

ed by a vote of 36 to 21, after a somewhat acrimonious debate. The resolution is printed on 6,234. Hoar introduced a bill, which provides for extradition with Cuba (printed on 6,233), and which was referred to the committee on the judiciary. Morgan's motion that the senate consider the Nicaragua canal bill was lost by a vote of 28 to 21. Consideration of the post office appropriation bill was resumed. On the 22d a resolution of inquiry regarding military statistics in the Philippines, introduced by Kenney and printed on page 6,292, was agreed to. Carter presented the credentials of W. A. Clark, of Montana, announcing his appointment as senator from that state by the lieutenant governor, A. S. Spriggs, with the request that they be tabled. Consideration of the bill relating to the war in the Philippines and the establishment of a government in the islands was resumed. Spooner spoke at length for the bill, and, unable to finish his speech, continued it on the 23d, when, during an allusion to Cuba, he was interrupted by Hale, of his own party, who said he had grave doubts whether the United States would ever withdraw from Cuba. Spooner concluded his speech on the 24th and Bacon addressed the senate on his resolution calling for an investigation of the Cuban revenues, which is printed on page 6,404 and was referred to the committee on contingent expenses. The conference report on the Indian appropriation bill was adopted. A communication from Gov. R. B. Smith, of Montana, announcing the appointment of Martin Maginnis as senator from that state, presented by Carter on the 25th, was tabled and consideration of the Philippine war and government bill was resumed. Consideration of the sundry civil appropriation bill was then begun. The conference report on the post office appropriation bill was agreed to on the 26th and consideration of the sundry civil bill continued.

House.

On the 21st a bill was passed limiting the hours of labor on all government contract work to eight hours per diem, and also one to protect free labor from prison competition. This bill is printed on page 6,255. The conference report on the fortifications appropriation bill was adopted. Consideration of the Alaska civil code bill was resumed on the 22d, after which the conference report on the army appropriation bill was agreed to. A bill to provide for Cuban extradition was passed after a long debate on the 23d. The house then voted to non-concur in the senate amendments to the post office appropriation bill and appointed conferees. On the 24th the conference report on the Indian appropriation bill was adopted and consideration of the Alaska civil code bill was resumed and continued on both the 25th and 26th.

MISCELLANY

TRUTH'S ARMY.

For The Public.

He who would war for Truth must bide his time;
He shall not hear his name sung loud in rhyme,
And what he striveth for he shall not see
Till other generations reach their prime.
Truth's hosts are not a conquering army
borne

Along with lifting note of fife and horn;
They go to meet, what warriors blanch to face,
The poisoned arrows of a deadly scorn.
And yet they sow what generations reap;
The swords that fall from hands of nerveless sleep
Become the steel in other hands to win
Truth's kingdoms on the land and on the deep.

And they who fight the war of truth shall find
When all the things of earth are left behind
Their crown of victory—they who fight not men,
But Error, with the weapons of the Mind.

For 'tis God's army—and His great shield bends
Above them—like a mighty sun extends
His watchful smile above the host who bear
His royal purposes to deathless ends!

JOSEPH DANA MILLER.

JOHN STUART MILL ON THE IRISH LAND QUESTION.

Those who think that the land of a country exists for the sake of a few thousand land owners, and that so long as rents are paid, society and government have fulfilled their function, may see in this consummation a happy end to Irish difficulties. But this is not a time, nor is the human mind now in a condition, in which such insolent pretensions can be maintained. The land of Ireland, the land of every country, belongs to the people of that country.—John Stuart Mill.

AN HISTORICAL ANALOGY.

For The Public.

In 1778, while the war of American independence was on the stage, and in the vain hope of arresting its progress, the British parliament that had passed the stamp act and put a tax on tea renounced the claim of the mother country to impose taxation in the colonies for the augmentation of the imperial revenue. It also promised to impose only such duties as might be necessary for the regulation of commerce, the net product whereof was to be applied to the use of the colony wherein they were levied. But the application of the ointment did not cure the sore from which it was exuded, and the war went on until equity was established. Our revolutionary sires could hold the eye on a "plain duty" until it was performed,
ELROY M. AVERY.

JUST COMMONSENSE.

It is always well to remember that parties and nations are simply collections of men, therefore liable to the weaknesses of men, and in all things to be judged as men are judged, by their fruits.

Now, if you observe two men in con-

troversy, and one of them keeps arguing: "We have no right to do that way; it is unjust, dishonest, wrong." And the other keeps arguing: "You're a liar! You're a copperhead! You're a traitor!" Which of these men do you presume to be right? And which do you fancy feels surest of his ground?

If you were a tourist from Mars and saw two great crowds of men debating a policy; and one crowd appealing to history, to reason, to liberty and justice and the eternal standards of right, even as against their own usual party; and the other side appealing to party spirit, and passion, and chances to make money and "glory"—which would you think was probably in the right of it?—Charles F. Lummis, in the Land of Sunshine.

THE SULTAN OF JOLO ASKS QUESTIONS.

From an article on "Our Friend, the Sultan of Jolo," published in the May Century, and written by Charles B. Hagedorn, adjutant of the Twenty-third United States infantry, and secretary of the acting governor of Jolo.

Before the sultan arrived there were many conjectures concerning his personal appearance. Some described him as a dignified man of the world, others as a Moro of the ordinary type; but a Polish trader from Sandakan told us that he was "just like a monkey." His description was a very accurate one. He is a small man with a most repulsive face, his thick, protruding lips, flat nose, and swarthy skin showing his Malay origin.

Meeting him at the gate, I escorted him and his followers to the acting governor. The sultan, his secretary, Datto Joakanine, Datto Dakola, and seven or eight other less influential dattos followed us in. We all shook hands, their awkward grasp and handshake telling us that our custom was not theirs.

Seated about a table, we had a long and tedious conference. The sultan came in to look at us, and to see what Americans were like. He had never seen an American before, but had heard of our country, and that we were very rich and had much land. "Why did you come here to get more land?" was one of the first and rather awkward questions he asked. "I am poor, and my people are poor. Why are the Americans here?" The acting governor at once began to talk about Cuba and "humanity's sake," described oppression and the blowing up of the Maine; but this was not an altogether satisfactory explanation of our presence in Jolo. After carefully preparing a goodly portion of

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