King
John says we mustn't.

But suppose luck ran against the Lord's
anointed,
And Democrats and riff-raff should get
in,
Impeach the rank and file of the appointed,
And rob us of our yearly tale of tin—
There's that blamed old charter of King
John 'ud back 'em up in it.

Somethin' the matter with the ma-
chine, I guess—kind o' drags on the
last line. But honest, I'm goin' to con-
sult you further on this injunction busi-
ness. It's a-worryin' me. I wish I
could appoint a man a good lawyer
as easy as I can appoint him a
justice of the Supreme Court of the
United States. Look at the beauty
show I've got there now! Smooth as
eggs, but no earthly good. If they were
chair-makers the chairs they'd turn out
would stand on two legs and tip.
They've got the intellectual rickets.
See what they did with my Constitution
—good straight Constitution, too, backed
by Magna Charta and the old English
common law—said it didn't apply to
Manila! What's the result? Why
now all my foreign territory is a world
of chance, with Taft floatin' around
and tryin' to keep on top and save the wreck-
age. I'm goin' to give the whole Philip-
pine territory back to the Filipinos some
day, and stop the disgrace, expense and
bother. That's what I'm thinkin' of.

UNCLE SAM.

WHO IS A CHRISTIAN?

Extract from a sermon preached in St. James Episcopal church, Greenville, Miss., July 5, 1903, by the Rev. Quincy Ewing.

"To this end I was born, and for this cause came I into the world, that I should bear witness unto the truth. Everyone that is of the truth heareth my voice."

It is easy enough, and always has been, to discover whether or not a man has "confessed Christ;" but thousands have "confessed Christ," and remained at heart followers of some other master, between whom and Christ there was fixed an immense gulf. Paganism, heathenism, barbarism, brutelism, do not become Christian because they spell the name of their Messiah or their God with the letters that spell Christ; names may indicate realities, but realities are painfully often belied

by names. From the beginning until now, there have been thousands of varnished, unregenerated pagans, heathen, barbarians, who have been known as professing Christians—some of them prominent laymen; some, priests; some, bishops; some, archbishops; some, popes;—varnished, unregenerated pagans, heathen, barbarians, who would have to be severely excluded in making up the roll of citizenry of the Kingdom of Christ to save it from confusion with the kingdom of the Devil!

But the difficulty of determining who are Christians, and who are not, is not due to any lack of simplicity or definiteness on the part of the religion of Jesus Christ. There was never anything more simple or definite than that religion, however jumbled and distorted, however padded or starved, the essential elements of it may appear in this wise man's theology, or that infallible church's creed. The test of Christian discipleship is simple enough; the difficulty is in applying it in the face of ancient prejudices and superstitions. But that difficulty is greatly minimized when, fully accepting the test, we resolve honestly and fearlessly that it ought to be applied.

If we are able to feel that Christianity has to do primarily with realities rather than with names or forms—realities of the heart, mind, soul—then in applying the test of Christian discipleship, we should be bold enough to ask concerning any man, not, Is he a church member? not, Has he "confessed" Christ? but, rather, Does he in the most real thought and purpose of his life reverence those truths that Jesus held supreme? Does he in his inmost heart accept it as the eternal aim and destiny of his being to obey the will of the Father-God, to serve the brother-man?

These are the test questions; and he of whom they are affirmatively answered must be included in the spiritual Kingdom of Jesus Christ, no matter what he is called, no matter what he calls himself. He may be dwelling in a land where churches are many, and the name of Christ a familiar sound; and he may not be called by his fellowmen, or call himself, either a churchman or a Christian. He may be dwelling in some land where no church has ever yet been built, and the name Christ has never yet been heard; but, wherever he may be, and whatever he call himself, or be called by others, the man who strives to worship by obedience the unseen God who made him, to help and uplift the hu-

man brother who needs him—such a man has heard the redemptive Voice, and cannot be rightfully excluded from the spiritual kingdom of Jesus Christ, without ignoring the very vital heart of His religion, without dispiritualizing it, without making it form first and substance afterwards!

The spiritual kingdom of Jesus Christ may exist without any visible church or formal creed, however valuable church and creed may be in witnessing to its truth and power; but the spiritual kingdom of Jesus Christ does not anywhere exist, and cannot, save as human souls claim for their own the spiritual attitude of the Christ Himself toward the invisible Father in Heaven, and the struggling brother on earth.

GOD AND LIBERTY.

In Cincinnati, July 19, Herbert S. Bigelow spoke on the above subject, at the Vine Street Congregational Church.

It is told of Voltaire that when an old man a friend brought to him his son for a blessing. Voltaire put his hands on the lad's head and said: "My son, God and Liberty—remember these words."

Are they not indeed the greatest words in the vocabulary of man? God and Liberty. The dark hours in the history of the race have been the times when these words were forgotten.

These words mean nothing apart from each other. They are but different sides of the one mighty thought.

I have heard men argue that there is no God. I have attended some of these "anti-God" meetings, and have read the literature of unbelief. They think they are fighting the idea of God. In reality it is only some caricature of God. The essence of the idea is seldom questioned even by professed atheists. They are fighting the God of theology and not the living God.

I should say that every man believes in God who believes in liberty. He has in him the essence of faith in God who believes that liberty is always and at all times practicable.

Faith in God means faith in this universe. It means faith in the rationality of this universe. It means faith in the morality of this universe. It means that such is the nature of the universe that truth must prevail here, that right must triumph. It means faith in the eternal harmonies. It means a boundless hope for the future. It means confidence in the destiny of the race; that unconquerable spirit of optimism which inspired the words of Whittier:

But life shall on and upward go;
Th' eternal step of progress beats

To that great anthem, calm and low,
Which God repeats.

