

The Public

First Year.

CHICAGO, SATURDAY, APRIL 23, 1898.

Number 3.

LOUIS F. POST, Editor.

Entered at the Chicago, Ill., Post-Office,
as second-class matter.

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 622, 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 indefensible position on the Cuban question, as declared in his message upon which we commented last week, has been reversed by congress. Thus the republicans in congress, in the face of the demands of the president, of the speaker, and of the syndicate cabinet which rules at the white house, have undertaken to redeem the promise respecting Cuba which the republican platform made.

That platform committed the party to sympathy with the Cuban revolutionists, and the country—so far as the republican party could control it—to recognition of the independence of the Cuban republic. But the president, obedient to the strong men who have him in tow, disregarded that

pledge, in his message to congress, and asked for irresponsible authority to make war, not in behalf of the Cuban insurgents, not even vaguely for Cuban independence, but for the purpose of ending hostilities in the island by imposing, as he expressed it, hostile restraint upon both Spain and Cuba.

The ultimate purpose of this request the world may never know. It may have been to establish the plutocratic "insular" government which Spain had already undertaken to set up in the island. It may have been to adapt the Hawaiian scheme to Cuba and make that island a territory of the United States in the interest of favored investments. It may have been to lay the foundation for government in Cuba by an American syndicate under American protection. But whatever the purpose may have been, it certainly was not to redeem the pledge of the republican platform by recognizing the existing Cuban republic as an independent nation. The president, as far as in him lay, repudiated that pledge.

Had his party in congress adopted the suggestions of his message, the good faith of republican platforms would, as we said last week, be hereafter seriously questioned. And not that alone, but, as we also said last week, this country would have been carried on into a terrible war not for liberty but against it. But from this act of bad faith the republicans in congress have saved their party, and from this war against liberty they have saved their country. The resolution which they forced upon the president—forced upon him in the face of enormous difficulties in the partisan sense—is nothing short of a recognition of the Cuban insurgents.

That the congressional resolution does recognize the Cuban insurgents, notwithstanding the fact that the Turpie amendment which made that recognition specific was left out, is evident upon examination. Speaker

Reed so understood it when he sulkily refused to sign the resolution on the night of its adoption. He realized that he and the president had been beaten by their party in congress, and that the resolution as it passed, instead of repudiating the republican platform and endorsing the president, repudiated the president and obeyed the platform.

When the two houses agreed to retain the clause which declared that the people of Cuba "are and of right ought to be free and independent," they thereby decided to recognize the independence of the Cuban republic as now organized. It was for that reason so hard a fight was made by Reed to keep out the little words, "are and." With those words out, the declaration would have been no more than that the people of Cuba "of right ought to be free and independent," which would have left the way clear for the organization by the administration, of almost any kind of government in Cuba that the pecuniary interests of Senators Hanna and Elkins and their plutocratic compeers demanded. But with those words retained, there is a distinct recognition of an existing independent government in Cuba.

Since no such thing is known to nations as an actually free and independent people who have no independent government organization, it is impossible to place upon that clause of the resolution which declares that the people of Cuba "are and of right ought to be free and independent," any other construction than that the existing republic is an independent government. There is no other government organization in Cuba to which those words can apply. They cannot apply to the Spanish government. Neither can they apply to the "insular" government, which is a Spanish side show. They must apply therefore to the Gomez government. Besides these three there is none on the island. The words amount either to a recognition of the Gomez government, or they are mean-

ingless; and they cannot be regarded as meaningless when the two houses of congress held out far into the night over the question of retaining or rejecting them.

Upon the face of the resolution then, the United States has recognized the independence of the existing Cuban republic; and the executive is bound, in using the military and naval power of the United States to expel Spain from the island, to do so for the purpose of relieving the already existing Cuban republic from the barbarities of Spanish warfare.

Nor does this construction depend merely upon a form of words. The question of Cuban independence has been a live question before the American people—in political conventions, in congressional debates and votes, in state papers, in newspapers—for more than two years. At no time during that period has it been an abstract question. It has all the time and in all connections been a question of the independence of a certain organized government—of the government whose armies Gomez commands. No one has thought of Cuban territory when speaking of Cuban independence. No one has thought of the Cuban people irrespective of their government organization. Everyone has thought of the organized revolutionary government which is at war with Spain. That and that alone has been the object of American sympathy. And when the American people, through their law-making power, assert officially that the Cuban people "are and of right ought to be free and independent," they can mean nothing but that the revolutionary government of Cuba actually is as well as ought to be both independent and free. The words are so indissolubly associated with the agitation in behalf of the Cuban republic which has led up to the resolution in which they occur, that they admit of no other interpretation.

As the matter now stands, we are to go to war not to impose by our power a stable government upon both parties to the contest in Cuba, as the president would have it. We are to go to war not regardless of liberty, which is the only cause that could

justify our going to war at all. We are to go to war not under the reasonable suspicion of the civilized world, which the president's message aroused, that we are seeking a conquest of new territory. On the contrary, we are to go to war to protect from foreign oppression a free and independent neighbor; and in doing so we distinctly disclaim all intention of seeking our own national aggrandizement. Inasmuch as war is to be forced upon us, this is certainly matter for congratulation.

We may well wish to avoid war. We may wish to avoid it for its inevitable horrors, for its destruction of life and property, for its excitation of brutal instincts, for its interference with the development of those sentiments of justice out of which alone real freedom and that universal interdependence which is the only true independence, can grow. We may also wish to avoid it because war can be depended upon to determine nothing but questions of brutal superiority. But if war must be, let it at any rate have on our part disinterested motives to account for it, and be in the aid of liberty. This is the character which the congressional resolution has given to our impending conflict with Spain. The president's message, which also invited war, would have given it a very different character. For this the president is to be condemned. But let it not be forgotten that his own party in congress has officially denounced him and is entitled to the credit of having done it.

There is something sublime in the patriotism of the tobacco manufacturers who so generously announce their willingness to bear the burden of a heavy war tax on manufactured tobacco. To appreciate the sublimity of their patriotism it is necessary to remember that tobacco users and not tobacco manufacturers will have to pay the tax. Nor should the fact be overlooked that in thus generously agreeing that tobacco users may be taxed through them to carry on the war, these manufacturers specially request that the tax be not made effective on tobacco already manufactured. That is a fine stroke. Not only would the manufacturers take credit for paying a tax which they

collect from tobacco users, but they would also put themselves in position to charge higher prices for untaxed tobacco already manufactured. Oh, patriotism—business patriotism—verily thy name is humbug!

The Cuban controversy has brought again to the surface a claim on the part of the president, which ought in some way to be overruled by congress before, by being repeatedly asserted, it crystalizes into a recognized executive right. We refer to the claim that the power to recognize new governments is a presidential prerogative. Nothing could be clearer than that this claim has no foundation in the constitution. There is not a word in that instrument to make it even colorable, except in Article II, Section II, Paragraph 2, which empowers the president to make treaties and appoint ministers and consuls, and in Section III. of the same article, which commands him to receive ministers. But these provisions really confer no power to decide upon the admission of new governments into the sisterhood of nations.

The authority to make treaties with and appoint ministers and consuls to foreign nations—an authority which can be exercised only in conjunction with the senate—conveys no implication of authority to select the nations. Like the authority conferred upon congress by Article I, Section VIII, Paragraph 3, "to regulate commerce with foreign nations," it decides nothing as to national selection. A foreign nation being recognized by us as independent, the president then, and not till then, has power to make treaties with it, subject to approval by the senate, and to nominate officials to represent us in its jurisdiction; but the constitutional provision which gives him these powers cannot be reasonably construed to vest in him the antecedent power of national recognition.

