

is the servant of the body over which he presides, and not its master, and, if he attempts to dominate the assembly or to thwart its will, any member may act in his place. But the court, without denying the correctness of this as an abstract proposition, did not consider that it was raised in the case, and said that, if it was, it was analogous to the right of revolution. It was held that in declining to entertain the motion and sustaining a point of order against it, the mayor was acting within the lines of his duty and powers as a presiding officer, and that, if he was in error, the remedy was not for another member to put the motion, but to appeal to the house from the decision, which, if a majority were against it, would be thereby overruled. The question which the court declined to decide would have been substantially presented if, on taking an appeal from the decision, the presiding officer had refused to put the question of sustaining his decision to vote. Whether such a refusal, which would cut off the last remedy of the aggrieved members, would justify one of them in putting the motion or not, remains undecided.—Case and Comment.

COAL AT \$2 A TON BUT FOR COAL TRUST.

Thomas P. Fowler, president of the New York, Ontario & Western railroad, made some startling revelations about coal prices before the state railroad commissioners in the Fifth Avenue hotel, New York, on March 14.

President Fowler stoutly declared that there was no such thing as a coal trust, but, in almost the same breath said that if the independent owners of coal mines were allowed to build a railroad of their own to market the product of the mines, stove coal would be selling in this city for two dollars a ton.

The independents want to build a railroad along the route of the abandoned Delaware and Hudson canal from Lackawaxen, Pa., to Kingston on the Hudson. The coal trust has been bitterly fighting the project of the independents.

John A. Garver, counsel for the independents, examined Mr. Fowler.

"What would be the effect on the New York market of an increased outlet for coal to tidewater?" asked Mr. Garver.

"It would, of course, reduce the price of coal, just as if you dumped potatoes on the market without a demand. Without some restriction there

would be coal on the market not needed and stove coal would be a drug at two dollars a ton. I suppose that would satisfy the individual operators."

"Then the output is restricted now?"

"We bring to the market all that is needed; all that can be sold to give a fair profit to the coal man."

"That is, the coal trust or combination?"

"There is no combination," retorted the witness.

Frank H. Platt, son of Senator Platt, as counsel for the coal trust, in opening for his side, denied all the claims of the independents.—N. Y. World.

ONE OF THE TESTS OF CIVILIZATION.

An interesting glimpse is given of national characteristics and ideals in the treatment accorded the aged poor in different lands. Beginning with America, the unprejudiced observer would probably conclude that to be old and poor in this country is nearly as bad as to be criminal. Those who have investigated the subject say that America treats its indigent aged worse than any other civilized country. Europeans generally form their opinions on this question from an observation of how New York treats her poor on Blackwell's island; but, after all, very few of the states do any better by this class of its population than New York. In France those of the aged poor who are lucky enough to gain admittance to the hospices fare better, perhaps, than similar persons fare anywhere this side of Japan, a country noted for the respect accorded to parents and the aged generally. Those who cannot obtain admission to the hospices of France are left to starve or beg outside. In Germany workmen over 70 who have contributed regularly to the pensions fund for 30 years are given a pension which amounts to less than \$50 a year. Other classes fare as they can. Both Denmark and Austria treat their aged poor with more kindness and consideration, the former sending the thriftless to the poorhouse, but providing liberally for the worthy poor, while Austria gives kindly and respectful treatment to all poor persons over 65. In Holland care for this class of the population is regarded as a religious duty. In Sweden, Norway and Switzerland the working people in general are so prudent and thrifty that few of them ever need help, while in Spain, Portugal and Italy the reverse is true, and no one of the working classes, as a rule,

acquires a competency for old age, but when strength fails resorts to begging.

As to Iceland, a writer in Temple Bar two years ago gave this description of the primitive but charming way in which the unfortunate aged are treated:

In every district a list is kept of the old people who are unable to provide for themselves, and at the beginning of the year the local authorities seek out homes for them. The custom is for each ratepayer to receive one or more of them, according to his means, into his house on a visit, the length of which depends, of course, upon the number of ratepayers there are in the commune. The old women are expected, provided they have the strength, to give a helping hand in the house where they are staying; and the old men, perhaps, in the garden; but if they be unwilling to work, no one would ever dream of using compulsion. For the most part these pauper visitors just saunter about in much the same way as old, worn-out family retainers might do, and have their meals with the rest of the household. It is an almost unheard-of thing, it seems, for them to be either neglected or ill-treated; for they are regarded as being under the special protection of the whole community; and if anyone were known to do them wrong he would speedily find every man's hand against him.

—Chicago Daily News.

THE FAMINE IN INDIA.

Faith in God is sometimes taxed by the sight of human misery. Many see a rift of light in the dense cloud of suffering hanging like a pall over "sad India," in that, through the efforts of Christian people to relieve the anguish, giving spiritual bread as they minister physical relief, many will find eternal life, and the suffering ones, going to these messengers of light because of their extremity, will gain relief that otherwise they would not only never have sought, but spurned when offered.

When God's children are deprived of their spiritual inheritance, we feel it to be a great calamity. We are ceaseless in our efforts and prayers that this priceless boon may be restored. If temporary relief from famine through the hands of God's people, may lead many into covenant relations with God, would not a permanent economic system, based on Christian ethics, be far more productive of wonderful results in this respect?

Is it as easy to lead people to see that God is their loving heavenly Father when they are cut off from the physical sustenance he undoubtedly planned for his creatures as it would be if a system prevailed by which they realized their temporal wants were supplied by him?

