The Public

First Year. CHICAGO, SATURDAY, APRIL 16, 1898. Number 2.

LOUIS F. POST, Editor.

THE PUBLIC is a weekly paper which prints in concise and plain terms, with lucid explanations and without editorial bias, all the really valuable news of the world. It is also an editorial paper. Though it abstains from mingling editorial opinions with its news accounts, it has opinions of a pronounced character, which, in the columns reserved for editorial comment, it expresses fully and freely, without favor or prejudice, without fear of consequences, and without hope of discreditable reward. Yet it makes no pretensions to infallibility, either in opinions or in statements of fact; it simply aspires to a deserved reputation for intelligence and honesty in both. Besides its editorial and news features, the paper contains a department of original and selected miscellany, in which appear articles and extracts upon various subjects, verse as well as prose, chosen alike for their literary merit and their wholesome human interest. Familiarity with THE PUBLIC will commend it as a paper that is not only worth reading, but also worth filing.

SUBSCRIPTION, ONE DOLLAR A YEAR.
Free of postage in United States, Canada and Mexico; elsewhere, postage extra, at the rate of one cent per week.

SINGLE COPIES, FIVE CENTS EACH.

Published Weekly by THE PUBLIC PUBLISHING CO., at Room 822 Schiller Bldg., Chicago, Ill.

Post Office Address:
THE PUBLIC, Box 687,
CHICAGO, ILL.

N. B.—Payment of subscription is acknowledged up to the date in the address label on the wrapper.

SUBSCRIPTION AGENT FOR WESTERN RESERVE, OHIO: OTTO PFISTER, 316 American Trust Bldg. (Telephone Main 1069), Cleveland, Ohio.

EDITORIALS

President McKinley's Cuban message flatly repudiates an important part of the platform upon which he was nominated for the presidency; and if the republican party in congress adopt its recommendations, as a party measure, the party itself will be stultified.

Platforms, it has been said, do not make, but only accompany, politics. But the people of this country have come to recognize them as solemn pledges, which must be redeemed, if the occasion for redemption occurs, under penalties analogous to those that fall upon merchants who ignore their commercial obligations. Should the president's message, therefore, be approved by his party, the good faith of republican platforms will hereafter be seriously questioned.

This is not to say that every petty paragraph of a platform—thrown in perhaps to gratify some faddist who happens to have influence for the moment with party leaders, but in which the general public has no interest—binds a party if the question afterwards becomes important. Political parties, no more than judges, should be bound by mere obiter dicta. Any man, or body of men, is apt to make casual declarations which are repudiated or explained as soon as attention is centered upon their significance. But the Cuban declarations of the republican platform of 1896 were not obiter dicta. They were not uttered casually, nor incidentally, nor carelessly, nor in reference to a subject which did not interest the American people. On the contrary, they were uttered deliberately, with a full understanding of their significance, both on the part of the platform makers and of the public, and with reference to a subject in which the American people were already profoundly interested. If ever a political party can be in honor bound by its platform declarations, the republican party is bound by the Cuban plank of its platform of 1896; and if ever a party can repudiate a sacred pledge, the republican party will have done so if it marks time, as a party, to the music of the president's Cuban message.

To meet in advance any charge of injustice in the foregoing comment, compare the Cuban plank of the republican platform of 1896, on which Mr. McKinley appealed to the people for election, with his message of 1898, in which he appeals to a republican congress for permission to cast that plank adrift. Here is the plank in full:

> From the hour of achieving their own independence, the people of the United States have regarded with sympathy the struggles of other American people to free themselves from European domination. We watch with deep and abiding interest the heroic battle of the Cuban patriots against cruelty and oppression, and our best hopes go out for the full success of their determined contest for liberty. The government of Spain having lost control of Cuba, and being unable to protect the property or lives of resident American citizens, or to comply with its treaty obligations, we believe the government of the United States should actively use its influences and good offices to restore peace and give independence to the island.

To what "heroic battle" did those words allude, if not to the insurrection then and still in progress in Cuba? Who were the Cuban patriots referred to, if not the men who were fighting under Gomez? To whom did the best hopes of the republican party thus go out "for the full success of their determined contest for liberty," if not to the civil government from which he and his men derived their authority, and which, in better condition than ever, now asks our recognition? In whose behalf, if not of that government, was it intended by this plank of the republican platform that the United States should actively endeavor to "restore peace and give independence"? Surely the republican party did not then allude to the make-believe provincial government which Spain is now setting up, and which in state papers her officials call the "insular" government. That make-shift had no existence when the republican platform was adopted—not even the paper existence which it enjoys now. The Cuban struggle with which the republican platform expressed sympathy, and the government whose independence it demanded, could have been no other struggle than that of Gomez and his compatriots, nor any other government than the insurgent government under which and for which they were and still are fighting. Not only was that government the only one which was battling for liberty on the island, but it was the only one in the triumph of which the American people were interested.

This is so commonly understood that no proof of it should be necessary, but proof is at hand. So strong had public feeling grown in behalf of the insurgents as far back as the winter of 1896 that the senate, on the 28th of February, of that year, by the overwhelming vote of 64 to 6, adopted a concurrent resolution recognizing a condition of public war between Spain and what the resolution called "the government proclaimed and for some time maintained by force of arms by

the people of Cuba." A resolution substantially identical was adopted about the same time in the lower house by the still more extraordinary vote of 213 to 17. These resolutions were a demand for the independence of what for brevity we may call the Gomez government. To that, and to that alone, would the descriptive words of the resolution apply: "the government proclaimed and for some time maintained, by force of arms, by the people of Cuba." And if there were no other reason, these resolutions would prove that when, four months later, the republican delegates to St. Louis inserted the Cuban plank in their platform, they meant, as had their copartisans who in senate and house voted for the resolutions, to demand the independence of the republic set up by the Cuban insurgents.

The plank quoted above from the republican platform was clearly an expression of sympathy with and a demand for the independence of the insurgents. It had no reference to any government — existing, prospective, or possible—except the government of the insurgents, the Gomez government, the government of Cuba libre.

But President McKinley's message advises point blank against recognizing even the belligerency, much less the independence, of that government. It extends no sympathy to the "Cuban patriots" who have battled for three years "against cruelty and oppression." No hope does it hold out for "the full success of their determined contest for liberty." It makes no recommendation for the restoration of peace with insurgent independence. On the contrary, it asks authority from congress for the president to turn the guns of the United States against the insurgents—against the very Cuban patriots with whom his party platform sympathized. If that is not the meaning of the kind of intervention he proposes, an intervention which involves, in the language of his message, "hostile constraint upon both the parties to the contest"—the Cuban insurgents as well as the Spaniards—we should be glad to be set right. It is impossible to compare the republican platform on the Cuban question with the president's message on the same subject, without concluding that one is irreconcilably opposed to the other. President McKinley has taken upon himself the responsibility of officially scorning the Cuban pledge of his party. It remains to be seen whether other leaders will finally commit the organization to this palpable breach of good faith.

There is, however, something in the president's message of more vital import to the American people than his infidelity to the solemn pledge upon which he was elected. It is his request of congress for the delegation to him of its exclusive constitutional power of declaring war. For be it observed that what he requests is not authority to determine the time, or to take advantage of an auspicious occasion, for beginning hostilities. Such power might wisely be granted to a commander in chief after war had been determined upon by the representatives of the people. But he asks for plenary power to determine whether there shall be war or not, and what shall be the cause of the war. This is a power which it was never intended to lodge anywhere but with congress, and one which no congress should grant nor any president solicit.

Turn to the message, in the concluding part, and see that this is indeed the power—in controvention of our supreme law as well as dangerous to our liberties—which the president seeks. Here is the language in full:

> **In view of these facts and these considerations, I ask the congress to authorize and empower the president to take measures to secure a full and speedy termination of hostilities between the government of Spain and the people of Cuba, and to secure in the island the establishment of a stable government capable of maintaining order and observing its international obligations, insuring peace and tranquillity and the security of its citizens, as well as our own, and to use the military and naval forces of the United States as may be necessary for these purposes.**

The power here requested is power to begin war, but against whom and for what? In one part of the message congress is given to understand that it is to be made against both the Spanish and the Cuban insurgents, if they don't stop shedding one another's blood; for he explains, as already quoted, that the intervention which he advocates involves "hostile constraint upon both the parties to the contest." But nowhere is there any indication of what act shall constitute the cause of war. If congress were to give a president power like that, it would virtually abrogate its own exclusive authority to declare war. The delegation of constitutional functions should have a limit somewhere; and right here, at least, a limit should be placed.

Why does the president solicit this unconstitutionally autocratic authority? The question raises another important consideration. He does not intend to use it to secure the independence of the insurgents. That is made very plain by the message. He distinctly says that the insurrection lacks the attributes of statehood. For the same reason he does not intend to use it in support of a recognition of belligerency. Nothing remains, then, for him to do, but, as he says, intervene to end the war. This intervention, he adds, may take either of two forms: Intervention as an impartial neutral, imposing restraint to compel a compromise, or as an active ally of one of the parties. The first form he quite distinctly disclaims any intention of adopting. He would not put this country at enmity with Spain by becoming the ally of the insurgents; and, although he does not say so, it is to be inferred from all he does say, that he would not unite with Spain to enforce a continuance of absolute Spanish dominion over Cuba. But he could do what he intimates that he would do, namely, order both Spain and the insurgents to compromise their differences, and fight them both if necessary to enforce his order. But that is not all. After bringing both Spain and her rebellious colony to an agreement, by force of American arms, after thus executing the mandate of his message—"the war in Cuba must stop!"—he would still use the army and navy, making further war upon Cuba if necessary, to "secure in the island the establishment of a stable government." In other words, President McKinley solicits investiture with the war-making power, in order to put an end to the Spanish war in Cuba, not through the recognition and firm establishment by us of the existing Cuban republican government, but by dispersing that government, and with the consent of Spain, voluntary or enforced, setting up an entirely new government upon the island. Are the American people hot for war of that kind?

This message of the president is nominally a plea for peace. But peace upon what terms? Peace with liberty? Not at all. To the question of liberty Mr. McKinley seems to have given no consideration. His ultima-

tum is peace with stability! Such is the peace they have in Russia—peace with stability! Such, too, is the peace of partitioned Poland—peace with stability! Was it not peace with stability that reigned in Warsaw?