Still less can the claim in question be based upon his duty to receive diplomatic officials from foreign countries. That in the exercise of this function he may decline to receive a particular person, is quite true, and he might thereby prevent diplomatic intercourse between this country and any

other or all others; but he could do so only by violating his oath of office, by pretending that the officials whom he refused to receive were personally objectionable when in fact they were not. He cannot construe this power of personal selection into a power of national selection. This provision of the constitution, like the other, simply imposes upon the president the duty of receiving persons as representatives of nations which we, as a nation, recognize as belonging to the family of nations. It does not empower him, as a mere dictator, to decide which nations are and which are not so recognized.

If the president were conceded this autocratic claim, he might force congress to divest itself of its exclusive constitutional power to declare war. He could, at any rate, by recognizing insurgents against the will of congress, place congress in an awkward dilemma. Congress could not declare war in such a case without subordinating its own views as to the insurrection to those of the president, which would be a virtual surrender of its war power; and it could not refuse to declare war without ignoring its duty to support the president in the exercise of what, according to the claim in question, is his constitutional prerogative. It would be obliged to repudiate either its own government or one of its own most sacred functions.

The claim of the president, a claim which by the way was also made by Cleveland in connection with the Cuban question, is one of the signs of a disposition to usurp the powers of congress and place them as far as possible beyond the reach of the people. It is in perfect harmony with the president's request in his recent message to congress to be given dictatorial power over the Cuban question both as to the relations of Spain to the Cubans and the relation of the Cubans to each other and to this country. These usurpations may seem harmless. The plea of good intentions may justify them to the thoughtless. But all usurpations are apparently harmless. No obviously harmful usurpation could ever be accomplished. It is only by piling one apparently harmless usurpation upon

another, adding one apparently innocent aggression to another, that a free people can be divested of their freedom. And this claim of the president to the exclusive power—regardless of congress, regardless of the people—of determining for the United States which of the governments of the world are legitimate and which are not, which we will recognize and which we will ignore, which our congress may regulate our commerce with and which it may not, which our congress may declare war against and which it may not, which the senate may unite with him to make treaties with and which it may not, which it may confirm ambassadors and ministers to and which it may not, is one of the usurpations which as a guarantee for the future it is the solemn duty of congress now in some way distinctly to overrule.

It is a gratifying fact that the Spanish war is to have another cause than the destruction of the Maine. This is not to say that Spain is absolved from responsibility for that catastrophe. The burden of proof at least, still rests upon her. When our government had shown, as it did, that the explosion was from without, it at once cast the burden of proof upon Spain. That government was then bound to show either that there were no explosives in Havana harbor, or that none that were there had exploded. The case against her is not met by insisting that an explosion from without would kill fish and that no fish were killed on this occasion. Nothing short of proof that no mine exploded in the harbor—proof that could be easily made by Spain, if the fact were true—can exonerate her from responsibility. But let Spain be never so guilty of the destruction of the Maine and the murder of the Maine's crew, that would be no reason for our making war upon her. By no possibility could victory in war restore our sailors to life. What insane folly, then, to kill thousands of other men on both sides even if we knew, even if we could prove to the point of convincing the whole world of it, that the Spanish authorities in Havana had set the mine and deliberately blown up the Maine. It would be far better to lay before the world the

proof of Spain's guilt and her refusal to atone for it, and leave her to the condemnation and contempt of mankind. War is too horrible to be entered upon for revenge.

In Milwaukee last week the federal court heard a case which brings once more to public attention the fact that the United States courts are step by step assuming authority over the administration of local government, and that this is being done in the interest of monopoly rings. The case in question grows out of an ordinance of the Milwaukee common council which reduces street car fares to four cents. Here is a purely local question, a question in essence of local taxation, but the central government, through a centralized judiciary, is to determine it. And the principle of determination, as recently laid down by the supreme court at Washington, turns upon the question of whether a four cent fare would return a profit—not upon the true value of the street car plant, not upon what it could be reproduced for, but upon its cost as indicated by its stocks and bonds. So, as the outstanding stocks and bonds of the Milwaukee roads amount to some \$9,000,000, those roads claim the right to charge fares which will yield a profit on that capital sum, though it is proved that the roads could be duplicated for half the amount. In no competitive business are profits governed by that principle. Competitive manufacturers and merchants must be content with profits upon the present value—the present cost of reproduction—of their capital, utterly regardless of what their capital may have cost originally. There is some satisfaction, however, in the present efforts of monopolies to annul laws and ordinances regulating fares. The people will soon grow weary of fighting them in that way, and resort to the simple plan of constructing and operating their own street cars and railway systems.

Criticizing our remarks on page four of last week's issue, in sympathy with the idea of the nationalization of railroads and an adjustment of fares in harmony with the post office principle of disregarding distance, a reader warns us that under the present

methods of taxation such a reform would only affect land values, causing some landowners to lose their power of levying tribute and others to gain it. Broadly speaking, and in the long run, this is incontestably true. It may therefore be a good reason for an elementary reform in the distribution of land values. But it is no reason at all for not reforming the railroad system.

CONQUERING FEAR.

A suggestive contribution to the April *Cosmopolitan* is Speaker Reed's essay on "The Conquest of Fear." Mr. Reed points to the great triumphs of the human race in annihilating time and space, in improving medicine and surgery, and in promoting the accumulation and developing the possibilities of a more equal distribution of wealth. But he says that if he were to select the greatest triumph of all, it would be "our victory over the fear of the unknown and undiscovered, over demons and witches and all the false gods which mock when our fear cometh."

He then graphically pictures the state of perpetual apprehension in which our ancestors, both within and beyond historic ken, lived out their lives. In brilliant rhetoric he here describes the every-day strain, comparable only to the strain of battle, which they must have been under while during all the day their main object of thought was the preservation of their lives from real dangers and their lives and souls from dangers imaginary. Instead of recognizing natural law, they recognized in everything "a god to be propitiated or a devil to be appeased."

Over this dread, says Mr. Reed, man has triumphed. Though the victory be even yet won for less than a third of the race, the vanguard of civilization, fighting "through unknown centuries and amid tears and terrors," has conquered fear.

But is it so certain that the vanguard of civilization has conquered even the kind of fear that Mr. Reed considers? Gods are still propitiated and devils appeased. Not only do vulgar superstitions prevail to a laughable degree, but in the very van of the vanguard of civilization are those, and they are not few, who are governed in the most important actions of their lives by superstitious fear. Even in the chief places of our civilization there are men and women who worship God not from love, but

from fear of hell fire. What is that but devil worship? How does it differ from propitiating gods and appeasing devils?

Beyond this kind of fear, however, is a fear of which Mr. Reed makes no account—a terror that has largely taken the place of primitive superstition. This new fear is the cause of perpetual apprehension, on the part both of those who have and of those who have not conquered superstitious fear; and it is becoming more and more widespread and intense. Our ancestors who dreaded the "unknown and undiscovered," who inferred from every new mystery of nature a new god to be propitiated or a new devil to be appeased, had no fear of society, of that social organism—that Greater Leviathan, as Henry George called it—which is vaguely spoken of now-a-days as the community. But dread of this is the great fear of our time.

Primitive man could not contend with the powers of nature. They were mysteries to him, and so he feared them. But primitive men could contend with one another, and man had no fear of man. Nor had he any of society. In his time, such social forces as he felt at all touched him through the strong arm of social agents or dictators—men like himself. He could understand that, and did not fear it in the sense in which he feared natural phenomena. As there was nothing subtle nor mysterious in social manifestations, they did not excite his fear. What he feared was the mysterious. So before the mysteries of nature he quailed at the thought of god and devils. To-day man is the same. He, too, dreads the mysterious. Consequently he is in a similar state of fear; not toward nature, though, but toward society.

