

count of 25 per cent. from the present duty on raw sugar, the saving to the Sugar Trust would approximate or perhaps exceed \$8,000,000.

It is rather startling to have President Roosevelt so anxious to see this bonus given to the Sugar Trust, and yet pose as the great trust fighter. But it must be remembered that no trust has been prevented from its extortion by the Republican plan of fighting them, and that "words are good only when backed by deeds."

The faction of the Republicans that is fighting Cuban reciprocity is the ultra-protectionists, who declare that no letter or word of the sacred tariff must be changed; and they are backed by the money of the trusts and the protected organizations and monopolies. The Protective Tariff League, the organization of the manufacturers who are benefited by the tariff, is the center around which all monopolists gather, and is supported by the money of monopolists. Its organ, the American Economist, is fighting Cuban reciprocity tooth and nail, on the ground that the Republican party is pledged to protect the domestic sugar growing interests. In its issue of September 11 it appeals to the Republicans to stand firm for those interests, and says:

There are some things which even Congress cannot do, and one of these things is to enact a revenue measure which originates with the Executive, is ratified by the Senate, and finally "approved" by the House of Representatives. Article 6 of the Constitution prescribes a procedure precisely the reverse of this. It requires that all laws relating to the revenues shall originate in the House, be concurred by the Senate and approved by the President. From the foundation of the Republic up to the present day this procedure has been followed. No revenue measure has ever been enacted into a law that did not originate in the House of Representatives.

Thus this faction of the Republican party takes issue with President Roosevelt and his faction by declaring that a reciprocity treaty which reduces the tariff is unconstitutional because, "all laws relating to the revenues must originate in the House of Representatives." As this reciprocity treaty with Cuba will be the most important political issue that will come before Congress, the position of the Democrats, who hold the balance of power between the Republican factions, is significant. At the close of the last Congress, after Cuban reciprocity had been defeated, the Democratic members held a caucus and declared:

Resolved, First: That we condemn the Republican majority in Congress for their failure to pass a measure providing reciprocity with Cuba.

The bill which passed the House of Rep-

resentatives was heartily supported by the Democratic minority after the protection to the sugar trust had been removed by the solid Democratic vote, aided by a small minority of the Republican members. As it passed the House, the bill carried relief to Cuba, reduced the price of sugar to American consumers and struck a heavy blow at the notorious and obnoxious sugar trust. The refusal of the Republican senators to consider this measure unless the protection to the sugar trust should be restored gives evidence that the President and the Republican party in Congress are willing to refuse relief to Cuba and totally ignore American consumers, rather than abandon their alliance with the trusts.

From these declarations it will be seen that the Democrats favor Cuban reciprocity, but demand that at the same time the protection to the Sugar Trust of one cent and upwards a pound on refined sugar, known as the differential duty, should be abolished. That proposition was passed by the House of Representatives, the vote being: Yeas, 199; nays, 105; 61 Republicans voting with the Democrats. (See Congressional Record, April 18, 1902, page 4610.)

The minority faction of the Republicans thus voting with the Democrats made the majority for the abolition of the protection to the Sugar Trust. The bill then passed the House as amended: Yeas, 247; nays, 52; but the Senate refused to adopt it.

The whole fight will be repeated when Congress meets, and it will be interesting to watch the votes of the Republican members, and see how they line up, for or against the Administration programme. The Democrats will offer the same amendment to abolish the differential duty on refined sugar which gives shelter to the Trust, and adds at least one cent a pound to all sugar consumed in this country. * * *

MAYOR JOHNSON'S WAY.

AS AN ADMINISTRATOR.

A committee of three men connected with the city government of Montreal were in the city yesterday investigating the methods of street cleaning and other work in charge of the board of public service. They are on a tour through several cities of the Middle States. The visitors were very favorably impressed with the condition of the city's streets and were surprised to learn the relatively small cost of the work.

"We pay a good deal more than that," said one of the men, "but our streets are much dirtier than yours." They considered the Cleveland street cleaning service the best they had seen. They left for Detroit after a tour of the city.