And though the message is nominally a plea for peace, it is very far from being a peaceful manifesto. If its recommendations be carried out, it will lead straight to war. The United States cannot undertake to impose "hostile restraint" upon any party to a contest without fighting, nor upon both parties to the contest, without fighting both parties. Recognition of Cuban independence need not involve us in war. The burden of beginning or provoking war would at any rate, in that event, be upon Spain. And such recognition, even without intervention on our part, might insure Cuba's freedom. Our playing the part of a Spanish policeman is the principal obstacle with which Cuba has to contend. But the moment that the president should undertake to use the power which he asks from congress, and begin his work of "pacifying" Cuba, war would break upon us. The message is essentially a war message. Worse than that, it is a message which leads on to a war, not for liberty, but against liberty—against the only thing for which this country ought ever to go to war at all.

The attempt of Congressman Grosvenor, the president's spokesman in the lower house, to make it appear that the message contemplates liberty as well as stability, was extremely weak. It would be better for Mr. McKinley to stand by his message as transmitted, than to try to explain into it sentiments which it does not express. He would then have the credit at least of possessing the courage of his opinions. Grosvenor's explanation was based upon a single expression in the message, that in which the president speaks of his purpose to establish in Cuba a stable government capable of "observing its international obligations." No government can have international obligations, argues Mr. Grosvenor, unless it is independent, and therefore the president meant independence. The argument is thin. A government with international obligations in respect of Cuba might be imposed upon Cuba, and though that would be an independent government, it would not be independence for Cuba. Canada has a government capable of observing international obligations. It is the English government. And satisfied though the Canadians be with that government, Canada is not independent. Cuba, also, once had a government capable of observing its international obligations. It was the government of Spain. But Cuba was not independent. Moreover, a local government might be thrust upon Cuba by American power, by "hostile constraint upon both parties to the contest," as the president puts it in his message, which would be capable of observing its international obligations, and yet not be independent. But waiving these obvious considerations, which show that the president's language, which Grosvenor quotes, is inadequate to express what Grosvenor says it means, the message, as a whole, and the whole conduct of the president previous to his transmittal of the message, negative the good faith of Grosvenor's explanation. In the preliminary negotiations with Spain no step was taken by the president looking to independence. So the message itself shows. According to his own report the president asked nothing of Spain but the abrogation of the reconcentrado order, permission to relieve the suffering, and a suspension of hostilities until October—during the period, that is to say, when the Spanish troops in Cuba cannot fight to advantage and the insurgents can. The utmost that can be said in support of Grosvenor's explanation, is that the words that he quotes might, in a stress, be interpreted to America as meaning independence, and to Europe as meaning something else. But that is a diplomatic use of words which is unworthy of American candor. Mr. McKinley would fare better with his countrymen as an outspoken opponent of independence, than in the role of a sly middle-age diplomat in which his friends who read "independence" into his message are placing him.

We have no intention of reflecting upon the president's integrity. But when his susceptibility to the hypnotic influences of stronger minds is considered, in connection with the fact that Senators Elkins and Hanna —who would strangle in an atmosphere not impregnated with dollars or the possibility of dollars—and men of their own sordid species, have been his closest advisers throughout the preparation of the message, and that the document is notable for its marked indifference to all considerations of human liberty, it is difficult to get rid altogether of the idea that the "stable" Cuban government for the establishment of which an irresponsible and unconstitutional authority over war and peace is solicited by the president, is not wholly disconnected from some plan for the future government of Cuba by a syndicate.

The reason for the carpenters' strike in Chicago last week is suggestive of a possible change in the character of labor conflicts. Here was no question of hours, or of wages, or of employing "scab" workmen. The strike involved nothing but a question, an entirely new question, of working for "scab" employers. While the employing carpenters were willing to concede all the demands of the men, they themselves demanded in return that the men should work for no employing carpenter who did not belong to the employers' union. To this demand the men refused to accede; and as the employers had made it an item of the agreement with their men, an agreement which they refused to sign unless this item were accepted, the men went on strike. It was a clear case of putting the foot into the other boot. In substance, this strike was by the employers against the men, because the men insisted upon their right to work for "scab" employers. It was probably the first instance of the kind; but in the regular processes of evolution from this point, a condition may yet be produced in which employers' unions and workmen's unions, in making treaties with each other, will stipulate, the one that they will not employ "scab" workmen, and the other that they will not work for "scab" bosses.

Certain private interests in the region of the great lakes never allow an opportunity to go by for promoting the possibilities of naval ship building and the maintenance of a war fleet upon those waters. Our difficulties with Spain are no exception. Already, on pretense of the necessity of building warships on the lakes, the abrogation of our treaty with Great Britain, which forbids a naval establishment by either power upon these inland seas, is being urged—nominally, upon patriotic grounds of course, but in truth from the same motives as those which have given us a mediæval tariff, namely, the promotion of private interests. The treaty in question was made in 1818, and has

been faithfully observed by both countries ever since. It provides that the naval forces upon the lakes shall be limited to one vessel for each nation on Lake Ontario, two on the other great lakes, and one on Lake Champlain, no vessel to be of more than 100 tons burden nor to carry more than one 18-pound cannon. This is a beneficent compact and should not be disturbed. Though we might never have war with Great Britain, even if the lakes were as full of battleships as they are of fish, we shall continue to be more secure against war with that country if this peace-fostering treaty holds than if it be abrogated. With its abrogation would come the necessity on both sides for a fleet of war vessels, and after that irritation, and then war. Let us by all means keep both navies off the lakes, and go on cultivating those peaceful relations with Canada which our treaty as to the lakes has helped to preserve for 80 years.

When Mr. Moody was at Evanston he told the parable of the Good Samaritan in his characteristically picturesque style; and in conclusion, with his usual boldness and bluntness, he applied the parable to his audience. "Take some of these fat horses that are standing in your stables here in this town," he said, "and harness them to your carriages, and take three or four poor washerwomen out for a drive; and you stay and take care of their children. You laugh, but that would be to act the part of the Good Samaritan." It is not easy to see, however, how that would be acting the part of the Good Samaritan, unless Mr. Moody means to imply that washerwomen have fallen among thieves. If they are not robbed, there is no reason why the owners of fat horses and nice carriages should take them out riding—not on the basis of the parable of the Good Samaritan. That would not be to relieve a neighbor who had been plundered; it would be a superlatively impertinent act of charity—a thrusting of one's good things upon a neighbor who had not been robbed of his own good things. But Mr. Moody probably feels, what he does not express and probably does not see, that washerwomen have in fact fallen among thieves and been robbed; that they are victims of social injustice. So he likens them to the object of the Good Samaritan's mercy, and the owners of fat horses and fine carriages—provided only that they give the washerwomen a ride and nurse their children meanwhile—to the Good Samaritan. Let no one jeer at him for this. Rather let them ask him to explain how it is that, in a world so splendidly endowed by the God whose message he professes to bear, washerwomen are in the plight of the man of the parable who fell among thieves. Blessed as was the work of the Good Samaritan, the work of him who had identified the robbers and cleared the highway of their gangs would have been thrice blessed.

One of the recent disputes between the Canadian Pacific railroad and the American roads brought to light a queer fact. It appears that in 1887 the American transcontinental roads agreed to allow the Canadian Pacific to sell tickets from coast to coast for $7.50 less than the regular rate. This allowance was intended as an offset to a difference in length of haul. Now what would any man of ordinary sense, knowing nothing of the facts beyond this statement, suppose that difference in length of haul to be? Would he suppose that the Canadian Pacific's route was longer or shorter than that of the roads making the concession? Could he possibly come to any other conclusion than that the Canadian Pacific had been allowed by the pooling agreement to charge less because its route was shorter? Surely, such a man would reason in this way: The shorter the haul, the less the expense of carriage; the less the expense of carriage, the less the fare; therefore, the lower fare over the Canadian Pacific implies that its road across the continent is shorter than the competing roads. But he would be wrong. The Canadian Pacific was allowed to carry passengers across the continent for $7.50 less than the regular fare, not because its route is shorter, but because it is several hundred miles longer. Here is a fact that goes far to confirm the opinions of recent investigators into the mysteries of railroading. It goes to prove that distance is a small factor in the cost of transportation. If the Canadian Pacific can afford to carry passengers several hundred miles farther than its competitors, for $7.50 less than they charge, they can afford, if distance is an important factor, to carry for still less. In ways like this railroad monopolists themselves are furnishing data for the oncoming movement in favor of the nationalization of railroads, and an adjustment of fares in harmony with the post office principle, which disregards distance.

PROPERTY AND PROPERTY OWNERS.

There is a tendency in connection with discussions of questions of government to regard property owners as having superior rights. Large property owners often assert such rights; small ones echo the pretense as if their interests and those of large property owners were identical; and non-property owners commonly accept the theory with due meekness. An example of this tendency has been afforded in the course of the development of our unpleasant relations with Spain. The issue in this country, as it has shaped itself at the time of this writing, is whether the United States shall recognize the existing Cuban republic as an independent nation, or, without recognizing the republic, shall expel the Spanish government from Cuba, and superintend the erection of a new government there by the inhabitants. The principal argument for the latter proposition, and it has been made by the attorney general himself to the president and the rest of the cabinet, apparently with effect, is that the present Cuban republic does not represent the property owners of Cuba, the prevalent idea among the advocates of the proposition being that Cuban property owners, rather than the devoted men who have been fighting bravely and successfully for three years for Cuban liberty, must be allowed to determine the form of administration of the new government to be set up on the island. When public opinion is stirred by an issue of that character, it behooves the American people, saying nothing of the Cubans, to reflect for a moment upon what is to be understood by property.

"Property is robbery," said Proudhon, and for two generations his name was anathema with the thoughtless herd. And were the thoughtless herd not right in his case? Isn't it a libel to say that property is robbery? A man works hard with his ax all day in the woodlot and at night brings home in firewood the results of his labor. Nobody has lost what he has gained, nobody will lose in consequence of his gain. Why, then, is not that firewood his property? By every consideration of justice it is his, and the man would be outraged in his

rights if his property were denounced as robbery.

The same would be true of a man who, after breaking and cultivating a field, had harvested the ripened grain. That grain would be his property, and, since no one would lose anything in consequence, his property in the grain could not be robbery.

Precisely so with the man, who, unaided, builds a hut. It is his property; there is no element of robbery in it.

Or, if we advance a step, and take an illustration in conformity with complex industrial methods, the result is the same. If a man build a house, cultivate a farm, or pursue any other of the manifold vocations of modern life, voluntarily aided by other men whom he pays for their share of the work all that it is worth—where labor is under no duress, direct or indirect, but everyone is absolutely and in every respect free to accept or reject proffered wages—then the house or the products of the farm or of the other vocation, whatever it may be, are his property as truly and justly as if he had done all the work himself. Indeed, where the labor market is thus free, he must do the equivalent of that work or lack the wherewithal to pay the price for the labor that aids him.

In no sense can property be robbery if it is the result of the labor of the property owner, provided others suffer no loss in consequence of his gain; and if all property were of this character, Proudhon's aphorism would be foolishness.