He finds himself in society, a part of society, dependent upon society and society upon him, yet—be he rich or poor—in constant dread of being mysteriously crushed by society. Nothing is more inexplicable to modern man than the fact that want and fear of want, the degradations of poverty and crimes which fructify in poverty, follow in the wake of the material advances which society makes, of the very advances which Mr. Reed describes. It is as mysterious and dreadful to them, as fearful in its possibilities to themselves if they are thoughtful, as were swiftly flowing rivers and mountain torrents to Mr. Reed's prehistoric savage who knew nothing of hy-

draulics. And because it is mysterious and therefore uncontrollable, it excites his fear much as our naked and houseless ancestors, skulking home at nightfall, were inspired with fear by the voiceful sighing of the wind among the trees. But just as man has conquered the kind of fear of which Mr. Reed writes, by probing its mysteries and discovering in them only manifestations of beneficent law, so he will learn to conquer his fear of the social organism. Its mysteries, also, even in their most terrible forms of poverty, business depression and crime, are but manifestations of what in essence and undiverted by human meddling are beneficent social laws.

As man discovers natural physical law, he ceases to fear physical nature. That is the core of Mr. Reed's thought. So, as man discovers social law, will he cease to dread the social organism. For then he will find society to be what he has already found physical nature to be—his very obedient servant. And this discovery will lead him on to perfect his discoveries in spiritual law, having done which he will no longer fear God. All natural laws—physical, social, and spiritual—are beneficent. On every plane, in every realm, we conquer fear as we dissipate mystery.

FINANCE AND TRANSPORTATION.

A practical solution of the financial and transportation problems, which has the endorsement of Gov. Pingree, of Michigan, who says that it "presents in their true light questions that immediately concern the American people," has been put out by Jay D. Miller, a prominent Chicago lawyer of republican affiliations. Mr. Miller holds that the questions of money and railroad transportation are so far interdependent that if the transportation problem were properly met, both that and the money problem would be thereby solved.

He begins by showing that the railroads of this country are so heavily mortgaged that in interest on bonds alone, in addition to dividends on watered stock, the public pays the full cost of the roads every 20 years. He therefore proposes that the people themselves build railroads as government institutions, paying for them with paper money "based upon the same thing that gold and silver bullion are based upon, to wit, labor"—the labor employed in constructing the roads and in producing materials and supplies. The people would then

own the railroads without having issued an interest bearing obligation; and when the paper money, which Mr. Miller would make a legal tender, had been redeemed in passenger and freight service, or any other government service, the roads would have been paid for once and forever.

On the point of redemption Mr. Miller says: "When the government issues a gold or silver paper certificate, the coin (a concentrated form of labor) against which it was issued, remains stored in the vault; and the holder of the certificate can, if he choose, return it and get the coin (labor). When a dollar of paper money is issued, as herein outlined, the wealth (labor) upon which it is based, is stored in the railroad. The holder of the dollar cannot return it and take the railroad, but he can get a dollar's worth of railroad service (labor). The latter is redemption as much as the former." The same principle is applied by Mr. Miller to telegraph, telephone, pipe line, canal and post office service.

The objection that under this plan paper money might be issued in excess of the actual value of the roads is met by the suggestion that the yearly depreciation of the roads be estimated and provision made for cancelling a proportionate amount of the money. If, for example, a road would last ten years, as ascertained by the experience of practical railroad men, ten per cent. of the issue should be cancelled annually. And as a further safeguard, "in order to keep one dollar at all times as good as any other dollar," the secretary of the treasury should be authorized, with the approval of a majority of the members of the supreme court (not as a court but as individuals), to cancel all or any part of the currency in question when redeemed. Such money, says Mr. Miller, "will be honest as well as sound"—"will always be good and at par."

This outline of his solution of the financial and transportation problems, Mr. Miller fills in with liberal quotations in support of his position, in one respect or another, from railroad experts and political economists; and also with a somewhat minute examination, upon the basis of expert authority, into the monopoly features of transportation under private control. One or two of these elaborated points are especially worthy of consideration.

Answering the familiar objection to public ownership of transportation

facilities, that government management, as exemplified by the postal service, is wasteful, he shows that this charge against the post office is justified only by the corrupt power which private railroad monopolies exert. Whereas express companies carry parcels from shipper to consignee, 1,000 miles at the rate of three dollars a hundred pounds, the railroad monopolies tax the post office eight dollars a hundred pounds for an average of less than 450 miles, in addition to exacting for postal cars a rental of more than enough each year to build the cars. This is the explanation of the deficit in our postal service,—a fact which argues not against but in favor of public ownership of transportation facilities.

Another point of peculiar interest and importance which Mr. Miller develops at length, is the fact, not generally known outside of railroad circles, that distance is a minor element in the cost of transportation. In support of this point reference is made to street car service. Within certain extended limits the same fare for that service is universally charged, regardless of the distance of the ride. Reference is made also to the zone system in Hungary, under which a ticket purchased in a particular zone carries the passenger to any station within that zone, regardless of distance. On the same point the experience of the Chicago & Northern Pacific is invoked. It seems that this road fixed its passenger fare to any point between Chicago and Blue Island—about 17 miles—at five cents, with the effect of increasing the revenue. The reduction of rates so stimulated travel that a larger income was earned with a given expenditure for cost of service. Accordingly, in harmony with the recommendations of James L. Cowles—whose recent work on "A General Freight and Passenger Post," Prof. James commends as giving "the best account of the movement for a reform in our freight and passenger tariff policy, and the best arguments in its behalf which have yet been given in English"—Mr. Miller proposes basing rates upon the character of accommodation, without regard to distance. He would charge so much, that is to say, for passengers on local trains, so much more on express trains, so much more than that on fast trains; and for freight, so much if it requires shelter, so much less if it does not require shelter, and so on. Under such a system of rates, with government ownership, it is

argued that our "railroads would produce a greater revenue than under the present exorbitant charges and system of secret favoritism."

Mr. Miller's little book, buttressed as its arguments are with an abundance of facts marshalled lawyer fashion, will prove a revelation to those who have given inadequate consideration to the railroad problem. It is an intellectual mine in connection with the railroad problem which all sides to the controversy will find it profitable to explore. Copies of it may be had of Jay D. Miller's Sons, Oak Park, Ill.

WAR REVENUES.

While the congressional committees on foreign affairs have been before the public eye with their warlike resolutions, the committee on ways and means of the lower house has been quietly at work in the background planning a measure for raising war revenues. Judging from the details that have leaked out, these measures are to be so contrived as to compel the classes who are to do the fighting to do the paying also, while enabling other classes to get back with a profit all that they may put into the war.

From an increase in the internal revenue tax on beer an annual addition to the revenue is expected, amounting to \$35,000,000. From an increase in the tax on tobacco, the additional revenue expected is \$33,000,000. A bank check tax is counted on for some millions more. Tea and coffee also are to be heavily taxed. From these and similar sources an extra income of over \$100,000,000 is looked for. Then, to make the war department easy at once, it is proposed to issue \$500,000,000 in bonds, redeemable in gold value money. Let us consider these propositions.

