

with that. The only permanent safety is in a sound ship. Religion has confined itself too long to the task of dragging drowning men out of the water. It is a more important duty to keep them from falling into the water. The greatest obstacles our John Storms have to meet are the effects in the lives of the people of hoary-headed injustice shielded by law and blessed by religion. This generation is suffering more from the lack of an aroused social conscience and a sound political economy than for the lack of agencies to give comfort and aid to the victims of social wrong. Sense and conscience are wanted in the legislatures. The most important factor in the salvation of the race is freedom.

AN APPEAL FROM THE PRESENT.

Extracts from the speech of Hon. George F. Hoar in the senate, April 17. Of the delivery of this speech the Springfield Republican said, editorially:

"There was one passage in Mr. Hoar's speech which acquired its dramatic force chiefly from the delivery. Referring to the Johnson impeachment, he said it had once been his fortune to witness the impressive spectacle in that chamber of senators responding to the call of the roll in a great state trial and giving in a sentence the reason for the vote. Would, he said, that the roll of the great men of the republic might thus be called on the pending question of imperialism. Thereupon the senator proceeded to call a number of names, such as Washington, Adams, Jefferson, Webster, Seward, Lincoln and Sumner, quoting against each some expression pertinent to the subject. They all voted no, all save Aaron Burr, whose yea vote was based on the ground that his buccaneering expedition down the Mississippi was at last to be vindicated. Then came the call, in shrill tones: 'William McKinley?' There was no answer. Then, stepping into the central aisle of the senate chamber, in still louder tones, the orator called again: 'William McKinley?' The effect given was of hesitation and reluctance to answer on the part of the one summoned to vote and give the reason. Finally came the response . . .

"Eye-witnesses describe the effect as very dramatic. A most impressive stillness came over the chamber as the name of the president was called, and the large audience awaited the response breathlessly. It is further stated that when Mr. Hoar reached that passage in his peroration: 'I appeal from the millionaire and the boss and the wire-puller and the manager to the statesman of the older time in whose eyes a guinea never glistened,' etc., he looked squarely at Senator Hanna. The latter's face flushed, and for once, says the Washington correspondent of the Chicago Inter Ocean, his smile of indifference or contempt forsook him. He was visibly angry."

Until within two years the American people have been wont to appeal to the declaration of independence as the foremost paper in history. As the years go round the Fourth of July has been

celebrated wherever Americans could gather together, at home or abroad. To have signed it, to an American, was better than a title of nobility. It was no passionate utterance of a hasty enthusiasm. There was nothing of the radical in it; nothing of Rousseau; nothing of the French revolution. It was the sober utterance of the soberest men of the soberest generation that ever lived. It was the declaration of a religious people at the most religious period of their history. It was a declaration not merely of rights but of duties. It was an act not of revolution but of construction. It was the corner stone, the foundation of a great national edifice wherein the American people were to dwell for evermore. The language was the language of Thomas Jefferson. But the thought was the thought of everyone of his associates. The men of the continental congress meant to plant their new nation on eternal verities which no man possessed by the spirit of liberty could ever thereafter undertake to challenge. As the Christian religion was rested by its author on two sublime commandments on which hang all the laws and the prophets, so these men rested republican liberty on two sublime verities on which it must stand, if it can stand at all; in which it must live or bear no life. One was the equality of the individual man with every other in political right. The other is that you are now seeking to overthrow—the right of every people to institute their own government, laying its foundation on such principles and organizing its powers in such form as to them shall seem most likely to effect their safety and happiness, and so as to assume among the powers of the earth the separate and equal station to which the laws of nature's God entitles them. Equality of individual manhood and equality of individual states. This is the doctrine which the republican party is now urged to deny. . . .

Certainly the flag should never be lowered from any moral field over which it has once waved. To follow the flag is to follow the principles of freedom and humanity for which it stands. To claim that we must follow it when it stands for injustice or oppression is like claiming that we must take the nostrums of the quack doctor who stamps it on his wares, or follow every scheme of wickedness or fraud, if only the flag be put at the head of the prospectus. The American flag is in more danger from the imperialists than there would be if the whole of Christendom were to combine its power against it. Foreign violence at worst

could only rend it. But these men are trying to stain it. . . .