The night work on the paved streets

is to be stopped for awhile. More men are needed for day work in cleaning the leaves off the streets. About 50 men have been laid off who have been doing night work. This will result in a saving of about \$80 a day.—Cleveland Plain Dealer, of Oct. 9.

AS A CAMPAIGNER.

This morning [Oct. 7] Mayor Johnson faced a howling mob of Republican students of the Ohio Normal University at Ada. This meeting was not on Chairman Salen's programme. It was arranged by Mr. Johnson himself before leaving Kenton. He was informed by W. L. Finley and other Hardin county leaders that it was the Republican student vote at Ada which made Hardin county doubtful, and that without this student vote the county would be safely Democratic. The mayor at once decided to go to Ada and talk to the students.

A telephone message was sent just before the mayor started and the meeting was arranged upon an hour's notice. It proved to be one of the most interesting incidents of the campaign. . . . As by a preconcerted plan the boys, as soon as they had become well settled in the hall, sang in chorus a doggerel rhyme, a compound of pointed anathema for Johnson and Democrats in general and of praise for "Hanna, Herrick, Harding, rah, rah, rah." The student body is Republican ten to one and the personal consignment of Johnson to the nether regions was bellowed forth with a thunder of strong lungs which made the ancient building tremble.

"That was a fine song," said Mr. Johnson, smiling at the crowd, and heedless of the grins of derision which met him on every side. "I wish you boys would sing it again so that I could receive the full benefit of it."

No further invitation was required, and again the lusty Republican throats expressed their unqualified contempt for Johnson and the "Demmes" and their everlasting faith in "Hanna-Herrick-Harding, Rah! Rah! Rah!"

"That's a fine song," repeated Mr. Johnson, still in the very best of good humor. "A mighty fine song. I'd like to know the man who wrote it. Of course there is not much argument about it, but it is a good song, nevertheless."

Then the mayor spoke for 45 minutes upon subjects which were most calculated to appeal to the students. He dwelt mainly upon Senator Hanna's past record. Instead of attacking Mr. Willis [professor of political science in the University, and a Republican representative to the last legislature from Hardin county], as

the students had evidently expected, Mr. Johnson took occasion to praise him in the highest terms for his vote against the "curative act," for Willis was one of the nine Republican legislators who "bolted" their party on this measure. In perfectly respectful language the mayor criticised Mr. Willis for fathering the "Willis bill," to levy a fixed tax upon corporations regardless of the value of stock. At the outset Mr. Johnson was received with entire coldness. Toward the end, after he had worked in two or three apt stories, the students became much more friendly and even applauded occasionally. When the speaker had finished he was given a rousing cheer. Mr. Willis, who had been in the hall throughout Mr. Johnson's speech, took occasion to thank the students for the respectful manner in which they had listened to the Mayor.

After Mr. Willis had thus done the graceful thing Mr. Johnson again addressed himself to the students and smilingly requested them as a grand finale to repeat once more the political doggerel with which they had received him. But a great change had taken place. Not a single voice took up the song. Instead, the entire body, including those who had "rah, rah, rah" most lustily for Hanna-Herrick-Harding, joined in a mighty cheer for Johnson. The real ovation came at the Mayor's departure. Nearly a thousand students gathered at the campus about the "Red Devil" and yelled themselves hoarse. A big cannon was called into requisition and was fired three times as a parting salute. Never has Mayor Johnson better displayed his ability to turn an intensely hostile crowd into a friendly and enthusiastic gathering.—Carl T. Robertson, Staff Correspondent, in Cleveland Plain Dealer of Oct. 8.

WHY SHOULD WOMAN "OBEY"?

When Miss Ethel Clement, of Rutland—that charming Vermont town in the heart of the marble region—objected to utter the word "obey" in the marriage service of the Protestant Episcopal church, and elected rather to be married by a Congregational minister, who was not compelled by any ritual to require it, she had no notion of waging a general dispute over the matter. But so great is the power of tradition, so pervading the superstition of the subjection of woman, that the incident has received much attention. We read the most scathing comments on the conduct of Miss Clement, who is certainly a woman of character and conscience, and also of cultivated intellect and social standing. Nevertheless here is what an emi-

nent journal like the New York Tribune allows one of its juvenile editors to say:

She embarks upon her conjugal career with the buoyancy and light-heartedness of one not vowed to "mind" anybody. The number of these headstrong and insubordinate brides is happily never large enough to cause a social revolution, but about so many are sure to appear during each pairing season, and it is just possible that the records of most of them may show forth a sweet docility instead of that kicking in the harness which might not unreasonably be looked for.