Who would pay the beer tax? Those who advocate it, intimate that it would be paid by the brewers. If that were true, the tax would be utterly indefensible upon its face. While a tax upon brewers for the purpose of discouraging their business as detrimental to the community might be justified as a police measure, no extraordinary tax upon them can be justified as a revenue measure. They receive no particular benefits from society; their income is freely paid to them by their customers; no privileges are conferred upon them by the community. They are therefore entitled to be as free from arbitrary exactions as any other business class. But in fact the brewers would not pay the

beer tax. Those who propose the tax know this, and the brewers know it. The brewers object to the tax, but that is not because they expect to pay it; it is because they fear a loss of custom. A moment's reflection should satisfy anyone that the brewers would not pay the beer tax. They would not if they could and probably could not if they would, pay \$35,000,000 a year more in taxes than they pay now without recouping themselves either by charging higher prices for beer or by supplying a poorer quality for the old price. The war tax on beer would be a tax upon beer drinkers; and as beer has become—whether that is matter for congratulation or not makes no difference—a national beverage with the common people, it would be a tax upon the common people, the very class that will be called upon to do the fighting.

So it would be with the tobacco tax. The class that would be asked to enlist, and that would enlist, are the largest consumers of tobacco. And strange as at first it may sound to say so, this also is the class that would bear the brunt of the proposed tax on bank checks. The use of small bank accounts has become exceedingly common within the past decade, and with it the custom of drawing small checks; and most of the small checks are drawn by men who are not rich but are of the class from which "bullet-stoppers" will be drawn when the first effervescence of patriotism subsides. For every small check these men draw they would pay as high a tax as their rich neighbor would pay on large checks. In addition to that, the tax on business checks generally would be shifted to customers. And not only the tea and coffee tax, besides the taxes already mentioned, but nearly if not quite all the other proposed war taxes would be borne in greatest degree by this same class.

Now let it be observed that what this class as a class will be called upon to contribute to the war will not come back. It will not come back to them in any form, except it be in the form of meagre pensions grudgingly bestowed, and in the privilege of calling that their country to the valuable part of which most of them have no legal right to a foot. What they give, whether in money or blood, will be given outright. Not so with what other classes give. In some degree, a very small degree, comparatively, they too will give outright when they drink beer or tea or coffee, or smoke tobacco,

or draw a check. What they thus give will not come back to them. But the substantial war contributions of these classes are to be neither in taxes on beer or coffee or tea or tobacco or small checks. Their contributions to the war are to be loans on bonds. And these contributions will come back to them; aye, will come back to them with a profit. Not only will the bonds bear interest, but they will be so carefully protected as to the money of their redemption, that at the close of the war they will command a premium. Many a bond of the civil war, for which the government received less than 50 cents in gold value money, has since risen to \$1.15 and more in that money, besides paying interest year by year. Large as is our pension expenditure, it is exceeded by the interest and premiums on the bonds which our money patriots of the civil war period bought.

So it will be with the method now in course of preparation for raising funds for the pending war with Spain. These funds will be so raised that the fighting masses will contribute outright, and the thrifty classes will lend on good security and profitable conditions. It is too much to hope for, probably, that the United States government may at this crisis reverse the old custom of putting all the burdens of war upon the common people. He would be an optimist, indeed, who should look at this time for a war revenue measure which would put the financial burden of the coming war upon the monopolists of the country, and a dreamer who should propose it; but some good may possibly be done in the future by calling attention now to the fact that both in blood and treasure the losers by the war about to break upon us are as usual to be not the privileged classes but the working masses.

DECAY OF COBDENISM.

In the North American Review for April, John P. Young has a paper in which he attempts to show that Cobdenism in England is extinct. Mr. Young mistakes the decline of an organization, and a tendency in some quarters against the specific reform which that organization originally represented, for the extinction of the spirit of freedom which gave vitality to the organization at the start. Because the Cobden Club is moribund, it by no means follows that the principle which gave it birth is dead. What has killed the Cobden Club is not its adherence to a dead principle,

but its failure to adapt itself to the expansion of a living one. Having stood for free trade when the free trade principle made itself manifest only in a movement to reform the customs revenue, this club clung to that manifestation long after the principle had vitalized more advanced agitations, and so in the very nature of things it fell into a decline.

In its origin Cobdenism was a great democratic movement. It struck at privilege, and it struck hard. The evidence of this is not confined to the fact that the plutocratic elements of England broke out violently against it. There is abundant internal evidence also. At that time English laws put a high customs tariff upon imported grain. They did so in the interest of the agricultural landlords of England. By "protecting" English grain from foreign competition, they increased the price of bread and raised agricultural rents, thus enabling the parasitic landlord class to live with greater luxury in the sweat of the faces of the industrial classes. A similar situation, reversed as to parties in interest, exists to-day in Germany. The agrarian movement there, which constitutes the backbone of German protectionism, is organized for the purpose of raising the rents which feudal landlords exact from their agricultural tenants. What that movement is trying to establish in Germany is precisely what the Cobden movement demolished in England—special tariff privileges for the monopoly owners of agricultural land.

But with the overthrow of this particular privilege the Cobden movement stopped. The Cobden Club has tried to live upon the glory of the past. Instead of carrying the free trade principle farther into the heart of special privilege, it preached merely the abolition of customs tariffs, as the remedy for industrial oppression and the secret of national greatness. The abolition of customs tariffs, did we say? Why, it did not go even so far as that. The sum and substance of its demands was a reduction of customs tariffs to a revenue basis. The club saw no more in free trade 50 years after the corn law fight than the anti-corn law agitators saw in their first glimpses. That club was to free trade what a star gazing society would be to astronomy, if it had advanced no farther in Galileo's science than the first crude perceptions of the Copernican school; or what a railroad company would be to

transportation, if it used old Stephenson locomotives. Of course the Cobden Club is virtually dead. It has been virtually dead for years, and all intelligent free traders have known it. No protectionist magazineer was needed to give them that information. And what is more, it deserved to die.

Yet the free trade principle still lives in England. It is stronger than it was in Cobden's day. The reason that the protectionist writer in the North American cannot see this is the same reason that has extinguished the Cobden Club: The principle has assumed newer and more radical forms. The specific reform which Cobden accomplished has been accomplished for good. Despite the occasional reactionary appearances in ultra tory clubs and aristocratic magazines, an English ministry could no more re-establish a bread tariff in England than it could re-establish the feudal system. It could not even re-establish any kind of tariff exclusively for protection. There is a significance which protectionists overlook in the fact that every diplomatic and military movement of England has the "open door" doctrine, the doctrine of open ports for all nations, for its purpose. That would not be so but for Richard Cobden. Even in this sense, then, the spirit of Cobdenism still lives in England. But it lives there in a deeper sense. From the vitalizing principle of a mere customs reform, it has become the vitalizing principle of a general fiscal reform, and better yet of a general social reform.

In one of his speeches in parliament during the corn law agitation, Cobden warned the landowners of England against forcing on the attention of the middle and industrial classes the subject of taxation. "Mighty as I consider the fraud and injustice of the corn laws," said he, "I verily believe if you were to bring forward the history of taxation in this country for the last 150 years you would find as black a record against the landowners as even in the corn law itself." Then he added, referring to the landed aristocracy:—

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.

In those words Cobden foreshadowed the direction the free trade movement would take when the Cobden Club should have died. He seems to have seen that the free trade principle went far beyond the question of abolishing a customs tariff on grain.

It must have seemed clear to him that that reform, while it would reduce agricultural rents, would, by encouraging manufactures, increase town and city rents. And so the event has proved. The pecuniary benefits of his reform have been largely absorbed by city landlords, like the Duke of Westminster, and thus his free trade reform, the free trade of the Cobden Club, has been in a sense a failure. Not, however, because free trade is a false or ineffective doctrine. It is neither. But because his successors have not carried the doctrine far enough.