But there is another side to the shield. The man who works in the woodlot, afterwards, let us say, gives the firewood which results from his labor to a neighbor in exchange for the ownership, as if it were a beast of burden, of the neighbor's child. If in those circumstances that child were property, then in that case property would be robbery. The child would be robbed of its natural birthright of freedom.

So, if parents were allowed property rights in their children from birth to death, then property to that extent would be robbery.

Or, to get a little closer to our own American ideas of property, if the wood chopper gave his firewood to a white man for a negro child, upon an agreement that the negro child should be his property for life, then that property would be robbery, and no human law or custom could make it anything else. True, the woodchopper would have parted with his wood, a result of his own labor, but he would have bought with it not the result of the other man's labor, thus completing an exchange of labor for labor; he would have bought only an arbitrary power over the future labor of a third person. To recognize his right of property in the negro child would therefore be to deny the negro child's right of property, as he came to maturity, in the products of his own labor. Such property would be robbery.

Again, to take an illustration from the actual civilization of the present time, if the woodchopper gave his firewood to an Indian for a bit of grazing ground near the mouth of a prairie river, and afterwards millions of people sought a livelihod there, building up a Chicago with its varied industries, its deserts of poverty and oases of wealth, thus by their demands for space making the grazing lot annually worth the labor of an army of able-bodied men, property in that lot would be robbery. Whatever the owner might gain through his ownership, others would lose out of their labor. Though the wood chopper had parted with his hard-earned firewood, his property in the lot would be robbery none the less, because he would have bought with his firewood not a product of the seller's labor, but an opportunity to levy tribute upon third persons.

Were all property of this kind, then, Proudhon's aphorism would be an expression of profound wisdom and high morality.

In fact, however, property, as the term is commonly understood, includes both classes of ownership—ownership of the earnings of one's own labor, and ownership of legal power to levy tribute upon the labor of others. It is because the term is used so much in this double sense, even by students of political economy, that we have the prevalent sentiment which recognizes all property as something sacred. Property in the products of one's labor ought to be sacred; but this sentiment ignores the fact that great estates are not that kind of property, and so gives an appearance of sanctity to what is in truth robbery.

In his last work—"The Science of Political Economy," book iv., ch. v. and vi.—Henry George considered this question of property from the standpoint of a political economist. These chapters are among the least completed part of his work, and it is probable that he intended to continue the discussion at greater length; but what he succeeded in putting upon paper before he died is extremely valuable. "The real basis of property," he says, "the real fundamental law of distribution, is so clear that no one who attempts to reason can utterly and consistently ignore it. It is the natural law that gives the product to the producer." And George shows that he does not here overstate the matter. Subjecting John Stuart Mill's theory of property to an overhauling, he demonstrates that Mill's reasoning, in spite of his utilitarian ideas, and notwithstanding some of his phrases to the contrary, led him on to the doctrine that just property consists only in the fruits of the owner's labor; and that, although unquestioned possession for a reasonable time ought to be a complete title, this does not apply to unjust systems of property since they consist not of one wrong in the remote past, but of a perpetual repetition of wrongs. Upon the indisputable basis that all just property rests upon the natural law which gives the product to the producer, George concludes that this will not sustain property in land. Obviously it will not; for property in land—either in the land itself, irrespective of its improvements, or in its value as land, as location—is in no measurable degree any individual's product. The land is a gift of nature, and its value is simply a scarcity price.

Yet the owners of large plantations in Cuba are referred to chiefly when it is demanded that the organization of Cuban freedom must be satisfactory to Cuban property owners. The owners of city lands also are of course included, but that does not alter the significance of the demand. Property in city land, like property in large plantations, is essentially a mere legal right to levy tribute upon producers. The classes contemplated in the demand are those that live and move and have their luxuries in the sweat of the faces of people whom they contemptuously put in the category of the propertyless. That is to say, the owners of property in the sense in which property is robbery, assume not only to appropriate labor products which others produce, and which are therefore the property of the latter in the sense in which property is not robbery, but they insist further upon governing those whom they despoil, basing their claim upon the very fact of the spoliation. It is in support of this claim, as opposed to a recognition of the independence of

the Cuban revolutionists, that we have been asked by the administration to go to war with Spain. Both from Madrid and from Washington comes the word that the existing Cuban republic is not satisfactory to the property classes of Cuba, and therefore must not be recognized as a legitimate government.

When such an attitude can be assumed by an American administration without exciting instant and general denunciation, it is high time for the people to analyze the conception of property, and to draw the line of demarcation clearly and unmistakably between the property which is and the property which is not robbery—between the property its owners earn and that which they merely appropriate. It is high time, too, to recall that this line is not necessarily determined by human law. Robbery is none the less robbery because it may have conventional sanctions. The final test of property rights is not legislative law, but moral law; and according to moral law that only can be just property which is the product, directly or indirectly, of the owner's labor, and which does not lessen the product of anyone else's labor. All other property is morally robbery.

RELIGION AND DEMOCRACY.

One of the evils of monarchy, an evil of the deep spiritual kind, is illustrated by one of the reports with which the Spanish trouble has burdened the cable. A correspondent tells his paper that the queen of Spain's energy, in advocating defense of the colonial claims of the kingdom, is due to her ambition to hand intact to her son upon his coming of age all the territory that his father left under the Spanish flag. That this correspondent has not misrepresented the queen may well be believed. She undoubtedly regards all Spanish territory and all Spanish subjects as in a way private property, to be passed down from father to son much as a prairie farmer expects to pass down his farm and live stock. Here is a sense of human ownership, or mastership at least, which no pretty words of the paternal kind can quite gloss over.

That monarchy is bad for the subjects, all history testifies, and subjects are renouncing it wherever they feel their power and know how to use it. If they have not always done it in form, as in England and her colonies, they have done it in fact. England is as much a republic as the United States, in everything but name, and in some things her people enjoy even greater republican freedom than do the people of the United States. But monarchy is bad not alone for the subjects but also for the monarch. No one can grow up and live out his life under the impression that he is a superior being, a chosen one of the Lord, picked out to be a master of his fellow men, entitled to control their freedom and to live upon their labor, without losing as much in character as he may gain in power. Democracy is more closely allied to true religion than we are accustomed to suppose.

PATENT MONOPOLIES.

The United States circuit court of appeals for the New York circuit has just made a decision invalidating the controlling trolley patent. This decision brings again under consideration the crudity of our patent law system, and indicates the urgent necessity for a radical change. It is bad enough that monopolies should be fostered under valid patents, but when they are fostered under invalid ones, the condition becomes insufferable. A change is then imperatively needed. Nor would a beneficial change be difficult to make, aside from the difficulty which always attends the substitution of a good law for a bad one. We have only to consider the real purpose of patent laws, in connection with the evils they have generated, to discover readily a remedy, at least for the evil mentioned above.

The only justification for patent laws is the necessity of some peculiar method for rewarding a peculiar kind of labor—that of the inventor. Under the prevailing system this reward is supposed to be conferred by giving to inventors for a limited period a monopoly of their invention. But actual experience shows that inventors seldom reap great advantage from their monopolies. Other monopolies are so much more strongly intrenched that they hold the inventor at their mercy, and, adding his little monopoly to their big one, deny to the public the benefits, in greater or less degree, of invention. All this could be remedied, measurably at least, by abolishing the monopoly feature of patent laws. If patents for inventions, instead of conferring a monopoly upon inventors, conferred upon them authority merely to collect reasonable royalties, the public could not be deprived of the benefit of inventions. For the security of the inventor, at the time of issuing a patent, the royalty might be fixed, upon the payment of which any person should be at liberty to use the invention throughout the life of the patent, and after that without royalty. Such a patent, while it would be a better assurance to inventors of the wages of invention, would utterly prevent that monopolization of inventions which under the present patent system has become an evil that cannot and will not be much longer endured. Anyone might then use any patented invention simply upon payment of a reasonable royalty.

Some one has compared President McKinley's economical use of egotistic pronouns with President Cleveland's liberality in their use, quite to the disparagement of Cleveland. His manuscripts bristled, says this observer, with I's, my's, me's, mine's, etc. Very likely Mr. Cleveland was egotistical, but his liberal use of the personal pronoun does not prove it. On the contrary, it suggests lack of self-consciousness. The studied avoidance of that pronoun is better evidence by far of self-consciousness than is even a too free use of it. The man who frequently introduces I's, my's and me's into his writing or speech, when giving his own opinion or telling about matters in which he is prominently concerned, is very likely so absorbed in his subject as to disregard appearances; whereas the man who, in similar circumstances resorts to circumlocution to avoid using the personal pronoun, shows how distinctly present in his own mind is his own personality. This observation may not apply to either McKinley or Cleveland, but it is true in general.

In his appeal to President McKinley against intervention, the Cuban tory who described himself as "President of the Honorable Government of Cuba," objected to falsehoods circulated by part of the American press, and by way of emphasizing his assertion that there is no good faith in them, wrote: "As was said by the immortal Washington, 'Honesty is the best policy.'" That reads like a joke. But evidently it was no joke. Senor Galvez undoubtedly supposed Washington to be the author of the time-honored proverb he quoted, though his own Cervantes had put it into Don Quixote long before Washington was born. Perhaps Washington's veracity in connection with a cherry tree, a

hatchet and an angry parent was responsible for Senor Galvez's confusion.

NEWS

Preliminary steps to a declaration of war with Spain were taken on the 13th by the passage by the house of representatives of a joint resolution, subject to adoption by the senate and approval by the president, which recites the three years' futile war of Spain against the revolutionists—describing it as having been conducted by "inhuman and uncivilized" methods, "contrary to the laws of nations," causing "the death by starvation of more than 200,000 innocent noncombatants," "for the most part helpless women and children," and as inflicting intolerable injury upon the interests of the United States, culminating in the destruction of the Maine and her men—and which therefore not only authorizes but directs the president "to intervene at once to stop the war in Cuba, to the end and with the purpose of securing permanent peace and order there and establishing by the free action of the people thereof, a stable and independent government of their own," and to use the land and naval forces of the United States to execute this purpose.

This resolution had been reported by the republican members of the house committee on foreign affairs. The democratic members of that committee, supported by the silver republican, Mr. Newlands, offered as a substitute a joint resolution, which, without preamble, declared that "the United States government hereby recognizes the independence of the Republic of Cuba;" and, upon considerations "of humanity, of interest, and of provocation, among which are the deliberate mooring of our battleship, the Maine, over a submarine mine, and its destruction in the harbor of Havana," directed the president "to employ immediately the land and naval forces of the United States in aiding the republic of Cuba to maintain the independence hereby recognized." Provision was made also for the relief of starving Cubans.