Mr. President, it was my good fortune to witness an impressive spectacle in this chamber, when the senators answered to their names in rendering solemn judgment in a great state trial. By a special provision each senator was permitted, when he cast his vote, to state his reason in a single sentence. I have sometimes fancied that the question before us now might be decided not alone by the votes of those who sit here to-day, but of the great men who have been our predecessors in this chamber and in the continental congress from the beginning of the republic.

Would that that roll might be called. The solemn assembly sits silent while the chair puts the question whose answer is so fraught with the hopes and liberty and destiny of the republic.

The roll is called. George Washington: "No. Why should we quit our own to stand on foreign ground?"

Alexander Hamilton: "No. The declaration of independence is the fundamental constitution of every state."

Thomas Jefferson: "No. Governments are instituted among men deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed. Every people ought to have that separate and equal station among the nations of the world to which the laws of nature and of nature's God entitle them."

John Adams: "No. I stood by the side of Jefferson when he brought in the declaration; I was its champion on the floor of congress. After our long estrangement, I come back to his side again."

James Madison: "No. The object of the federal constitution is to secure the union of the 13 primitive states, which we know to be practicable, and to add to them such other states as may arise in their own bosoms or in their neighborhood, which we cannot doubt will be practicable."

Thomas Corwin: "No. I said in the days of the Mexican war: 'If I were a Mexican, as I am an American, I would welcome you with bloody hands to hospitable graves;' and Ohio to-day honors and loves me for that utterance beyond all her other sons."

Daniel Webster: "No. Under our constitution there can be no dependencies. Wherever there is in the Christian and civilized world a nationality of character, then a national government is the necessary and proper result. There is not a civilized and intelligent man on earth that enjoys satisfaction with his condition if he does

not live under the government of his own nation, his own country. A nation cannot be happy but under a government of its own choice. When I depart from these sentiments I depart from myself."

William H. Seward: "No. The framers of the constitution never contemplated colonies or provinces at all. They contemplated states only; nothing less than states—perfect states, equal states, sovereign states. There is reason, there is sound political wisdom, in this provision of the constitution—excluding colonies, which are always subject to oppression, and excluding provinces, which always tend to corrupt and enfeeble and ultimately to break down the parent state."

John Marshall: "No. The power to declare war was not conferred upon congress for the purpose of aggression or aggrandizement. A war declared by congress can never be presumed to be waged for the purpose of conquest or the acquisition of territory, nor does the law declaring the war imply an authority to the president to enlarge the limits of the United States by subjugating the enemy's country."

John Quincy Adams: "No. The territories I helped bring into the nation were to be dwelt in by free men and made into free states."

Aaron Burr: "Yes. You are repeating my buccaneering expedition down the Mississippi. I am to be vindicated at last!"

Abraham Lincoln: "No. I said in Independence hall at Philadelphia, just before I entered upon my great race, that I rested upon the truth Thomas Jefferson had just uttered, and that I was ready to be assassinated, if need be, in order to maintain it. And I was assassinated in order to maintain it."

Charles Sumner: "No. I proclaimed it when I brought in Alaska. I sealed my devotion with my blood, also. It was my support and solace through those many long and weary hours when the red-hot iron pressed upon my spine, the very source and origin of agony, and I did not flinch. He knows our country little, little also of that great liberty of ours, who supposes that we could receive such a transfer. On each side there is impossibility. Territory may be conveyed, but not a people."

William McKinley; William McKinley: "There has been a cloud before my vision for a moment, but I see clearly now; I go back to what I said two years ago: 'Forcible annexa-

tion is criminal aggression; governments derive their just powers from the consent of the governed, not of some of them, but of all of them.' I will stand with the fathers of the republic. I will stand with the founders of the republican party. No."