It has, therefore, fallen out, just as Cobden intimated in his speech that it would, that upon the death of his movement another got under way, one which differs from his only in giving to the principle of free trade full play. This movement is advancing directly upon landlordism. It does not stop with depriving landlords of the benefit of a protective tariff upon bread; it aims at depriving them of the benefit of all kinds of tariffs, all kinds of taxation, all kinds of special privileges. It questions their right to the land itself. This is the significance of many events in England during the past decade, not least among which is the recent defeat of landlord interests at the London elections.

Whoever attempts to size up the free trade spirit in England by the test of the present attitude of Englishmen toward the specific reform which Cobden advocated in the infancy of free trade agitation, as Mr. Young has done for the North American, may find reason for supposing the spirit of free trade to be extinct; but let him look for it in the light of the social agitations which are shaping English politics, and he will find the free trade spirit in England to be more vital, more determined, and more aggressive than ever.

NEWS

Pursuant to the congressional resolution printed in full below, President McKinley conveyed to Spain on the 20th, a few minutes before himself signing the resolution, the

ultimatum of the United States regarding the Cuban question. The ultimatum has not at this writing been made public upon official authority, but it is understood to have required the departure of Spanish troops from Spain, and to have demanded an answer from Spain within three days.

Upon being informally notified of the ultimatum, the Spanish minister at Washington turned over the affairs of his office to the French ambassador and the Austria-Hungarian minister and, obtaining his passports, departed for Canada, where he intends to remain until the close of the war. The American minister at Madrid has turned over the archives of his office to the British representative, preparatory to departing.

The Spanish resolution adopted by both houses of congress on the 18th and signed by President McKinley on the 20th, is in full as follows:

Joint resolution for the recognition of the independence of the people of Cuba, demanding that the government of Spain relinquish its authority and government in the island of Cuba and withdraw its land and naval forces from Cuba and Cuban waters, and directing the president of the United States to use the land and naval forces of the United States to carry these resolutions into effect.

Whereas, The abhorrent conditions which have existed for more than three years in the island of Cuba, so near our own borders, have shocked the moral sense of the people of the United States, have been a disgrace to Christian civilization, culminating, as they have, in the destruction of a United States battleship, with 266 of its officers and crew, while on a friendly visit in the harbor of Havana, and cannot longer be endured, as has been set forth by the president of the United States in his message to congress of April 11, 1898, upon which the action of congress was invited; therefore,

Resolved, first, That the people of the island of Cuba are, and of right ought to be, free and independent.

Second, That it is the duty of the United States to demand, and the government of the United States does hereby demand, that the government of Spain at once relinquish its authority and government in the island of Cuba and withdraw its land and naval forces from Cuba and Cuban waters.

Third, That the president of the United States be, and he hereby is, directed and empowered to use the entire land and naval forces of the United States, and to call into actual service of the United States the militia of the several states, to such ex-

tent as may be necessary to carry these resolutions into effect.

Fourth, That the United States hereby disclaims any disposition or intention to exercise sovereignty, jurisdiction or control over said island except for the pacification thereof, and assert its determination, when that is accomplished, to leave the government and control of the island to its people.

It was not without great difficulty and concessions from both sides—concessions as to verbiage at least—that the forgoing resolution was agreed upon by congress.

The lower house first adopted a resolution, in which, while intervention was authorized, there was no recognition whatever of Cuban independence. In the senate the majority of the committee on foreign relations reported a resolution also authorizing intervention, but declaring in addition, that “the people of the island of Cuba are and of right ought to be free and independent.” The minority of the committee agreed to this, except that they favored a clause specifically recognizing the republic of Cuba. These events were reported on page seven last week, and the events leading up to them were told on page eight of the week before.

On the 14th, 15th and 16th, the senate debated the issue raised by the conflicting resolutions, and on the 16th, late in the evening, it adopted the resolution proposed by the majority of its committee, but with the addition of the recognition clause desired by the minority, and of a clause disclaiming on the part of the United States “any disposition or intention to exercise sovereignty, jurisdiction or control over” the island of Cuba except for pacification—being the fourth clause of the resolution quoted in full above.

At the next session of the lower house, on the 18th, that body refused to concur with the senate, and after some “backing and filling,” conferees were appointed from both houses. They at first were unable to agree, the house conferees insisting upon striking out the important words “are and” in the first subdivision of the resolution, as well as the clause specifically recognizing the independence of the present republic. The senate conferees were willing to strike out the latter clause, but not to agree to the other demand of the house.

At this point, therefore, the issue turned solely upon the question of retaining or striking out the words

“are and” in the first clause; that is, as to whether we should declare that the Cubans “are and of right ought to be,” or that they only “of right ought to be” free and independent. At the second conference, held late at night, the house conferees receded from their position on this point, and the resolution was agreed to with the words “are and” retained, and the clause of specific recognition struck out. Both houses, long after midnight of the 18th, adopted the agreement of the conferees, and the resolution as quoted in full above, went to the president on the 19th. It was returned with his approval on the 20th.

A detailed account of these proceedings will be found in this department under the title “In Congress.”

While the United States were thus adjusting the legislative formalities preliminary to a war with Spain, the Spanish government was not idle in the same direction. On the 14th the Spanish cabinet agreed upon a decree, which the queen regent signed on the same day, convening the cortes on the 20th. That body would have met in regular course on the 25th.

The Spanish cortes is composed of a senate and congress of equal authority. Senators are of three classes: Senators by their own right, including princes of the blood, grandees, admirals, captain generals, etc.; senators nominated by the crown for life; and senators elected by the states, the church, the universities, the academies, etc. The first two classes are not to exceed 180, which is the number of the third class. The congress is composed of 431 deputies elected by the people under a restricted suffrage.

At the cabinet council on the 18th, the draft of the queen’s speech to be delivered from the throne upon the assembling of the cortes was agreed upon; and at a meeting of liberal senators and deputies held in the senate chamber at Madrid on the 19th, preliminary to the meeting of the cortes, Sagasta, the prime minister, made a speech, in the course of which he declared that Spain will never surrender Cuba, and counseled a speedy organization of the two chambers in order to afford the government prompt means for defense. At the meeting of the conservatives, held in Madrid the same night, their leader, Silvela, advised all conservatives to support the liberal ministry in resisting the demands of the United States.

Upon the meeting of the cortes on the 20th the queen regent and her young son, the king, were drawn in state to the senate chamber, where the queen regent delivered her speech from the throne, which, contrary to established etiquette, was frequently applauded. Expressing the gratitude of Spain to the pope and the great powers, she explained that in anticipation of American aggression she had hastened to assemble the cortes, whose supreme decision she believed would sanction the unalterable purpose of her government to defend Spanish rights at whatever sacrifice.

In both countries the legislative proceedings were supplemented by warlike activities of another kind. Coincidentally with the Spanish decree convening the cortes, a decree was issued opening a national subscription for increasing the strength of the Spanish navy. It was headed by the queen with a subscription of 50,000 pesetas—\$10,000. On the 14th also, Gen. Weyler was summoned to Madrid, a fact which gave rise to the rumor that he would be made commander in chief of the Spanish forces in America; and on the 15th it was reported that the Spanish fleet was assembling at St. Vincent, one of the Cape Verde islands, and taking on large supplies of coal. Meanwhile our government issued orders on the 14th abolishing the custom of posting the movements of naval vessels, and on the 15th directing the preliminary movements of the army. The latter order concentrated the regular army in four grand divisions: Six regiments of cavalry and ten batteries of artillery, under Maj. Gen. John R. Brooke, to be stationed at Chickamauga; seven regiments of infantry under Brig. Gen. W. R. Shafter, at New Orleans; six regiments of infantry under Brig. Gen. John J. Copping, at Mobile; and six regiments of infantry under Brig. Gen. J. F. Wade, at Tampa, Fla. Acting Rear Admiral W. T. Sampson, is to command the naval force assembled at Key West; Commodore W. S. Schley commands that at Hampton Roads; and Commodore George Dewey that at Hong Kong, China, which is expected to operate upon the Philippine islands.