The essential difference between the two resolutions was the omission from that offered by the republicans of any recognition whatever of the present republic of Cuba, and the distinct recognition in that offered by the democrats of the independence of that republic.

Only 20 minutes on each side for debate was allowed by the republican majority in the house, their insistance being that this was a time for action and not for talk. Upon the roll call 190 votes, all from republicans, were cast against the substitute resolution, which recognized the present Cuban republic, and only 147 votes—including three republicans, three silver republicans, 21 populists and fusionists and 120 democrats—for the substitute. The substitute was accordingly lost. The vote was then taken upon the resolution offered by the majority of the committee, that which proposed war without recognizing the Cuban republic. This was adopted by 322 to 19. Among the 19 who voted against it were a few who opposed both resolutions; but nearly all who voted in the negative on this resolution had voted in the affirmative on the other, thus showing that they favored war for the recognition of the Cuban republic, but not for the recognition of some Cuban government as yet unformed. Jerry Simpson, the populist, was among the latter.

In the senate the resolutions reported by the republican majority of the committee on foreign relations, after reciting "the abhorrent conditions" in Cuba which "have shocked the moral sense of the people," been "a disgrace to civilization," and culminated "in the destruction of a United States battleship with 266 of its officers and crew while on a friendly visit to the harbor of Havana," and "cannot longer be endured," declare, first, that "the people of the island of Cuba are, and of right ought to be, free and indepndent;" second, that the United States demands the relinquishment by Spain of her government in the island and the withdrawal of her land and naval forces; and, third, that the president is directed and empowered to use the army, the navy and the militia to carry the resolutions into effect.

A minority of the senate committee concurred in the report of the majority, except that they favored "the immediate recognition of the republic of Cuba."

Thus the point of difference between the republicans and the democrats in the senate as well as in the house, related to the question of recognizing the present republic, the democrats favoring and the republicans opposing such recognition.

The foregoing proceedings in both houses were the response of congress to the president's message on the Cuban question.

President McKinley's message on the Cuban question, anxiously awaited and long deferred, was sent to congress on Monday, the 11th.

After minute recitals of the horrible condition of affairs in Cuba, the message sets forth the president's conclusion that a military victory for either the Spanish or the insurgents, short of subjection or extermination, is impracticable; and it describes his submission, in consequence of this—as an act of friendliness no less to Spain than to the Cubans—of a proposition to the Spanish government, on the 27th of March, "looking to an armistice until October 1st, for the negotiation of peace, with the good offices of the president." It tells also of his having asked at that time for the immediate revocation of the inhuman reconcentrado order promulgated by Weyler, a request which was granted. Continuing, the message informs congress that in reply to the president's proposition, the Spanish cabinet offered, on the 31st of March, to submit the question of peace to the Havana government—the so-called "autonomist" congress of Cuba, which meets on the 4th of May next—and expressed a willingness to accept at once a suspension of hostilities provided it were asked for by the insurgents.

Such seems to have been the sum and substance of the diplomatic negotiations between this country and Spain. No recital appears in the message, at any rate, of any proposition looking to the independence of the island.

Describing Spain's reply to his proposition as disappointing, the president proceeds in his message to specify three measures for a pacification which remain untried. The first of these is recognition of Cuban belligerency. But he regards that, without other action, as incapable of accomplishing anything toward pacification, and as in itself unwarranted by the facts. Recognition of independence, the second measure, is also, upon the authority of American precedents cited in the message, and as matter of expediency, condemned. The third measure he presents in alternative form, as intervention "to end the war, either as an impartial neutral by imposing a rational compromise between the contestants, or as the active ally of the one party or the other." He advocates the former alternative, that of intervention to enforce a compro-

mise, which involves, as he says, "hostile constraint upon both the parties to the contest, as well to enforce a truce as to guide the eventual settlement."

The grounds upon which the president rests his position are four in number. He holds, first, that it is our duty so to intervene, the contest being at our own door, in order to put an end to the barbarities and bloodshed existing in Cuba; second, that we owe such intervention to our own citizens in Cuba whose lives and property are endangered by the present conditions; third, that it is necessary in the interest of our commerce. His fourth ground, which he regards as of the utmost importance, is that the present condition of affairs in Cuba is a constant menace to our people and our peace, and entails upon this government enormous expense to maintain neutrality, while compelling our country to keep on a semi-war footing. In this connection he refers feelingly to the destruction of the Maine and the death of her men, and announces the Spanish offer to arbitrate that issue, an offer to which he says he has made no reply, and regarding which he makes no recommendation.

The message closes with an expression of the president's belief that "the object for which Spain has waged the war cannot be attained," and that "the only hope of relief and repose from a condition which cannot be longer endured is the enforced pacification of Cuba." To that end he asks congress "to authorize and empower the president to take measures to secure a full and speedy termination of hostilities between the government of Spain and the people of Cuba, and to secure in the island the establishment of a stable government, capable of maintaining order and observing its international obligations, insuring peace and tranquillity and the security of its citizens, as well as our own, and to use the military and naval forces of the United States as may be necessary for these purposes." A request is also made for additional appropriations to relieve the starving Cubans.

The Spanish situation up to the appearance of the president's message may be summarized as follows:

The diplomatic representatives of Great Britain, France, Germany, Russia, Austria and Italy called upon the president in a body, on the 7th, and in the name of their respective governments presented a note appealing to the "feelings of humanity and moderation of the president and the American people in their existing differences with Spain," and expressing the hope "that further negotiations will lead to an agreement which, while securing the maintenance of peace, will afford all necessary guarantees for the reestablishment of order in Cuba." This note had been submitted to the assistant secretary of state, Judge Day, in advance, and he had prepared and submitted the president's reply, also in advance. In his reply the president, after expressing his recognition of the good will which had prompted the note, and giving assurances that the United States shared in the hope therein expressed, declared the appreciation by our government of the humanitarian and disinterested character of the communication, and its confidence that "equal appreciation will be shown for its own earnest and unselfish endeavors to fulfill a duty to humanity by ending a situation the indefinite prolongation of which has become insufferable." Russia was indifferent about this action of the European powers, so it was reported, and merely consented to its representative's participation, but did not instruct him to act. Great Britain was reported as having refused to participate until assured by the American government that the note as drafted would not be regarded as unfriendly.

Concurrently with this mild and formal proceeding at the white house, the ambassadors of France, Russia, Itay, Germany and Austria—Great Britain was not represented—were said to be advising the Spanish government to abandon Cuba. It was rumored also that Spain was assured that upon making such concession Austria would be delegated by the European powers to defend the present Spanish dynasty against any rebellion which might result at home. On the 9th it was rumored that, apparently as the result of this episode, the Spanish ministry had agreed to grant an armistice in Cuba on condition that the United States should immediately cease to lend moral and material aid to the insurgents, that the American squadron in the vicinity of Cuba should be withdrawn, and that the American war vessels in the Pacific should leave the neighborhood of the Philippine islands. The rumor conveyed also an intimation that if the United States declined these conditions the five European powers named last above would support Spain. This proposition was regarded both by the United States authorities and the Cuban representatives in this country as ridiculous, not only on account of the conditions, but also with reference to the proposed armistice. The Cuban representatives called attention to the fact that an armistice is a bargain which would require the assent of the insurgents as well as that of the Spanish ministry, and, recalling the fate of Ruiz, asked who would make the overtures to the insurgent commander in the face of the provisions of the Cuban constitution which, under penalty of death, forbids either the giving or the receiving of any terms looking to peace and not based upon a recognition of Cuban independence.

The rumor of the 9th regarding an armistice proved to be true only in part. On the following day the Spanish minister signalized his first call at the Washington state department in nearly two weeks by presenting an official communication from the Spanish government which announced the proclamation by Spain of an armistice without conditions. The communication as made by the minister presented four points to the consideration of the United States authorities. First, that the queen has commanded a cessation of hostilities in Cuba without condition, its duration and details to be determined by Gen. Blanco, the captain general of Cuba. Second, that she has granted to Cuba institutions as liberal as those of Canada, which it will be the duty of the Cuban legislature, established by her, to develop upon its meeting on the 4th of May next; and that Cuba is in addition represented in the Spanish parliament. Third, that the queen of Spain has made official and repeated expressions of sympathy with the United States on the destruction of the Maine. Fourth, that the cause of the Maine disaster is a question of fact which can be settled only by proof, and that the Spanish government is ready to submit this question to experts to be selected by the maritime powers.

Following the receipt of the foregoing communication a session of the president's cabinet was held—the second for the 10th—at which the communication was considered. According to rumors following the second session of the cabinet it was there decided to let the long looked for presidential message go in to congress on Monday,

the 11th, but with the addition of a paragraph relative to the armistice offered by Spain. These rumors were confirmed by the message itself.

Meanwhile, on the morning of the 9th, Consul-General Lee, who had been recalled from Havana, as reported on page nine last week, made a farewell call upon Gen. Blanco. Blanco refused to see him. In the afternoon, Gen. Lee with his staff boarded the American dispatch boat, the Fern, in Havana harbor. He was followed by two of our Cuban consuls, and at about six o'clock the Fern steamed out of the harbor. It had been preceded by the Kevelyn with 247 passengers, among whom was Clara Barton, of the Red Cross society. The British consul accepted charge of American interests in Havana.

Gen. Lee arrived at Key West early on the morning of the 10th. Thousands of people gathered on the wharf and in the streets to greet him. In response to calls for a speech he simply said that nearly all Americans had left Havana, that he was on his way to report officially, and that he refused and should continue to refuse all interviews on Cuban affairs until after he had reported. He received an ovation all the way from Florida to Washington, and upon his arrival at Washington, on the 12th, an immense crowd greeted him. He was driven in Secretary Sherman's carriage to the state department, where another demonstration awaited him. After a brief reception at the state department he was driven, along with Secretary Sherman and Assistant Secretary Day, to the white house, whence, after paying his respects to the president, he went to his hotel. At a demonstration in his honor in the evening nearly 20,000 people took part. The dispatches from Washington spoke of him as the hero of the hour.

During the afternoon of the 12th, Gen. Lee appeared before the senate committee on foreign relations, where he testified that in his opinion the Maine was blown up by a submarine mine, operated from a shore station by a subordinate artillery officer of the Spanish forces. Gen. Blanco, he said, knew nothing of the affair; but he confirmed the report that upon paying his farewell visit to Blanco he was curtly informed that Blanco was lying down and could not be disturbed. He declared that peace in Cuba can be produced only through independence, yet did not believe it wise to recognize the insurgent government until the Spanish had been driven out and it could be seen whether the civil republic is the master or the creature of the insurgent armies. At the same time, Lee expressed friendliness for Gomez and his followers.