Mr. President, I know how imperfectly I have stated this argument. I know how feeble is a single voice amid this din and tempest, this delirium of empire. It may be that the battle for this day is lost. But I have an assured faith in the future. I have an assured faith in justice and the love of liberty of the American people. The stars in their courses fight for freedom. The ruler of the heavens is on that side. If the battle to-day goes against it, I appeal to another day, not distant and sure to come. I appeal from the clapping of hands and the stamping of feet and the brawling and the shouting to the quiet chamber where the fathers gathered in Philadelphia. I appeal from the spirit of trade to the spirit of liberty. I appeal from the empire to the republic. I appeal from the millionaire, and the boss, and the wire-puller, and the manager to the statesman of the elder time, in whose eyes a guinea never glistened, who lived and died poor, and who left to his children and to his countrymen a good name far better than riches. I appeal from the present, bloated with material prosperity, drunk with the lust of empire, to another and a better age. I appeal from the present to the future and to the past.

In New Haven, Conn., a hot-food company began operations a few days ago. It undertakes to provide hot meals for families, course dinners for entertainments, and suppers and luncheons for parties and after-theater occasions. Canvassers call from house to house and solicit business. When the offer is accepted, an attendant of the company calls daily for the bills of fare of the various meals. The food is cooked in the company's kitchens, which are located in different parts of the city, and delivered in hot ovens.—Woman's Journal of April 14.

Just before the late local elections in Chicago the Municipal Voters' League gave this delightful description of one of the candidates for aldermen:

J— Y—, democrat, clothing dealer; colorless, except as a reflection of corporate appetite.

Much may the administration regret the pro-Boer programme of Hon. Webster Davis; but it must con-

gratulate itself because of the fact that the unadministration idiosyncrasy of Mr. Davis did not move him to pay a visit to Aguinaldo instead of to Mr. Kruger.

G. T. E.

A visitor at a Columbia (Mo.) school the other day asked one of the lower grade classes this question: "What is the axis of the earth?"

"An imaginary line passing from one pole to the other, on which the earth revolves," proudly answered a pupil.

"Yes," said the examiner, well pleased, "and could you hang a bonnet on it?"

"Yes, sir."

"Indeed! And what kind of a bonnet?"

"An imaginary bonnet, sir."

The visitor asked no more questions that day.—Woman's Journal.

BOOK NOTICES.

"Bimetallism," by A. J. Utley (Los Angeles: Fish & Hornbeck), a book of 250 pages, is a discussion of the money question from the bimetallic standpoint. Though intended rather as a treatise than a reference book, it contains a great quantity of historical and statistical information bearing on financial questions. To a condensed history of the precious metals is added an exposition of the cost of producing them, together with chapters on the ratio between them, on their consumption in the arts, on the parity of exchange between gold-using and silver-using countries, and on other subjects of equal importance in their relation to the "battle of the standards." Mr. Utley adopts the quantitative theory of money with all it implies—prosperity and a contented people with an expanding volume, and depression, poverty, misery, crime, with a contracting volume.

"The City for the People" (C. L. Taylor, 1520 Chestnut street, Philadelphia), by Prof. Frank Parsons, is an example of excellent work upon the subjects with which the author has made himself familiar by conscientious labor. It is also an example of the puerile work such a man can do in unfamiliar lines. Prof. Parsons's brief discussion of land monopoly mars the book. It is only an echo of the school men. By no possibility can it be an expression of his own independent thought. What he says of compensation, for instance, exposes his unfamiliarity even with what Henry George had to say upon that point, and is altogether a woeful display of superficial and confused thinking. But in his own field Prof. Parsons is admirable. He makes, to begin with, a simple but important and necessary distinction between government ownership and public ownership of public utilities. "Russia has government ownership of railroads," he says, for illustration, "but there is no public ownership of railroads in Russia, because the people do not own the government." This consideration leads to an inquiry, after a full presentation of the subject of public ownership of monopolies, into the related subjects of direct legislation, proportional representation and home rule for cities. In all respects the work in these