On the 17th the preliminary commission designated by the Cuban autonomist government to propose con-

ditions of peace to the insurgents, left Havana upon its mission. But the next day brought news by way of Havana, which indicates that the insurgents have no disposition to accept the Spanish "armistice." The insurgents had attacked a Spanish garrison at Espujarosa, in the province of Pinar del Rio, and, according to Spanish official reports, had captured the fort and entered the town. Skirmishes in the province of Santa Clara and Santiago de Cuba, also were reported a few days earlier.

The American consulate at Malaga, Spain, was attacked by a Spanish mob on the 16th, the flag insulted and Consul Bartleman abused. The local authorities personally attacked the mob, arresting several rioters and placing a strong guard around the consulate; and the Spanish government at Madrid telegraphed to the governor of Malaga to express to the American consul the regrets of the cabinet and its determination to punish the ring-leaders of the mob. Dispatches received at London on the 19th reported a resumption of the riot and the killing of the American consul's colored servant.

It was reported from Washington on the 16th that Great Britain had decided in case of war between this country and Spain to treat coal as contraband of war. This decision is regarded as neutral in form but friendly to the United States in fact; for Spain would be largely dependent in case of war upon the British for coal supply, while the United States could obtain supplies from her own coal fields.

IN CONGRESS.

Week Ending April 20, 1898.

Senate.

On the 14th the center of interest was shifted from the house to the senate, where unanimous consent for the consideration of the Cuban resolutions was granted, and Turner, populist, of Washington, continued a speech begun the day before in criticism of the president and his message. Senator Turner was followed by Hoar, republican, of Massachusetts, in defense of the president. Turpie, democrat, of Indiana, made an appeal for recognition of the insurgents. Gray, democrat, of Delaware, wanted the outrages perpetrated by the Spanish in Cuba to be specified as the cause prompting us to make war, and opposed recognition of independence at this time. Fairbanks, republican, of

Indiana, recognizing that war was inevitable, nevertheless opposed recognition of the insurgents. "We must intervene," he said, "and then let the majority rule." As he closed, the house resolution was reported and laid upon the table. A motion to adjourn, which followed, was voted down—32 to 30—all the senators who were known to favor Cuban recognition voting in the negative.

In the course of a give and take talk which then occurred, relative to fixing a time for voting, Carter, republican, of Montana, who had voted against the adjournment, exclaimed: "The country requires that we act and not talk on this matter." Thereupon there was applause both in the senate and the galleries. Vice President Hobart ordered the applause to cease, addressing his words directly to the galleries, which brought out a sharp retort from senators that he himself was out of order in speaking directly to the galleries, something which had never been done before in the senate. After this spasm the senate adjourned, by a vote of 32 to 23, until the 15th at an early hour.

The galleries were thronged on the 15th, and with one exception—Walthal, of Mississippi, who was sick—every senator was in his place. The Cuban debate, resumed at ten in the morning, continued until nearly 11 at night. Speeches were made by Culom, republican, of Illinois, Wolcott, republican, of Colorado, and Spooner, republican, of Wisconsin, in support of the president's position; and by Berry, democrat, of Arkansas, Daniel, democrat, of Virginia, Tillman, democrat, of South Carolina, Chilton, democrat, of Texas, Teller, republican, of Colorado, and Stewart, republican, of Nevada, in favor of recognition of the present Cuban republic. In the afternoon, a motion to adjourn was voted down by 10 to 61. The motion was renewed later in the day, and during the informal discussion which it produced, Wellington, republican, of Maryland, made an assertion regarding Money, democrat, of Mississippi, which Money denounced as a lie, an expression for which he afterwards apologized to the senate. An agreement was finally made that the vote on the Cuban resolutions should be taken before adjournment on the 16th.

The center of interest continued in the senate on the 16th. Senator Cannon, republican, of Utah, was the first to speak. He favored recognition of the Cuban republic. Senators

Burrows, republican, of Michigan, Platt, republican, of Connecticut, Wellington, republican, of Maryland, Caffrey, democrat, of Louisiana, Hawley, republican, of Connecticut, White, democrat, of California, Clark, republican, of Wyoming, Gear, republican, of Iowa, Elkins, republican, of West Virginia, Pritchard, republican, of North Carolina, and Morgan, democrat, of Alabama, spoke against recognition; while Nelson, republican, of Minnesota, Perkins, republican, of California, Thurston, republican, of Nebraska, Kenney, democrat, of Delaware, Bate, democrat, of Tennessee, Pasco, democrat, of Florida, Petrus, democrat, of Georgia, Bacon, democrat, of Alabama, McEnnery, democrat, of Louisiana, and Clay, democrat, of Georgia, spoke for recognition. After these speeches the vote on the amendment recognizing the republic of Cuba as the true and lawful government of that island was taken. It was adopted—51 to 37. An additional amendment was then offered by the committee on foreign relations disclaiming any disposition or intention on the part of the United States to exercise authority over the island except for its pacification, which was adopted without dissent.

A motion by Frye, republican, of Maine, to strike out the words "are and of right" from the clause of the resolution reading that the people of Cuba "are and of right ought to be free and independent," was laid on the table by a vote of 55 to 33. Senator Morgan's substitute for a declaration of war was also laid on the table—83 to 5.

Hale, republican, of Maine, then spoke at length in opposition to the resolutions as amended, as being discourteous to the president. He was followed in the same strain by Gorman, democrat, of Maryland, Allison, republican, of Iowa, and Aldrich, republican, of Rhode Island. Jones, democrat, of Arkansas, replied to Aldrich. A vote on the motion to strike out of the house resolution all after the resolving clause, and to insert instead the senate resolutions as amended, was then carried by 60 to 28. Hoar, republican, of Massachusetts, now made the last speech, explaining his reasons for voting against the resolutions as they stood; and at nine o'clock the roll was called for the final vote. The house resolution as amended was adopted by a majority of 46—67 to 21.

Every senator was present but Walthal, democrat, of Mississippi, who

was still confined to his bed with illness. At 9:15 the senate adjourned till noon on Monday, the 18th.

Rawlins, of Utah, was speaking on the 18th on the question of the president's right to recognize a foreign nation, when the adverse action of the house upon the Cuban resolutions was whispered about. Soon after Mason, republican, of Illinois, had presented a resolution thanking Capt. Sigsbee for his courage, heroism and devotion at the time of the destruction of the Maine, which was under his command, the Cuban resolution as amended to-day by the house was laid before the senate. Davis, of the committee on foreign relations, moved concurrence in the house amendments, and a vote was immediately taken. By 46 to 32 the motion was lost. A motion to insist upon the senate resolution as adopted on the 16th was then adopted without division, while a motion to request a conference was defeated by a vote of 43 to 34.

Unimportant routine business followed until the receipt of a notification from the house that the house insisted upon its amendments and asked for a conference. A conference was then agreed to by the senate, and in its behalf Vice President Hobart appointed as conferees, Davis, Foraker and Morgan.