Pursuant to his orders from Madrid Gen. Blanco published in the Official Gazette at Havana, on the 11th, a decree suspending Spanish hostilities throughout the island. The object of the decree as stated in the preamble is to prepare for and facilitate the restoration of peace.

The report on Sunday night that Spain had ordered the suspension of hostilities provoked a riot in Madrid on the 10th. It was of no great magnitude and was easily suppressed. But on the 11th, rioting again broke out there, this time with more violence. The military police charged the mob, injuring some and arresting others. Twenty-three of the prisoners were on the following day held for trial, and warrants were issued for several well-known socialists and republicans.

The Cuban consular reports, which both houses of congress had by resolution asked for, and which had been withheld since midwinter, were transmitted to congress on the 11th. They are voluminous, and in their details of the treatment of non-combatant Cubans by the Spanish, sickening.

The United States consul at Matanzas, Cuba, who arrived at New York on the 12th, reported that for three days before leaving his post, the people threatened his life and the lives of members of his staff.

The taxation bill proposed by Gov. Pingree, of Michigan, after having been passed by the lower house, was defeated in the senate on the 8th by a vote of 15 to 16. To pass the bill 17 votes were necessary. For the purpose of considering the question presented by this bill the Michigan legislature was in special session, under a call of the governor. In his message to the special session, Gov. Pingree had explained that while the ordinary taxpayers of the state are bearing an annual burden of three per cent. upon the value of their property, the railroad companies pay less than one-quarter of one per cent., and that some of them, under the favor of exemption laws, pay nothing at all. He pointed out, also, that express, telephone and telegraph companies are unduly favored, relatively to other taxpayers, by the tax laws of the state. His recommendation was for a non-partisan commission, empowered to appraise corporate franchises at their true cash value, and to assess the corporations at the same rate upon that value as the rate imposed upon other people. The bill introduced pursuant to this recommendation was bitterly oposed by the railroad lobby, and the governor had occasion to complain to President McKinley, as reported on page 12 of last week's issue, that federal officials were offering federal patronage in the legislature to defeat the measure. The opposition to the governor, which defeated his bill as stated above, favors a commission to investigate the general subject of taxation and to report a bill to the next legislature.

The free silver convention of delegates from Ohio, Indiana, Illinois and Kentucky, which met in Indianapolis on the 6th, as noted on page 12 of last week's issue, was largely attended on the 7th, when Mr. Bryan and Mr. Towne, as well as George Fred Williams, were among the speakers. Resolutions were adopted declaring the financial question the paramount political issue, and pledging a continuance of the battle for free and unlimited coinage of gold and silver at the ratio of sixteen to one. The resolutions further opposed the delegation to individuals or corporations of the power to issue paper money, expressed continued confidence in Bryan's leadership, and, extending sympathy to the Cuban patriots, favored immediate intervention to secure the independence of the Cuban republic. A league was formed, of which James P. Tarvin, of Covington, Ky., was elected president. The league will hold its next annual convention at Lexington, Ky. An incidental object of this league is to force the renomination of Bryan by the democrats. Although nothing definite was said as to the vice presidency, a marked feeling was manifest in favor of George Fred Williams.

The movements in the Egyptian Soudan, of which an account was given on page 9 last week, were followed on the 8th by a battle to be known as the battle of the Atbara. The Anglo-Egyptian troops made an attack upon the body of dervishes which had left Shendy and intrenched

itself near the Atbara river. The attack was made at dawn after a night's march. It began with a destructive bombardment, and ended with a rush upon the stockade—called the zareba—and into the trenches. Mahmoud, the general in command of this body of dervishes, was found among the prisoners. The dervish loss in killed alone is reported as being 2,000. The Anglo-Egyptians' loss, which also was severe, includes several officers of high rank. Most of this loss was suffered in the charge, before the troops reached the zareba. As soon as they had passed this obstruction, the dervish army fled.

IN CONGRESS.

Week ending April 13, 1898.

Senate.

On the 7th the time of the senate was taken up with a consideration of the sundry civil appropriation bill, and the delivery of eulogies upon the late Senator George, of Mississippi. Abjournment was until Monday, the 11th. On that day, during the reading of a Cuban resolution and address presented by Senator Quay, the president's Spanish message arrived. Its reading caused subdued applause twice. At the conclusion of the reading, Senator Stewart, of Nevada, speaking to a motion to refer the message to the foreign relations committee, which was adopted, made an argument for the independence of the Cuban insurgents. Senator Butler, of North Carolina, saying that the message evidently did not mean the independence of Cuba, offered a resolution recognizing the Cuban republic as a separate and independent nation and directing the president to carry the resolution into effect by the use, if necessary, of the entire land and naval forces of the United States.

Consideration of the civil sundry bill, and passage of a house bill to bridge the Missouri river near Omaha, constituted most of the business done on the 12th. The session was given over largely to the Cuban question. Lindsay, of Kentucky, Wilson of Washington, and Allen, of Nebraska, introduced resolutions directing the establishment of independence in Cuba; and Pettus, of Alabama, Mason, of Illinois, and Butler, of North Carolina, made speeches. Pettus argued against the right of congress to delegate the war making power, Butler spoke for Cuban independence, and Mason, who is a republican, made an elaborate and serious speech in criticism of the president's message.

Upon the opening of the session on the 13th, the committee on foreign relations reported on the Cuban question, recommending intervention. Speeches were made by Foraker, republican, of Ohio, advocating direct recognition of the Cuban republic; by Lodge, republican, of Massachusetts, advocating retaliation for the destruction of the Maine; and by Lindsay, democrat, of Kentucky, advocating recognition of the republic. The resolution went over for the day. Hale, republican, of Maine, offered a substitute directing "the president to intervene at once to restore peace and order in the island of Cuba and establish a stable and independent government." The minority report of the committee, signed by Turpie, Mills, Daniels and Foraker, and favoring "immediate recognition of the republic of Cuba," was presented by Senator Turpie.

House.

On the 7th, the bill for the reorganization of the army, finally defeated, was under consideration. Congressman Sulzer, democrat, of New York, opened the debate with a speech in which he declared that Cuba would free herself if her independence were recognized. Sulzer was followed by Lewis, of Washington, who charged that the bill was part of a plan to increase the standing army. It was Lentz, of Ohio, however, a democrat, who made the session exciting. He pointedly intimated that the delay in presenting the president's message was in fact not for the safety of Americans in Cuba, as had been explained, but in the interest of stock jobbers, who had information in advance of the delay and profited by it when stocks rose in consequence. This brought Congressman Grosvenor, republican, of Ohio, to his feet with a lively speech in defense of the administration, in the course of which he assured the house that the president had been about to disregard Consul-General Lee's first message asking delay, but when the second came he yielded to the unanimous recommendation of the committees of both houses. Grosvenor also said that war with Spain was inevitable, and that it will be fought under the banner of the republican administration. Mr. Grosvenor's speech was especially important from the fact that he is supposed in a way to represent the administration upon the floor of the house. The democratic leader, Bailey, evoked enthusiastic applause when, in replying to Grosvenor, he said that if war came it would not be a republican war but a war of the people of the United States against Spanish tyranny in Cuba.

The house did not convene on the 8th, it having on the 7th adjourned over to Monday the 11th. That was District of Columbia day, and a local railroad bill was called up; but during a dispute over an attempt to call up the Fairchild-Ward contested election case instead, the president's message on the Cuban question arrived and was immediately read. The house was crowded with spectators and some points of the message elicited hearty applause, but at its conclusion the demonstration was slight. The message was referred to the committee on foreign affairs without debate, and after deciding the contested election case in favor of Ward, the house adjourned for the day.

Only routine work was done on the 12th, though frequent references to the Cuban question were made incidentally. Towards the close of the session, Lentz, of Ohio, criticised the president's Spanish message, principally for the disregard of the Cubans' right to independence, and was replied to by Hepburn, of Iowa, and Grosvenor, of Ohio. Grosvenor maintained that the message is really a demand for independence in Cuba, because it proposes the establishment of a government there, capable of "observing its international obligations;" his argument being that a government with international obligations means an independent government. To this Bailey in reply made a speech the burden of which is expressed in his query: "If the president meant the freedom and independence of Cuba why did he not say so?"

During the morning of the 13th the house worked uneasily at routine business until the committee on foreign relations reported. Upon the reading of its report on the Cuban question demand for an arrangement for debate was made by the democrats, which led to a controversy in the course of which a disgraceful personal fight occurred between a few members. The speaker refused to entertain any motion except an objection to giving unanimous consent for immediate consideration of the report. Bailey withheld unconditional consent, and the committee on rules retired and brought in a rule giving the report the right of way. The republicans then carried the previous

question, thus limiting debate to 20 minutes on each side, and after a speech by Dinsmore, democrat, in favor of recognizing the Cuban republic, and by Adams against it, the democratic substitute, which made that recognition, was voted down by 190 to 147. Mr. Dinsmore then moved to recommit with instructions to report back an amendment recognizing the independence of the republic of Cuba, but this motion was defeated by 190 to 146; and the original resolution which ignored the republic was thereupon carried against only 19 votes in the negative.

NEWS NOTES.

—The body of Frances E. Willard was cremated at Chicago last week. This was in accordance with her own wishes.

—Stocks fell on Wall street on the 13th, and wheat rose in Chicago, on the strength of the warlike action of congress.

—Gov. Pingree's special session of the Michigan legislature increased the taxes on express companies by 500 per cent.

—Princess Louisa, the eldest daughter of the king of Belgium, has been expelled from Austria-Hungary for immorality.

—At the senatorial elections in Spain, out of 180 senators voted for, 140 who will support the ministry in power were elected.

—At the elections held on the 12th in the larger cities of New Jersey, re-recent republican majorities were generally and overwhelmingly reversed.

—Prof. Briggs, whose application for a place in the Episcopal ministry was reported on page 10 last week, has withdrawn from the New York Presbytery.

—Gladstone, the "grand old man" of England, has been forced by the infirmities of age to abandon his literary work. His autobiography remains unfinished.

—Jefferson Day was celebrated at Chicago on the 13th by a large mass meeting presided over by Judge William Prentiss, and at which the principal orator was ex-Gov. Altgeld.

—The Indians on the Oneida reservation, near Appleton, Wis., anxious to promote their aspirations to American citizenship, offer to send a company of 100 Indians to the front in case of war with Spain.

—George Stout, a Philadelphia prize fighter, died at Columbus, O., on the 8th from the effects of a "knock-out" blow given him in a "contest" with Oscar Gardner, known to sporting circles as the "Omaha Kid."

