

betelnut and placing it between his stained lips, the sultan repeated the question: "Why are you here?" The governor was forced to abandon diplomacy, and said he was a soldier and came to Jolo because he was ordered; that all questions of state must be referred to a higher authority, and that it would take some time to get satisfactory explanations.

"What do you intend to do?" the sultan asked. He may not be a man of many words, or of great capacity, but he asked awkward questions.

HARD TO FIND EMPLOYMENT.

One of the most active business men of Boston has been telling some of his experience and observation of the difficulty experienced by young people in getting situations. He spoke of graduates of colleges, both men and women, though his remarks may well apply to others. He is in a position where educated persons would be more likely than others to imagine that there would be an opening with him for them. He says that he averages about one application a day, from young men and women. He told of his experience in helping a young friend in getting employment. He was a bright, educated fellow, and it seemed, with the older man's introduction and guarantee, as if he could find a situation. With his letters the young man went from one place to another, but only to find absolutely nothing for him to do. He could not get a foothold anywhere. The singular fact about his rebuff in almost every place was that it was connected with the trusts. The business house would say either that it had just gone into a trust and was discharging help, instead of taking on any more, or that it had been squeezed by the trust so that it was not able to do much business, or that the trust operations had made the business so uncertain that they did not know what they should do in the future, but if they should have any occasion to take on any additional help, they preferred to take experienced men who had been thrown out by the trust, and whom they knew to be experienced and all right, rather than take a young man. The upshot of the matter was, that, for one or another of these reasons, the young man could get no encouragement anywhere. My informant says that he knows of a dozen of similar cases, of college graduates of a few years' standing, smart and capable men, who are anxious to get work, but find the doors closed to them. One of

them remarked to him that he was willing to begin by washing windows, if it were with any assurance of anything better afterward. He knows of a case where one graduate of this class is acting merely as errand boy for a business house, because he could get nothing better to do.

Another business man, speaking in a similar line, said that he knew of a well-educated and competent graduate of the institute of technology, who is a civil engineer by training, who is to-day selling baking powder, in lack of anything better to do, and who finds a better opening in that line than in civil engineering. Another case was that of a young physician, who helps to keep the wolf from the door by soliciting advertising. These things are happening right here, in the midst of our good times.—Springfield Republican, of May 18.

SOME POINTS IN FAVOR OF DIRECT LEGISLATION.

Its adherents triumphantly point to the fact that frequently there is a small vote on constitutional amendments which are submitted to the people by their so-called superior body, the legislature, and they say the people will not vote on measures. This is true at times, but the corresponding fact is invariably overlooked, that often these things are not worth voting on. They are either trivial matters or else they are so ambiguously—not to say dexterously—worded that they have either no vitality in them or that vitality is extremely liable to be taken out by decisions of the courts. In fact judges and attorneys regularly complain that they cannot tell what these things mean, and honored judges have been known to completely change their minds within two weeks' time on their meaning. Is it any wonder then that oft-times the people should not think these things worth voting on? The fact that so many do go to the polls and vote on utterly unimportant matters is surprising.

Now if these things came from below up, if the people could really start an issue from themselves, as they can in Switzerland, by the initiative, then we would have the real, vital questions coming up for decision, and then we would find the people really voting on them. . . .

What happens when measures are disentangled from men and the people have a chance to vote directly on them? Those who are interested in the measure, vote on it. Those who are ignorant of it or who are not in-

terested in it, do not vote. Hence there is an automatic disenfranchisement of the ignorant and uninterested by themselves. You are much more likely to get a proper decision when the posted and interested vote. As long as no class are shut out from voting, this disenfranchisement by themselves is not injurious. . . .

Under direct legislation, if there is a small vote, it will simply show that either the matter is of small importance or else that opinion is all one way, so that many do not think it worth while voting because they are sure. This is what actually happens in Switzerland, where they have had direct legislation for years. One of its ex-presidents has said that whenever the people are vitally interested in a matter they come out and vote, and that though some things which he wanted carried were defeated by the people, he found, when he got some years off, so as to get a proper perspective and see these things in their true light, that the people were always right, even when they defeated the things he wanted carried. Thus in February, 1898, over 80 per cent. of the voters voted on the question of the nationalizing of the railroads of Switzerland, and there was no ballot-box stuffing to vitiate the figures, as here. I doubt if so high a percentage has ever been honestly cast in any large election in our country.

Let us take advice from our legislators, but not government. We have done away with the middle-man in religion, in business, in most every concern of life, let us do away with him in politics by having the power to pass on our laws whenever we see fit. In this way we can abolish political peptinoids and take such food as we need.—Eltweed Pomeroy, in The Direct Legislation Record.

A FEW ARGUMENTS FOR WOMAN SUFFRAGE.

Extracts from a paper read before the women of the Mississippi Suffrage association, at their annual meeting in Clarksdale, April 5 and 6, 1899, by Mrs. Quincy Ewing.

As one of the great American questions agitated for the past 40 years, and growing daily in the interest it excites, the question of suffrage for women early won my attention and allegiance. Looked at logically and dispassionately, it is one of conscience, of abstract right. In order to prove this we have but to recollect the fundamental principles announced in the Declaration of Independence: Governments derive their just powers

from the consent of the governed. Can the political condition of women be reconciled with this?