Now is it not apparent that faith in Liberty is but a corollary of this faith in God?

Suppose one believes that the foundations of the universe have been laid in equity and truth; that error needs but to be known to be discredited; that truth needs but to be tried to be proven. Suppose one has the faith that in this world of truth falsehood must stumble at every step, while reason and experience must continually admonish us of the righteous way. He who has this faith in the weakness of error and the might of truth will have faith in liberty. He will prize liberty as the guarantee of progress, the salvation of the world.

Among the greatest words of Scripture are those of Gamaliel, who advised against the persecution of the disciples of Jesus, because he believed that if they had the truth, opposition would be hopeless; and if they did not have it, it would be needless. Gamaliel had faith in the universe, therefore he had faith in Liberty.

Recently I saw a book which had been blue-pencilled by the censor of a certain ecclesiastical institution. I do not mention the name of the church, because bigotry is not the fault of one church more than another. This was a book on social problems written by an earnest and thoughtful man. But it taught a "strange doctrine" and was considered "unsafe." Its publication was prohibited, save the expurgated edition which I saw. The ugly blotches seemed to me like the shadows of the dark ages projected across the pathway of the twentieth century. Out of those mutilated pages there seemed to rise the image of truth, with blood-smeared face, and wounds which told of the assassin's cowardly work. As I turned the leaves of that book I marveled at the pygmy faith of the man who fancies that God's universe needs to be defended by his blue pencil.

Faith in God involves the faith that whatever is just must be accomplished in due time. Here, for instance, is a test of faith. We know now what the mere land is worth on which Boston stands. We know what it was worth 15 years ago. We know that in the last 15 years land values in that city have risen \$245,000,000, an average of over \$16,000,000 a year. We know that the average tax in Boston for the same length of time has been less than \$13,500,000.

This is to say that if Boston in the last 15 years had raised all her public revenue by means of a land value tax,

she would have exempted her industries from the burden of taxation, and she would have taken from the landlords only that unearned increment of land value due to the growth of the population and industry of the city.

That would take a great weight from the back of labor. It would take nothing from the landlords which properly belongs to them. The Springfield Republican, in commenting on these facts, seems to recognize the equity of this plan of raising public revenue. Then this journal, which on most public questions has shown so much faith in the right, calmly states that "apart from a question of right and justice" this plan can never be carried out because the selfishness of the landlord will oppose it. That is what I call an example of practical atheism. To concede that a thing is right, and then to give up all hope of bringing it about because there are evil forces which oppose it, that is faith in the devil; it is faith in the power of evil. It is not faith in the sovereign truth.

Faith in God implies faith in man. The tendency of the race is upward. Let unbelieving men repeal their meddling laws. Give the world a chance. Liberty is the only safety. Try to make good men, and you will only make them weak. Give them freedom, and the good in them will assert itself. Trust freedom as you trust God. Love freedom as you love men. If ever the words of a prophet were inspired it was when Isaiah boldly stated that to worship God truly is to serve the cause of Liberty, "to loose the bands of wickedness, to undo the heavy burdens, and to let the oppressed go free, and that ye break every yoke."

HON. THOS. E. WATSON ON CHILD LABOR.

The legislature of Georgia has been considering a bill to prohibit the employment of children under 12 years of age in the mills and factories of that State. On the evening of July 6 a meeting was held in the capitol building at Atlanta in the interest of the bill. The special correspondent of the Augusta Weekly Chronicle states that it "was one of the greatest demonstrations ever seen in the hall of the house of representatives. The capitol was a blaze of light, and the audience was packed to the ceiling. The aisles were so jammed with people, both on the floor and in the galleries, that those who got into the push could not go in or out. Hundreds were turned away and the corridors were filled with people. They kept coming and trying to gain admission to the hall long after nine o'clock." The Hon. Thomas E. Watson was the chief speaker of the evening. We reproduce a portion of Mr. Watson's speech from the columns of the Augusta Chronicle of July 8.

THE BILL.

What does the Houston bill seek to

do, and what are the arguments in its favor?

(1) It proposes to have the sovereign State give its protection to those who sorely need protection and who otherwise are helpers.

If child bondage be wrong, it is obvious that unless the State acts, the bondage will continue. The same conditions which caused it will perpetuate it unless the higher power steps in.

(2) It proposes that modern commercialism shall be told in language it must obey that our twentieth century civilization will not allow the children of the land to be thrown into its hopper and ground out into dividends.

It proposes to declare that modern religious sentiment and the enlightened convictions of leading men and women will not allow built up amongst us a system whereby our Christian civilization, like Saturn of old, devours its own children.

(3) It proposes to rectify and make safe the foundations upon which our future civilization depends. The children of to-day are those in whose hands will be borne the standards of our future progress. To the extent that we enslave and stunt and debase the child of to-day we damn in advance the civilization of to-morrow.

(4) It proposes to restore the order of nature—declared everywhere by the God of nature—a law to which all brute creation conforms, that the parent shall support the tender-aged offspring and not the tender-aged support the parent.

To allow idle, dissipated, unnatural parents to live in ease at the expense of little children of tender age is to reverse the order of nature and set at naught the law of God. Who objects to the Houston bill, and upon what grounds?

ITS OPPONENTS.

The associated cotton mills, through their Republican representative, H. C. Hanson, appear before the Georgia legislature. And at the very outset he exposes the weakness of his cause by abusing his opponents. In effect, he classes the advocates of the bill under the three heads of Fools, Fanatics and Demagogues.

This was a fine display of insolence made by a Republican to the Democratic legislature of Georgia!

In whose behalf did Hanson appear?

In that of capital? Oh, no. Associated capital never asks anything for itself.

Wearing the same old hypocritical