"The earth hath he given to the children of men" (Ps. cxv. 16). As the milk supply comes with the calf and baby, so come the land values with the community, and in proportion to the demand of the people is the supply of land values. If communities, instead of individuals, received these values, social conditions would be incomparably different. If the people of India could hoard the wealth of India, would they not have and to spare? Prof. Herron says, in "Between Caesar and Jesus:"

In the early part of 1897, when meetings for the relief of the famine in India were being held in English and American cities, when contributions were received from newsboys and washerwomen, scores of ships laden with wheat and carrying millions of money, arrived in English ports as rents from the people in India for the privilege of living on the lands the English had taken from them.

Dr. McGavran told us, at the jubilee convention, that it was not because there was not food in India that the people died by thousands of starvation, but because they were too poor to buy the food. Would they be as poor if labor had its just reward? Says Henry George:

If men lack bread, it is not that God has not done his part in providing it. If men willing to labor are cursed with poverty, it is not that the storehouse God owes men has failed, that the daily supply he has promised for the daily wants of his children is not here in abundance. Our trouble lies in that we have given into the exclusive ownership of the few the provision that a bountiful father has made for all.

May there not be deep lessons for us, in famine-free lands, in this daily death of thousands in India? Jesus never promised to care for the lilies and birds when separated from the land.

Is there not too little attention paid by Christians, ministers and missionaries to these matters of gospel economics? — Laura DeLany Garst, in Christian Standard, of Cincinnati.

WHAT IS ENGLISH?

Extract from an article with the above title, published in the London Speaker of April 21.

"English" means nothing, unless it has some reference to the traditions and the individuality of England. If an Englishman is proud of the aggression of his country, he is proud of something which is not peculiar to England. If he rejoices, as a good many of our London journalists are entitled to rejoice, that he did his part in inciting his countrymen to extinguish two independent communities of white men, he finds satisfaction in a policy which England

shares with Russia, Prussia, Turkey and the Saracens. If he has helped to extend the power of marauding financiers, he has certainly done something to draw England away from the beaten track and the traditional lines of her historical policy. Above all, if he has condoned the raid, made heroes of the chief actors, deprecated the payment of an indemnity to the Transvaal, and represented the whole transaction as a piece of romantic chivalry, he has taught his countrymen to admire qualities, such as forgery, lying, cowardice, bad faith, and financial greed, which nobody but the most ignorant and unscrupulous of Anglophobes has ever associated with the name of England.

The liberals who oppose the government, and who hate the spirit which during the last few years has been driving their countrymen into courses which they regard as dangerous and dishonoring, have no reason to fear the results of an appeal to the standards and the traditions of England. Let us take one aspect of the English history. For some generations our nation stood in the eyes of Europe for nationalism. The names of Canning, Byron, Palmerston, Lord John Russell—chief of all, that of Mr. Gladstone—were associated with that idealist movement which rescued the smaller states from despotism and gave a certain sacredness to the idea, the claims and the life of nationality. Nationalism has suffered a good deal at the hands of the jealousies, the ambitions, the new enthusiasms, which have given to the closing years of the century so dark and ominous a complexion for humanity. And if liberals wished to see in our policy in the near east something of the spirit which they were proud to identify with the actions of their greatest statesmen in the past, they might be open to rebuke on the grounds of a rash and inconsiderate judgment, but to say that their standpoint was not English would have been the silliest of slanders. Last year enough of that old tradition survived to make professors, politicians, men of letters and of science, in England as elsewhere, sad and indignant over the extinction of the autonomy of Finland. Is there anything anti-English or un-English in the feelings of liberals who are horrified and revolted by a course of action which has made their country no longer merely a helpless spectator in the eclipse of a national movement (as she was in the Greco-Turkish

war), no longer a sympathetic mourner over the destruction of a guaranteed autonomy (as she was last year), but the agent herself of the destruction of the principle for which, in other days, she had made so stout a stand in Europe? This may be cant, as it may be cant to believe in freedom of speech, but it is the kind of cant which made a great part of English history, and a part which we fancy a great many Englishmen have no wish to forget. . . .

There are not many Englishmen who remember with pride that we withdrew our ships from Port Arthur at the peremptory dictation of Russia; an indignity which was in no way redeemed after our retreat by our petulant assertions that our ships had the best of rights to be there. Let us recall that incident, the tone of the German dispatches a few months ago, the impotence of our fleet to act on the coast of Crete three years ago, except as the instrument of the German emperor's selfish ambition, and then recollect the exuberant enthusiasm with which some of our newspapers invited us to make war on two small republics with a united population that was comparable to that of a respectable English borough, and with a militia which, these newspapers assure us, would never take the field. An England which picks its quarrels with the weak and makes all its concessions to fear may be the England of Mr. Rudyard Kipling and of the Times, but it is not the England of history, and we don't think it will be the England of to-morrow.

THE PROFITS WILL GO TO THE FEW.

There is a point in regard to our national imperialism and expansionism that seems to be in danger of being overlooked by both sides in this controversy, and that is the point of who will receive the profits, if there shall be any, and who will pay the bills. Our new expansion is not to be an expansion of the race or nation in any such sense as our expansion on this continent has been. As Prof. Bernard Moses, one of the members of the new Philippine commission, has well said—and note his words, for it is a confession by an official engaged in the work, of the real inwardness of the whole scheme: "If our race moves forward upon these regions it will not be the race as a whole, but the race represented by its organizing and dominating classes. The migration beyond this shore will, therefore, be the movement of a class."