At a little after eight in the evening the senate conferees reported that the conference had failed to reach an agreement. They had offered to waive the Turpie amendment, which expressly recognized the existing Cuban republic, but the house conferees insisted upon omitting also the words "are and" from the clause declaring that the people of Cuba "are and of right ought to be free and independent." This the senate conferees would not concede. A motion made by Mr. Davis to insist upon the senate's amendments was then adopted without division and a motion for a further conference was defeated by a vote of 40 to 39.

The response of the house, asking for a further conference, came at half-past ten. Davis moved to insist upon the senate amendments, but to grant a further conference. His motion was adopted. A motion by Allen that the senate instead of the chair appoint the conferees was defeated by a vote of 49 to 28, and the chair appointed the same conferees as before.

It was long after midnight when the senate conferees again reported. They then announced that

the house conferees had receded from their position as to the words "are and," consenting to accept the phrase "are and of right ought to be," upon the withdrawal by the senate of the specific recognition of the present republic. The report was adopted by seven majority—42 to 35—and at ten minutes of two in the morning of the 19th the senate adjourned.

Consideration of the sundry civil bill was resumed on the 19th. This business was preceded by the presentation of a new Cuban resolution by Allen, populist, of Nebraska, which recognizes the Cuban republic as the lawful government of Cuba, and offers the friendly offices of the United States to adjust the financial affairs of that government with Spain and the holders of Spanish bonds for which Cuban revenues are pledged, to the end that Cuba shall be relieved from responsibility for such bonds. Several speeches were made relative to the Cuban question, and at the adjournment Cockrell, democrat, of Missouri, had the floor. His speech was in criticism of the president's Cuban policy. Speaking upon the same question continued on the 20th, when Allen offered another resolution relative to the Spanish war, which declares that in the opinion of the senate no circumstances can arise warranting an increase of the interest-bearing bonded debt, or that will interfere with the reform of financial affairs in this country on the lines laid down by the populist party platform of 1896. An amendment to the sundry civil bill, offered by Allison, republican, of Iowa, which appropriates \$473,151 to pay Great Britain the award for Behring sea claims, was agreed to.

House.

No business of importance was transacted in the house on the 14th, and except for a personal explanation on the part of Bailey, of Texas, in which he denied responsibility for the fight on the floor of the house—mentioned on page 10 in these columns last week—charging the responsibility upon the speaker, and the speaker's reply, the time of the house on the 15th was devoted to the consideration of private measures. On the 16th, after passing some minor bills, it adjourned till ten o'clock on Monday, the 18th.

But on the 18th business did not begin until noon. At noon, however, the Cuban matter was taken up. Dingley, the republican leader, was

recognized by the speaker and made a motion to concur in the amendments adopted by the senate with the exception of the words "are and," in the sentence "the people of the island of Cuba are and of right ought to be free and independent," and also with the exception of the words, "and that the government of the United States hereby recognize the republic of Cuba as the true and lawful government of that island," thus leaving the independence clause of the senate amendments to read as follows: "First—That the people of the island of Cuba of right ought to be free and independent." Dingley cut off all opportunity not only for debate but also for amendment, by moving the previous question. His motion to concur with the exceptions stated above was adopted by a vote of 178 to 156. Fourteen republicans voted against it.

About the middle of the afternoon the senate sent notice of its nonconcurrence in the exceptions proposed by the house, and the speaker again recognized Dingley, who moved that the house adhere to its proposition and ask for a conference; and he again attempted to cut off debate and amendment by moving the previous question. But upon the authority of a precedent submitted by Bailey, the speaker held that a motion to recede and concur would take precedence of Dingley's motion. So the question first came up on a motion made by Bromwell, republican, of Ohio, to recede from the house amendments and concur in those of the senate. Only 12 republicans voted for the motion, and it was lost by a vote of 173 to 148. Dingley's motion to insist and ask for a conference was then agreed to without division, and the speaker appointed Adams and Heatwole, republicans, and Dinmore, democrat, as the house conferees.

About half-past nine in the evening, the house was officially notified of the inability of the conference committee to agree, and of the action of the senate in still insisting upon its amendments and in refusing to ask for further conference. Bromwell again moved that the house recede from its disagreement and concur in the senate amendments. The motion was lost by a vote of 177 to 144. Only 11 republicans voted this time in support of Bromwell's motion. Adams, republican, of Pennsylvania, then moved that the house continue to insist and that it request a further conference. This motion was agreed to

without division and the speaker appointed the same conferees as before.

The conferees reported at half-past one that they had agreed to yield their contention as to the words "are and," and upon Adams's motion their report was adopted by a vote of 310 to 6, whereupon the house adjourned.

The house did no business on the 19th. It was in session but a few minutes. But on the 20th it passed the army bill without division, after amending it as to some of the provisions which the committee on military affairs had recommended. An attempt to reduce the term of enlistment from three years to one was defeated, as were one to grant leave of absence for purposes of enlistment to government employes, and another to allow companies and regiments to select their own officers. But company and regimental officers, though appointed by the president, are to be appointed upon the recommendation of the governors of the states to which their organizations belong.

NEWS NOTES.

—Spanish bonds on the London market closed on the 20th at 34, the lowest point they had reached.

—A correspondent of the London Times, as announced by that paper on the 19th, has been expelled from Havana.

—Robert Purvis, the colored abolitionist of Philadelphia, died there on the 15th at the age of 88. One of his sons was in the South Carolina legislature in the early 70's.

—A bill has been introduced in congress to restore to American citizenship Mrs. Sartoris, daughter of Gen. Grant, who became a British subject in virtue of her marriage.

—Metropolitan Tabernacle, situated at Newington Butts, in the southern part of London, England, and famous as "Spurgeon's tabernacle," was destroyed by fire on the 20th.

—Riots in Porto Rico are reported as growing out of the scarcity and dearness of food. Apparently they are influenced in some degree by expectation of an American war with Spain.

—George Parsons Lathrop, at one time assistant editor of the Atlantic Monthly, and a well-known literary man of New York, died in that city suddenly on the 19th. He was a son-in-law of Nathaniel Hawthorne.

—Upon the demand of the British consul at Havana, who has represented the United States since the recall of Gen. Lee, three Americans who had been arrested as spies were released on the 19th by Gen. Blanco.

—The republican convention for the Sixth congressional district of Indiana, which met at Brookville on the 19th, nominated James E. Watson to succeed Henry U. Johnson, who voted and tried to speak in the house against war with Spain.

—Reports from the borders of the Indian territory describe much uneasiness as prevailing there on account of fears that in case of the withdrawal of troops to engage in war with Spain the Indians will go on the war path.

—The steamer Packshan, which arrived at Vancouver from Dyea, Alaska, on the 14th, reported that the search for the bodies of those killed in the Chilkoot pass by the avalanche, mentioned on page 11 last week, has been concluded, and that 62 bodies were taken out.

—President Patton and Profs. Duffield and Cameron, of Princeton college, refuse to go as delegates to the Presbyterian general assembly, on the ground that they expect the college to be censured for allowing the sale of liquors at Princeton Inn. The importance of this refusal is its significance of a probable breach between Princeton college and the Presbyterian church.

—Privates of the 25th United States infantry, negro troops, now encamped at Chickamauga awaiting orders to go to the front in the Spanish war, are compelled to ride in the cars set apart for colored people. Some of them insisted on the 19th upon riding in the "white" cars on a train of the Chattanooga, Rome & Southern railroad, whereupon the conductor refused to move the train. He finally found the adjutant of the regiment who ordered the soldiers into the "colored" cars, and the train went on.