A reason sometimes given for the political non-existence of women is that their interests are identical with those of their fathers and husbands. But there are women who have no fathers and brothers, and, for those who have, laws are made for protection against fathers and brothers, if a sad fate makes such protection necessary. The reason, therefore, is worthless.

It has been urged that the mass of women do not wish to enact laws, though they feel their pressure. It may be so—but the noblest and best women are not so indifferent, having thought for themselves on the question; and their intelligent wish should decide it.

It would be well to quote to those who acquiesce in the old order of things, the ringing words of James Freeman Clarke:

I leave it to others to speak of Woman Suffrage as a right or privilege; I speak of it as a duty. Is this not your country as well as men's? And are you not bound to contribute whatever faculty God has given you to make it and keep it a pure, safe and happy land?

It has been urged by self-satisfied objectors that households would be divided by endless quarrels if women were given the ballot. The law does not, however, compel women to adopt the religious creeds of their husbands; practically this freedom has made no difficulty, and equal freedom in politics would make as little; for in history we find differences in religion have bred far more quarrels than differences in politics.

Yet another objection is this: "Will not the delicacy of womanhood suffer hurt if women be enfranchised?" Let us change the form of the question. Is political non-existence a school for the development of perfect womanhood? This query is important in itself and and what it involves. Is the character of one-half of the human race bettered, or dwarfed, by the absence of the grand notion of public duty engendered by public responsibility?

Let us ask the question: What is the sphere of woman? Is it one appointed by her guardians, and bounded by the ideas of narrow propriety inherited by the women who may read, but never think? Or is it a

broader and fuller one, appointed by God, and bounded but by the powers he has given? The acquiescence of women in any state but this latter proves nothing but their own want of intellectual and spiritual freedom. An acquiescence like this is an argument that cuts the wrong way for those who use it. Let women look to it, if they make no effort to secure privileges and duties they were meant to enjoy and fulfill; for it is sure that in despising such privileges they disgrace themselves.

If she be small, slight-natured, miserable, How shall men grow?

INCENDIARY TALK IN HIGH PLACES.

A paragraph among the editorial notes of the Congregationalist, of Boston, in its issue of last week, though very brief, must be esteemed significant. It calls attention, without distinct disapproval, to a sentiment which no one, even a very short time ago, could have expected as at all likely to appear in its columns—a sentiment which, both in expression or form and in purport, has apparently seemed to not a few excellent people as at least dangerous; that is, incendiary or revolutionary. It quotes thus:

The real issue that men of the future have got to meet is the struggle between plutocracy and democracy.

Of course, it is important to know who says this. This seems almost a first consideration with certain ones—not so much the truth of what is said, and its force on that ground, but the authority with which it comes. The statement is commented upon by the Congregationalist as follows:

These are not the words of W. J. Bryan or John P. Altgeld or Eugene Debs or any other supposed dangerous character from the inflammable and covetous west, although much like their utterances in tenor. They were spoken to the New England Free Trade league last week by Prof. William G. Sumner, professor of political and social science in Yale university since 1872. He supplemented the remark with the other statement that in every land with parliamentary institutions organized capital was trying to control legislatures for corporate profit and industrial exploitation.

The singularly ungracious reference to the west—not to characterize it as it more fully deserves—only renders more signal the significance of this editorial note. It is simply being forced upon the attention of the people of this country—what the west has long known and been ready, exposed to much obloquy, to speak of plainly, though assumed leaders of the people and editors in the east have tried their utmost to keep it out of sight—what a contest is going on in our land. What

Prof. Sumner, of Yale, says is true, but is not a particle more acceptable on that account than as said for years by men who have been persistently and malignantly discredited just for saying that. Representative government among us has come to be a thing of name only. It is so in our cities, in our states, and swiftly it is getting to be that in the nation. The representatives, legislative and executive, represent not the people, but, so far as effective action is concerned, they represent a power more masterful than votes, dominant over and not subject to the people. "Parliamentary institutions" are but a stalking-horse to cunning schemers. "Organized capital"—no matter who says it, providing it be true—is not only trying to control," as the Yale professor states, but has often succeeded in controlling, as is widely known, "legislatures for corporate profit and industrial exploitation." This is one of those things that so thoroughly ought to be said that he verily is guilty who keeps his tongue from saying it.—City and State (Philadelphia), of May 17.

A ROAD OF SORROW.

An extract from a letter describing the famine districts of India, written at Dhulia, Khandesh, April 3, to the Manchester (England) Guardian, by its special correspondent.

The drive of 34 miles from Chalisgaum to Dhulia, one of the taluka towns of western Khandesh, gave evidence enough and to spare of the state to which famine has reduced the richest district in the Deccan. Khandesh was thought to be proof against any serious famine, for it has a fertile soil and enjoys, as a rule, a sufficient rainfall. When the poorer provinces of the Deccan were suffering from the famine of 1896-7, Khandesh had only 16,000 people on relief works, and the official estimate for the present year, when things are indefinitely worse, was 33,000. The forecast was strangely wrong, for a quarter of a million men, women and children have found their way to the famine camps, and there is another 10,000 in the village—old, blind and village peasants—who get their dole of grain from government. So, then, the happy district which may be said to be almost a stranger to famine finds itself naked and helpless, like its famine-seasoned sisters of the Deccan, stripped at once of all reserves of fodder, food, cash, and even credit. There must be something wrong with India when one finds a collapse like this. The road along which I drove the other morning