—Russia is reaching out for a larger slice of China. On the basis of a slight conflict between Russians and Chinese at Kin-Chou, Russia proposes to insist upon including Kin-Chou within the territory leased to her by China.

—The firm of Alfred Dolge & Son, felt manufacturers, of Dolgeville, N. Y., has failed. The nominal value of the assets is less than the liabilities. Alfred Dolge was widely known as an ardent protectionist and cooperationist.

—The plant of the Penn Plate Glass company, of North Irwin, Pa., the largest independent plate glass plant in the United States, was totally destroyed on the 12th by fire. The loss is estimated at three-quarters of a million.

—Reports of the 8th from Seattle told of an avalanche which crossed Chilkoot pass on the afternoon of the 3d at a place where the pass was crowded with miners in camp. The camp, with most of the miners, was buried beneath tons of ice and snow.

—President Canfield, of the Ohio state university at Columbus, announces a gift of $250 to the university, from William J. Bryan, on condition that the income be used annually for a prize for the best essay on the principles of our form of government.

—Geological and geodetic surveys of Alaska, from the coast to the Canadian line, have been completed and issued by the United States Interior Department. They give the first official information relative to the Yukon gold fields, the richness of which they recognize.

—Cardinal Taschereau, of Quebec, died in that city on the 12th. The cardinal was born in the province of Quebec, February 17, 1820, was ordained a priest when 22 years old, was appointed vicar-general in 1862 and archbishop in 1871, and was raised to the cardinalate in 1887.

—Samuel French, who began the publication of plays at New York, in 1835, where his name was familiar for nearly two generations, and who afterwards acquired international reputation as a jobber in stage manuscripts, died at London, England, on the 11th. He was born in Maine in 1818.

—Margaret Mather, the actress, died at Charleston, W. Va., on the 7th. The night before her death, while playing in the fourth act of "Cymbeline," she was seized with convulsions caused by Bright's disease, and never recovered consciousness. Miss Mather was born in Detroit in 1862, and her real name was Margaret Finlayson. In 1892 she was married to Fred Pabst, of Milwaukee.

—The Chicago city council met for the first time with the newly elected members, on the 11th, but no attempt to organize was made. The motion to adjourn without organization was offered by Alderman Powers, known as the leader of the aldermanic "gang," who holds his seat as a democrat. He lacked two votes of a majority, which is reported as the reason for his willingness to postpone organization.

—Advices of the 8th, by way of Shanghai and London, report a state of open rebellion in the region around Chun-King, a tributary of the Tse-Kiang river, in the province of So-Chuen, China. The rebellion originated in an attempt of the local authorities to arrest murderers of American missionaries. The mob resisted this, and, according to the advices, had proceeded to sack a French mission in the neighborhood.

—A preliminary statement by the statistician of the United States geological survey shows that the total output of coal in this country in 1897 approximated 198,250,000 short tons —the largest record—with an aggregate value of a fraction less than $1 a ton. The increase in tonnage over 1896 is about 3.3 per cent. Pennsylvania is credited with 54 per cent. of the output. Illinois has second place, West Virginia third, and Ohio fourth, while Alabama is fifth and Iowa sixth.

—It was given out from Madrid on the 10th that dispatches had been received from Manilla, on the most northerly part of the Philippine islands, saying that the insurgents had captured Cebu, but had in turn been expelled by the Spanish garrison, with only a slight loss of Spaniards and over 500 of insurgents. But advices of the 12th to Madrid from the Philippine islands, report 10,000 rebels against Spanish authority as under arms, and fears of trouble in Manilla.

—A street fight which occurred at Hongkong, China, between German, French and Russian sailors on one side, and American and British sailors on the other, was reported from Vancouver, B. C., on the 11th. The

trouble grew out of a saloon fight between Russian and English sailors. About 600 tars were engaged in the street fight, and the police were powerless to stop it. According to the report, which comes from an officer of the steamer "Empress of Japan," the Anglo-Saxons "knocked seven bells" out of the other mob.

—William J. Bryan's name was on the list from which an orator to address the law class of the university at Madison, Wis., at the close of the present term, was to be selected. It had been put at the foot of the list, with the idea that an acceptance would be received from some one else before Bryan's name was reached; but all the persons ahead of Bryan declined. Thereupon, before the committee could communicate with him, a meeting of the class was hastily called, at which, against strenuous opposition, Bryan's name was struck from the list.

—The general use of carrier pigeons for purposes of maintaining communication with vessels at sea, is a probability. Owing to a recent accident to one of the French line of steamers, the line decided to try the experiment. Carrier pigeons were therefore put upon the Bretagne, and six were released at sea with messages. One alighted upon the British steamer Challerton, after flying more than 300 miles. The experiment is regarded as successful, and a system will be perfected, the principle purpose of which will be to communicate in cases of accident, though it will be used also for sending private messages.

MISCELLANY

BOSTON HYMN.

(Read in Music Hall, January 1, 1863.)

The word of the Lord by night
To the watching Pilgrims came,
As they sat by the seaside
And filled their hearts with flame.

God said, I am tired of kings,
I suffer them no more;
Up to my ear the morning brings
The outrage of the poor.

Think ye I made this ball
A field of havoc and war,
Where tyrants great and tyrants small
Might worry the weak and poor!

My angel—his name is Freedom—
Choose him to be your king;
He shall cut pathways east and west
And fend you with his wing.

Lo! I uncover the land
Which I hid of old time in the west,
As the sculptor uncovers the statue
When he has wrought his best;

I show Columbia, of the rocks
Which dip their foot in the seas
And soar to the air-borne flocks
Of clouds and the boreal fleece.

I will divide my goods;
Call in the wretch and slave:
None shall rule but the humble,
And none but Toil shall have.

I will have never a noble,
No lineage counted great;
Fishers and choppers and plowmen
Shall constitute a state.

Go, cut down trees in the forest
And trim the straightest boughs;
Cut down trees in the forest
And build me a wooden house.

Call the people together,
The young men and the sires,
The digger in the harvest field,
Hireling and him that hires;

And there in a pine state-house
They shall choose men to rule
In every needful faculty,
In church and state and school.

Lo, now! if these poor men
Can govern the land and sea
And make just laws below the sun,
As planets faithful be.

And ye shall succor men;
'Tis nobleness to serve;
Help them who cannot help again;
Beware from right to swerve.

I break your bonds and masterships,
And I unchain the slave;
Free be his heart and hand henceforth
As wind and wandering wave.

I cause from every creature
His proper good to flow:
As much as he is and doeth,
So much he shall bestow.

But, laying hands on another
To coin his labor and sweat,
He goes in pawn to his victim
For eternal years in debt.

To-day unbind the captive,
So only are ye unbound;
Lift up a people from the dust,
Trump of their rescue sound!

Pay ransom to the owner
And fill the bag to the brim.
Who is the owner? The slave is owner,
And ever was. Pay him.

O North! give him beauty for rags,
And honor, O South! for his shame;
Nevada! coin thy golden crags
With Freedom's image and name.

Up, and the dusky race
That sat in darkness long—
Be swift their feet as antelopes,
And as behemoth strong.

Come, East and West and North,
By races, as snowflakes,
And carry my purpose forth,
Which neither halts nor shakes.

My will fulfilled shall be,
For, in daylight or in dark,
My thunderbolt has eyes to see
His way home to the mark.

—Ralph Waldo Emerson.

THE JOY OF WORKING.

I thought that I was a husbandman whom God sent into a dreary world. I toiled breaking up the hard earth and clearing off the ground, but the more I worked the rougher looked my plot; for where the briers were cut away stones showed through the sand. I was tired, and when I saw God I said to Him that the vines went astray faster than I could straighten them, and that where I planted my grapes wild grapes grew up instead. God said to me that there was strength in the wild grapes, and I said: "Aye, Lord, but look at the stones." God said: "Do not I need the stones?"

But when I saw that God watched me as I worked I said: "The toil is hard, but I shall see the fruit." God turned away, saying: "You shall not see the fruit." I cried after Him: "But there will be fruit, O Lord?" and God said: "Of all your labor there shall be no fruit."

I said, complainingly: "Lord, it were so much better to find wild flowers that might be trained to be more beautiful; but there are always thorns for me to cut." And God said: "If there were no thorns I had here no need of such a husbandman as thou."

I went on working, for then I knew that I labored in the garden of the Lord that was to be.—Bolton Hall, in The Outlook.

PROTECTION NEEDED AGAINST CHEAP LAND.

Cheap labor is the dearest thing in the world. James G. Blaine, of sacred republican memory, proved that fact some years ago in his report upon the manufactories of Europe, where he says that goods produced by cheap labor are produced at great cost. The true explanation why the New England cotton manufacturers cannot manufacture as cheap as those in the south is this: In New England there is a large population, which has become more extensive, and the landlord can and does extract from the laborer a larger proportion of his wages in payment for rent,

and the New England manufacturers are unable to pay the wages to compete with the southern states, where land is more plentiful and rents are lower.

Now, in Denver, Col.—in a state where they pay the highest wages of any state in the union—the Overland cotton mill to-day is sending its goods to Massachusetts and competing with the goods of all parts of the United States. So the only way in which the gentleman from Maine can fortify his position is by the suggestion that we must have a protective tariff in favor of New England against the southern states. That will carry the protective tariff policy out to its legitimate conclusion, each state protecting itself against the others, each county protecting itself against other counties, and finally, following out the gentleman's line of policy, we shall have each township, I presume, protecting itself against the competition of other townships.—Jerry Simpson in the House, January 20.

WE ARE ALL CORRUPTERS.

The corruption which taints municipal and national politics is an exact reflection, counterpart, and largely a result, of the corruption which characterizes other aspects of life, especially "business." The corruption which characterizes the Chicago common council and city government, for instance, comes directly from the contact of both with private and corporation "business." The ward bosses of both parties are either contractors or the tools of contractors, who are in politics for the sake of their business, "for revenue only." The aldermen are bribed to betray public interests for the benefit of private business. There is a direct line of progress, of cause and effect, from the boodle alderman's vote to the dividend check of the street railroad stockholder; from the corrupt cowardice of a postmaster-general to the profits of the railroad company. It is "business" that corrupts politics, not politics that corrupts "business."

And the spirit is well-nigh universal. We bribe the sleeping-car porter and the hotel waiter to give us special attention; we pay the buying agent of our customers to use our stock; we give the policeman a cigar or a basket of peaches to overlook our encroachment upon the sidewalk in the display of groceries. Special "pulls" and friendships are used to thwart inimical administration and save our friends from trouble. Our letter of recommendation gets the man we chance to know a job, and turns out the equally needy and equally deserving man we do not chance to know. We point the finger of scorn at the "boodling" official and ourselves bribe the garbage collector to carry away our own unlawful rubbish in the city's wagon. Indeed, we are in a sorry plight, and in these days it is hard to find even the "remnant" that has not bowed the knee to Baal. It is timely for this nation to talk of sackcloth and ashes.—Chicago Commons.