The contrary is the fact. This woman starts honestly on her wifely duties. They must be the same for husband and wife, and not otherwise. The word and the idea "obey" as applied to the woman alone are wrong. They would be no better, but just as right, if it were the man who should say "obey." They belong to an age which passes as the higher conception of marriage prevails. Neither should obey, neither should command; the husband and wife are equal partners in the life of the family, and they meet on equal terms; they are to reason together, and in mutual love to determine the course of their life. The husband may be the stronger and the wiser—the wife may be the stronger and the wiser—and if the union be based on anything more permanent than mere attraction of sex or sordid business conditions, the essential qualities of the pair will find their own power, and be recognized, to the gradual arrival at a true coworking, such as fulfills the fit idea of marriage. A stricture like that we have quoted is not worthy of utterance in this day and this stage of perception of the equality of man and woman.

The legend of Eden, the doctrine of Paul, the tyrannic notions of Milton (which he so hatefully exemplified in his treatment of one of his wives), these are of the past. Woman was never the inferior of man; indeed, it is well known that the earliest growths of civilization were from woman. In the ages of violence, of barbarism, of feudalism, she was crushed under the iron hand, and at the best was an exponent of "sweet, attractive grace." This is not so to-day. As a matter of fact, woman has ruled the household, and not infrequently the state, by indirection. She should not rule so, but frankly, by her brain and heart, which work together with man's brain and heart for the best results, and when this is the case, there is the honorable and high motivated family and the noble community. The community yet lacks this great element in its legislation and its political life, because woman is not yet come to her own station of equal rank. She should vote with man, as she labors with man; and so united, they would make a different and better world.

We find in the Windham County Reformer of Brattleboro an excellent declaration on this particular instance, which we shall quote as gospel truth:

Miss Ethel Clement, of Rutland, who objects to the word "obey" in the marriage service, is probably a woman to whom a promise means something. She does not wish to cheapen her word by giving it unnecessarily or where she has no idea of keeping it. And she is quite right. In the old days, before woman had been given educational privileges, and when custom kept her closely in the home, dependent upon the exertions of father, brother or husband, there was some significance to the word "obey" as applied to her. In those times women obeyed their husbands, or were supposed to. If they had their own way then, it was only through the unexplainable wiles of femininity, as old as the world. But now it is different. Woman is no longer dependent, subservient, clinging. She is an individual, thoughtful, reliant, resourceful. She is her husband's companion, comrade, partner—not his shadow and echo. Sometimes in the affairs of the family over which the two preside, the wife has obviously better judgment, better skill in management, and the husband of to-day, if he recognizes this fact, is very glad to defer to his partner's ideas for the good of the firm. We are more sensible in these matters than we used to be. And in the present state of human development it is surely enough if one promises love and consideration in the marriage relations. If there were love and consideration on both sides, could there be any question of obedience between husband and wife?

No one has said it better than Tennyson in "The Princess"—words often quoted, never staled, but open to the grandest interpretation that can be conceived of the perfect working together of the complements of the race of man, so evolved out of the divine spirit, and growing slowly, as all growth is, from age to age, until the fulfillment.

The prince says to the princess:

The woman's cause is man's; they rise or sink
Together, dwarfed or godlike, bond or free;
For she that out of Lethe scales with man
The shining steeps of Nature, shares with man
His nights, his days, moves with him to one goal,
Stays all the fair young planet in her hands,
If she be small, slight natured, miserable,
How shall men grow? but work no more alone!
Our place is much; as far as in us lies
We two will serve them both in aiding her—
Will clear away the parasitic forms
That seem to keep her up, but drag her down—
Will leave her space to burgeon out of all
Within her—let her make herself her own
To give or keep, to live and learn, and be
All that not harms distinctive womanhood.
For woman is not undeveloped man,
But diverse; could we make her as the man
Sweet love were slain; his dearest bond is this,