COBDEN ON LAND VALUE TAX.

In the course of his great agitation against the cruel "Corn Laws," young Richard Cobden spoke bitterly as follows:

I warn ministers, and I warn landowners and the aristocracy of this country, against forcing on the attention of the middle and industrial classes the subject of taxation. For . . . mighty as I consider the fraud and injustice of the Corn Laws, I verily believe, if you were to bring forward the history of taxation in this country for the last 150 years, you will find as black a record against the landowners as even in the Corn Law itself. I warn them against ripping up the subject of taxation. If they want another league at the death of this one—if they want another organization and a motive—then let them force the middle and industrial classes to understand how they have been cheated, robbed and bamboozled.

. . . Honorable gentlemen claimed the privilege of taxing our bread on account of their peculiar burdens in paying the highway rates and the tithes. Why, the land had borne those burdens before corn laws had been thought of. The only peculiar state burden borne by the land was the land law, and I will undertake to show that the mode of levying that tax is fraudulent and evasive, an example of legislative partiality and injustice, second only to the corn law itself. . . . For a period of 150 years after the conquest, the whole of the revenue of this country was derived from the land. During the next 150 years it yielded nineteen-twentieths of the revenue—for the next century down to the reign of Richard III., it was nine-tenths. During the next 70 years to the time of Mary it fell to about three-fourths. From this time to the end of the commonwealth, land appeared to have yielded one-half the revenue. Down to the reign of Anne it was one-fourth. In the reign of George III. it was one-sixth. For the first 30 years of his reign the land yielded one-seventh of the revenue. From 1793 to 1816 (during the period of the land tax), land contributed one-ninth. From which time to the present (1845), one-twenty-fifth only of the revenue had been derived directly from land. Thus the land, which anciently paid the whole of taxation, paid now only a fraction or one-twenty-fifth, notwithstanding the immense increase that had taken place in the value of the rentals. The people had fared better under the despotic monarchs than when the powers of the state had fallen into the hands of a landed oligarchy, who had first exempted themselves from taxation, and next claimed compensation for themselves by a corn law for their heavy and peculiar burdens.—Justice.

A DEFENDER OF ARISTOCRACY.

W. H. Malloch, a British tory, has just written a book entitled "Aristocracy and Evolution," in which the old arguments against majority rule are revamped and a plea for rule by the few is made. Mr. Malloch, however, omits to indicate the method of selecting the chosen few or who shall be the judges of what constitutes real aristocracy. And this is just where the theory is unsound and why it never worked in practice. Some men may have a better knowledge of public affairs than others and be more fitted to frame laws for the public good, but the invariable lesson of human experience has been that wherever a class, no matter how honest it may be at the outset, is granted power over their fellows, that power in the end is used to oppress and enslave.

There is but one safe repository in which to intrust the rights of the people and that is with the people themselves. This is democracy as opposed to aristocracy. The people may occasionally make mistakes, but being themselves the victims of all blunders they quickly learn to correct them unless hampered by antiquated constitutions or stubborn and venal courts.

Despite the encroachments of monopoly in this country the American people are slowly but surely solving the problem of self-government. They need no king, no aristocracy or so-called better class to teach them what to do or what not to do. Their greatest difficulty is how to get rid of encumbrances set up by aristocratic superstition in the past.

One of these superstitions is the notion that every state must have an ironclad constitution to protect the rich, the effect of which is to strangle equality of rights and destroy liberty. Our constitutions, to conform with the Declaration of Independence, should affirm broad and fundamental principles. They ought not to attempt to lay down complex rules and restrictions, for it is in inhibitions of this character that monopoly finds its weapons to drive the people into subjection. Instead of our state constitutions being of public benefit they are to-day bulwarks of privilege.

Of the same aristocratic nature is the system which makes the United States senate practically irresponsive to the people. Elected, as they are, by legislatures and for so long a term as six years, senators care little for popular

sentiment. Here we may see a partial exemplification of the tory idea that the few and not the majority ought to rule.

Eminent republicans of the Hanna and Vanderbilt type may consistently take Malloch's new work as one of their text-books. It teaches in straightforward English the good old republican doctrine of "the people be damned."—Waukegan Democrat.

PUBLIC CONTROL OF RAILWAYS.

The merchant, the manufacturer and the farmer, working under conditions of industrial liberty, do not seem to require any peculiar supervision on the part of the state; for competition is adequate to insure relative justice as between customers, as well as to insure the sale of goods at a fair price. But in the railway industry competition does not work so beneficent a result. On the contrary, such is its nature that it imposes upon railway managers the necessity of disregarding equity between customers, and of fixing rates without considering their fairness, whether judged from the point of view of cost or of social results. Were this not true there would be no railway problem.

But what, it will be asked, is there peculiar about the business of transportation which renders it superior to the satisfactory control of competition? Even at the risk of raising a larger number of inquiries than can be satisfied by my reply, I venture to submit a categorical answer. The railway industry is an extensive, and not an intensive industry. It conforms to the law of "increasing" returns rather than to the law of "constant" or of "diminishing" returns. This being the case, ability to perform a unit of service cheaply depends more upon the quantity of business transacted than upon attention to minute details. Another way of saying the same thing is, that the expenses incident to the operations of a railway do not increase in proportion to the increase in the volume of traffic. As an industrial fact, this does not pertain to the business of the manufacturer, the merchant or the farmer, but is peculiar to the business of transportation; and it is adequate, when properly understood, to explain why all advanced peoples, without regard to the form of government they may have adopted or the social theories they may entertain, have surrounded the administration of railways with peculiar legal restrictions. The necessity of some sort of government control lies in the nature of the business itself. . . . It lies in the theory of modern society that men should succeed or fail according to their abilities. As a matter of fact, a railway manager has it within his power, through the manipulation of rates, to make or to destroy; to determine which persons in the community, and which communities in the state, shall attain commercial success, and which shall struggle in vain for its attainment. Such unusual powers cannot be safely entrusted to the guidance of private advantage, but must be brought under the direction of the public interest. Public control over railways, at least so far as may be necessary to eliminate from their administration invidious discrimination, is essential to the permanency of a democratic society.—Henry C. Adams, in Atlantic Monthly.

ONE OF THE REASONS WHY THE WARD BOSS RULES.

The alderman saves the very poorest of his constituents from that awful horror of burial by the county; he provides carriages for the poor, who otherwise could not have them; for the more prosperous he sends extra carriages, so that they may invite friends and have a longer procession; for the most prosperous of all there will be probably only a large "flower piece." It may be too much to say that all the relatives and friends who ride in the carriages provided by the alderman's bounty vote for him, but they are certainly influenced by his kindness, and talk of his virtues during the long ride back and forth from the suburban cemetery. A man who would ask at such a time where all this money comes from would be considered sinister. Many a man at such a time has formulated a lenient judgment of political corruption and has heard kindly speeches which he has remembered on election day. "Ah, well, he has a big Irish heart. He is good to the widow and fatherless." "He knows the poor better than the big guns who are always about talking civil service and reform."

Indeed, what headway can the notion of civic purity, of honesty of administration, make against this big manifestation of human friendliness, this stalking survival of village kindness? The notions of the civic reformer are negative and impotent before it. The reformers give themselves over largely to criticisms of the present state of affairs, to writing and talking of what the future must be; but their goodness is not dramatic; it is not even concrete and human.

Such an alderman will keep a standing account with an undertaker, and telephone every week, and sometimes more than once, the kind of outfit he wishes provided for a bereaved constituent, until the sum may roll up into hundreds a year. Such a man understands what the people want and ministers just as truly to a great human need as the musician or the artist does. I recall an attempt to substitute what we might call a later standard.

A delicate little child was deserted in the Hull house nursery. An investigation showed that it had been born ten days previously in the Cook county hospital, but no trace could be found of the unfortunate mother. The little thing lived for several weeks, and then, in spite of every care, died. We decided to have it buried by the county, and the wagon was to arrive by 11 o'clock. About nine o'clock in the morning the rumor of this awful deed reached the neighbors. A half dozen of them came, in a very excited state of mind, to protest. They took up a collection out of their poverty with which to defray a funeral. We were then comparatively new in the neighborhood. We did not realize that we were really shocking a genuine moral sentiment of the community. In our crudeness, we instanced the care and tenderness which had been expended upon the little creature while it was alive; that it had had every attention from a skilled physician and trained nurse; we even intimated that the excited members of the group had not taken part in this, and that it now lay with us to decide that the child should be buried, as it had been born, at the county's expense. It is doubtful whether Hull house has ever done anything which injured it so deeply in the minds of some of its neighbors. We were only forgiven by the most indulgent on the ground that we were spinsters and could not know a mother's heart. No one born and reared in the community could possibly have made a mistake like that. No one who had studied the ethical standards with any care could have bungled so completely. —Miss Jane Addams, in the International Journal of Ethics.

FROM THE KLONDIKE MINES.

February 17.—It is nearly warm here now, at least it seems so to us. All night and this morning the mercury stands resting at zero and we have the door open to get fresh air as we sit at our table at work. This warm weather wind blew straight in from the north, right up out of the Arctic circle, right past the north pole, perhaps.

What a land of contradiction! The rivers freeze first on the bottom instead of on the top or on the surface, as in other lands. The Yukon is shut up at the mouth first and is last to break

up there in the spring, unlike all other well-regulated rivers. And now comes this other contradiction right in the teeth of all outside precedent. I have noted that the south winds are cold winds, the coldest that ever man confronted. And now we have this terrific north wind and find that whether from the north pole or whatever land or sea it comes it is the warmest wind we have yet had. This morning the cheery little chick-a-dee birds are making the tree tops ring with their chatter, chatter, and their sweet song of spring, and they are as busy as bees flying and fluttering in and out about the spruce tops. There is something almost pathetic in their wild joy at this first pleasant morning in so many bleak months. Why, if they sing thus at a little piece of sunlight six by nine they would sing their little heads off if they should see a California spring day.

Our three little brown-bellied Douglas squirrels are also out to-day and in our cache for food. We are glad to give them whatever they want if they will only ask for it. But they prefer to steal. Kreling found one in the sugar barrel just now, and the guilty little squirrel scampered out as if all the mounted police of the Dominion were after him, leaving a trail of white sugar on the floor of the cache as he ran. Kreling, who never swears but only affirms, affirmed a great deal.

And now the great big black nights are behind us. I want to put it on record right here they are terrible, terrible in their deathly silence and monotonous black and white. That great moon, so white and cold and persistent, and all the time going round and round right overhead, is simply maddening. I shall not forget my horror of its whiteness and its vast expanse. I can now understand the hideous meaning of lunacy and the root of madness. And the birds! These few little chick-a-dees have not come a day too soon. True, we have months of snow and cold weather before us still, but this gleam of sunlight right in our window to-day tells us at least that there is a sun somewhere, and that we are likely to see more of it before we die. We have cut a notch in the edge of the table where the sunlight lay this morning, and we will now see the sunlight broaden and broaden, or, at least, note that the days grow longer and longer until soon we shall have a whole day sunlight instead of the everlasting moon—moon for morning, moon for noon, and moon for night; a mournful, cold and doleful monotony of moon. Nor did the sunlight come a bit too soon, either.

I told you I had looked in the faces of a few men here whose eyes gave back but a dim ray of light or reason. I told you I had seen a few men here who would leave the Klondike mental wrecks. The strain has been too heavy and too long for some of these men, already worried when they got here. Besides, there seems to me to be something stupefying or paralyzing to the mind here. The poor Indians are dull; they have a helpless, far-off look in their eyes, and seem piteously sad. They have two insane men at the barracks at Dawson. An old man took his own life at the mouth of the Klondike lately, and the mounted police are now in search for a prominent Canadian who has been lost sight of. And I know there is more than one man who is not quite right in his head wandering about. Surely the sun did not come a day too soon.—Joaquin Miller.

NATURAL DESCENT AND SPIRITUAL INHERITANCE.

Extracts from a sermon preached before the Western Reserve Chapter of the Daughters of the American Revolution, and the Western Reserve society of the Sons of the American Revolution, at Trinity cathedral, Cleveland, O., on October 31, 1897, by the dean of the cathedral, the Rev. Charles D. Williams.

I speak to those who claim descent from the sires of the revolution, the heroes of that immortal strife. The world knows no prouder lineage than yours. How the effete nobilities of the old world pale into insignificance before it, tracing their descent back perhaps to a king's favorite, or possibly even a king's mistress! How gloriously it shines beside that vulgar plutocracy which so often sickens the very soul in our modern American society! Some of our forefathers, you remember, were fearful lest the Society of the Cincinnati should eventually become an order of nobility. And if we were to have an American aristocracy based on ancestry, there surely could be no nobler, more appropriate lineage than this.

But what is that lineage to you? Merely a claim, a boast, a pride, to flaunt in men's faces as you do the badges and ribbons you wear? Then it is worse than valueless. It is a curse. And the sooner your organization is disbanded the better, both for you and your country. Or is your natural descent carrying with it a spiritual heritage? The vital question is, not simply does there run in your veins the blood of the sires of the revolution, but does there breathe in your soul their spirit of patriotism, of heroism, of devotion to country, to liberty and to right? That alone can make you spiritually, really, the sons and daughters of the revolution. And if you are thus spiritually and really the children of your ancestry, you will do the works of your fathers over again to-day.

The patriotism of war is not the highest kind of patriotism, nor by any means the most difficult and most rare. It is comparatively easy and common. There is a dramatic quality about it which makes it attractive. There is even an appeal in it to which the very old Adam in us—the natural spirit of belligerency—readily responds. And so it is comparatively easy to don a uniform and shoulder a musket and march against a visible and foreign foe, when drums are beating and fifes are shrilling and flags are flying. And many would be found to do it.

But the patriotism of peace is a higher, rarer and harder thing than that; the patriotism that meets insidious internal foes which wear no visible uniform and march under no visible banner; that meets such foes with no blare of the trumpet in the ears, and no consciousness of any dramatic effect before the eyes of the world, but meets them, nevertheless, with dogged resistance, with patient wisdom, with indomitable courage and with devoted self-sacrifice. That is the patriotism of peace, and few there be that seem capable of it. And yet it is far more important than the patriotism of war. Our ancestors found it so. We talk of the critical period in our country's early history. When was it? Not when Washington's soldiers stained with bleeding feet the snows of Valley Forge; not that year of disasters when the little feeble band of patriots which constituted the American army were hunted like a covey of partridges among the mountains of northern New Jersey, and congress itself refugeed from village to village to escape seizure by the enemy. Nay, not then, but those few years after the war had been all ended and its triumphs won, when internal dissensions and anarchy threatened the very existence of the new-born nation; when foreign governments watched confidently for the collapse of our feeble confederacy and expected the fragments to seek shelter again under the wings of old world tyrannies, and when many a noble American patriot who had never given up hope in the darkest hours of the conflict despaired utterly of the future. Ay, that was the critical period of our nascent nation's life. And then came the severest demand upon patriotism; the high, rare, difficult, patient patriotism of peace. And the names of the men who responded to that call, who toiled and studied and sacrificed and hoped and wrestled with the problems of internal dessensions and local prejudices until the federal constitution was formed and the lasting foundations of our government were laid, the names of these men, it seems to me, ought to stand the highest on our national roll of honor; higher, in some respects, than

the names of those who fought and bled and died on the battle fields of the revolution. * * *

Sons and daughters of the American revolution, the demands for that high and difficult patriotism of peace exist to-day as really and as mightily as they did at the close of the great struggle for independence. The calls to noble doing and daring, to self-sacrifice and devotion, resound in your ears as truly as they did in your forefathers' ears. The question is, first, do you hear? And, second, will you heed?

I pray God that your natural lineage may bring with it a spiritual heritage; your natural relationship be wrought into a spiritual kinship, that so you may do over again to-day the deeds of your forefathers. Otherwise, your descent from the patriots of old shall be not your blessing, but your curse; not your honor, but your disgrace. And God shall put you aside, and "of these stones," aye, perhaps even of despised immigrants from foreign lands, raise up a new race of heroes to meet the needs of the new day that is dawning upon us. Therefore, I pray, may the spirit of your fathers rest upon you even as the blood of your fathers runs in your veins; aye, above all, may the spirit of the All-Father rest upon you; for "where the spirit of the Lord is, there, and there only, is true liberty."

"AND THE STREETS OF THE CITY WERE LIKE UNTO PURE GOLD."

City streets can be kept clean, street-cleaning boards to the contrary. One American city has been kept clean for one period of time, and what has been saved to that city in money and health, and what has been added to it in good morals, cannot be estimated by this demoralized generation. From an Outlook sketch of Col. Waring's work in New York city in 1896 we take the following items that to many American citizens must read like quotations from some "Looking Backward" romance.

Each sweeper takes care of about six short blocks or three long blocks, which he sweeps at least once a day, and often twice or three times, depending on the traffic. The asphalt of Hester street, down town on the "East side," crowded with playing children and hucksters, is swept five times a day.

The sweepers work till four o'clock in the afternoon, with an hour for dinner. After four the section foreman goes over all of his streets (thorough work in this was made possible by the bicycle) to see that they are in good condition and that all the garbage and ashes have been removed.

Sunday work is done when it is necessary—after processions on Saturday, etc.—and in some districts a few sweepers and carts are out for several hours every Sunday.

That the down town crowded quarters of New York are now kept as clean as Fifth avenue is a well-known fact. The section foremen there have less territory to cover and more sweepers.

It is said that the daily applications at a large free dispensary on the East side have fallen away one-third in a year—a result which the doctors attribute to better health on account of clean streets.

ANOTHER OBSTRUCTIVE SENATE.

Second chambers have not covered themselves with glory either in Great Britain, in the United States or in Canada, and the Canadian body is certainly the worst of all three.—Toronto Weekly Globe.

Just as one gets himself nicely broken of the penny-paper habit, along comes some violent public agitation and drives him back into all his old excesses. For two months past it has been necessary to buy the day's history in installments about as follows: In the morning, a three-cent and a two-cent paper for news, and a one-cent paper to see what sort of information the readers of the one-cent morning papers are getting. At noon, a one-cent paper to see if anything happened overnight. At three o'clock, two or three one-cent papers to compare reports and see if anything is really going on. At five or six o'clock, the latest one-cent papers to see if war has been declared. In the evening, a three-cent evening paper as a sedative. Nine or ten papers a day have answered for most readers, though many of us have had more. That is an excessive indulgence. It is worse than cigarettes, and nearly as bad as absinthe. If we should have the war which at this writing the very latest extra predicts, we shall have to adopt stringent measures of self-restraint, and take the news three or four times a day and no more, as we take food. Else, if hostilities should be at all prolonged, there won't be Lakewoods and Bloomingdales enough to hold us all.—Harper's Weekly.

—"O'Higgins" seems a queer name for a Chilian warship, but the man thus honored was a native of the southern republic, and a fighter for it as well. His father, Ambrose O'Higgins, was born in Ireland in 1730, but while still a youth found it convenient, for one or another of the reasons so numerous in that period, to go abroad. He settled in Spain, grew rich, bought or earned a title, and finally betook himself to Chili. His son, Bernardo, became a revolutionary leader, won Chili's independence in the great battle of Maipu, and from 1818 to 1823 ruled the country as director, which meant dictator. He ruled very well, they say—well for South America, that is.—N. Y. Times.

Those who deserve help know better than to deal with the charity organizations. They appeal to their neighbors, almost as poor as themselves, and a share is given them to tide them over. For every stingy dollar more or less dishonestly doled out by the organized agents of the very rich, there are thousands given freely without question by the very poor. Real charity was sufficiently organized long ago in very few words by the man who said "Love one another," and who did not say "investigate one another," or "hire clerks to cross-examine the hungry."—N. Y. Journal.

A novelty has been added to the naval establishment, called the mosquito fleet. Petty squadrons formed of tugs and yachts, partly protected, and armed with rapid-fire guns, will be stationed at various exposed ports, and manned by naval militia. It is suggested that when an attack is expected at any particular port, several of these squadrons may be assembled at that point, and make a pretty formidable defensive force.—Harper's Weekly.

In a consultation between the secretary of the navy and the superintendent of the naval academy the other day, it was decided to waive the final examinations for graduation at Annapolis this year, and to give the members of the graduating class their diplomas two months in advance, so that they may be at once assigned to sea duty.—Harper's Weekly.

A Ohio member of Congress received a touching letter from a constituent who desired a lot of the eulogies that have been delivered from time to time in honor of deceased members, and closed his communication by saying: "I do love to read about dead congressmen." —William E. Curtis.

"You must not be impudent to papa," said Mr. B—— to his boy.

"I ain't impident, papa. I meant what I said the funny way, not the impident way," replied the boy.—Exchange.

Not all who seem to fail have failed indeed,
Not all who fail have therefore work'd in vain,
For all our acts to many issues lead;
And out of earnest purpose pure and plain
The Lord will fashion in His own good time.
—Matthew Fortesque Brickdale.