—Miss Catherine H. Spence, president of the Effective Voting League of South Australia, has issued a circular address in which she describes the year 1897 as an important era in electoral reform. Among other statements, she says that a petition, signed by 1,653 electors of South Australia, favoring the Hare method of proportional representation at federal elections, was presented to the federal

convention at its opening last January. She also says that eight cantons in Switzerland, and the municipality of Rio Janeiro, Brazil, have adopted proportional representation.

—Robert Goelet has been charged by the United States state department with abandoning, in Barbadoes on the 3d of March, five of the sailors employed on his yacht "Nahma." According to the report of the American consul at Barbadoes the men, who were on shore leave, returned late to the dock where they expected to meet the yacht's boat. It had left, however, and the yacht sailed away without them in spite of their signals. Though money was owing them for wages, they were left in a destitute condition. The collector of customs at the port of New York was instructed on the 15th to libel the yacht upon its return to that port.

—From a private letter received at Madrid on the 14th, it was learned that the rebellion in the Philippine islands, which was briefly mentioned on page 11 last week and page 12 the week before, has been growing in spite of official Spanish reports to the contrary. Over 20,000 men, well armed, are reported in the field against Spanish authority, and several engagements are said to have taken place. A special dispatch by way of London on the 17th, from Singapore, reports the arrival there from Manilla of a large number of Spanish officials and well-to-do Spanish families, driven out by the rebellion. They report that Manilla is panic-stricken.

—At the meeting of the New York Central Labor union on the 17th, peace resolutions were presented by Bishop Potter, Ernest H. Crosby, William Dean Howells, Bolton Hall, Charles Frederic Adams and John S. Crosby. The resolutions are described by the dispatches as "a masterly arraignment of war and plea for peace." They described the destruction of the Maine as raising a question of fact proper to be referred to arbitration; spoke of the oppression of the poor in this country as equalling that in Cuba; gave warning that war will only add to the suffering both in Cuba and the United States; asserted that a Cuban republic would be more cruel and oppressive than Spanish rule; explained that speculators would make money while workingmen of the two nations shot each other down; and showed that a foreign war would interfere with the

great battle for industrial freedom which is more important than the establishment of a republic in Cuba. The resolutions were defeated.

MISCELLANY

SOCIETY.

I.

I looked and saw a splendid pageantry
Of beautiful women and of lordly
men,
Taking their pleasure in a flowery
plain,
Where poppies and the red anemone,
And many another leaf of cramoisy,
Flickered about their feet, and gave
their stain
To heels of iron or satin, and the
grain
Of silken garments floating far and free,
As in the dance they wove themselves,
or strayed
By twos together, or lightly smiled
and bowed,
Or curtsied to each other, or else
played
At games of mirth and pastime, un-
afraid
In their delight; and all so high and
proud,
They seemed scarce of the earth
whereon they trod.

II.

I looked again and saw that flowery
space
Stirring, as if alive, beneath the tread
That rested now upon an old man's
head,
And now upon a baby's gasping face,
Or mother's bosom, or the rounded
grace
Of a girl's throat; and what had
seemed the red
Of flowers was blood, in gouts and
gushes shed
From hearts that broke under that
frolic pace.
And now and then from out the dread-
ful floor
An arm or brow was lifted from the
rest,
As if to strike in madness, or implore
For mercy; and anon some suffering
breast
Heaved from the mass and sank; and as
before
There revelers above them thronged and
prest.

—William Dean Howells.

WAR TAXES LABOR.

Even if we go to war without an army we must have money. The fifty million dollars already appropriated will not last many days longer. Accordingly, the ways and means committee has begun to bestir itself, and has laid out a plan for increasing the taxes one hundred million dollars per year and of borrowing five hundred million dol-

lars by issuing bonds. The new taxes are to be levied on beer, tea, coffee, tobacco and bank checks. The rates proposed are one dollar per barrel addition on beer, three cents per pound on coffee, ten cents per pound on tea, and a stamp duty on bank checks. The additional tax on tobacco is expected to yield fifteen million dollars, but the rate of tax is not mentioned. If we are going to war we shall need at least one hundred million dollars of additional revenue, and this is perhaps the most hasty means of securing it. Yet it should be understood that all these imposts, except the one on bank checks, being taxes on consumption, are taxes on labor. They are to be paid by all persons in proportion to their consumption of the articles named; and since wage-earners, or persons in moderate circumstances, consume the bulk of these articles, they will bear the most of the burden that war brings. So it always turns out when nations go to war. The poor pay the chief part of the money tax and of the blood tax also. It is a pity that we have no Henry George now to sound these facts in the ears of the laboring masses.—N. Y. Evening Post.

WAGE-EARNERS AND WAR.

It is said that those who are wage-earners in our New England states are much more eager than any other class to have a war, and this on the assumption that it would afford them not a little interest and excitement without personal loss, since the loss would only come to those who represent the capitalist class. No line of reasoning could be more erroneous than this. The capitalist may suffer something from a decline in income, but he can ordinarily support himself for some time upon his accumulated wealth. If he has money that he wishes to invest, he can find, perhaps, profitable sources for so doing by putting it in coal mines or timber lands in the Dominion of Canada, where war troubles will not interfere with the industry of the people; or he may invest it in railways or manufacturing in Mexico or South America, or, as to that matter, in Europe, drawing his income regularly, no matter how long Spain and the United States may be struggling to damage each other.

The wage-earner has merely his head and his hands with which to obtain his daily bread, and this has to be earned at the place where the head and hands are located. If the great building trade, for example, makes only about half the demand during the coming summer that it did last summer for mechanics of various classes, those who are out of

a job cannot readily take themselves and their families elsewhere, and, indeed, except out of the country, there is no reason to suppose they could do better elsewhere than they can do here. The ones who are to suffer, and who will be compelled to suffer even if matters go no further than they have at the present time—for already an arrest has taken place which cannot be made good—the ones, we say, who are chiefly to suffer will be the wage-earners, and, unfortunately, when this degree of suffering shortly begins there will only be a few of them who will be sufficiently keen-sighted to realize what the causes are that have brought it about.—Boston Herald.

CAIN AND ABEL.

A PARABLE OF PROPERTY, ADAPTED FROM THE TALMUD.

For the Public.

Now when the lads were grown, while Seth, their equal heir by right, was yet unborn, Adam waxed proud and said: "Lo, these sturdy twain are the tale of that seed which the Lord hath promised me. To them will I divide the land which He gave to me and mine to occupy and replenish." So to Cain, who was a tiller of the soil, Adam gave the near-by river plain, deep and mellow with the loamy spoil of the stream. And to Abel, who loved a shepherd life, he gave the lands beyond, the sunny hill-slopes and the upland pastures. And the earth, as before, repaid their toil with abundance.

Now, out of his plenty, Abel sacrificed to the Giver of All the choicest of his flocks and herds, fat lambs and well-favored bullocks. But of the increase of his fields Cain offered the blighted grain and gnarled fruit alone, and robbed the Lord of His proper rent by hiding the overplus within the earth.

And Abel's sacrifice was accepted and was returned to him fourfold in the increase of his sheep and kine. But Cain's was not accepted, and the portion which he had laid by was all to corrupted by mold and decay.

Therefore Cain hated Abel, his brother, and sought occasion to kill him.

Now Abel, to reach his pastures, must needs cross the hither land that Cain did till. So Cain rose early from his couch, thick spread with fleeces from Abel's flock, and lay in wait for Abel in the river-plain. And as Abel came leading his flocks and singing for joy of the fair dawn, Cain ran to meet him and said in wrath: "Wherefore comest thou with thy nibbling sheep and trampling kine upon the land which be-longeth to me?"

And Abel answered: "Wherefore

etest thou of the flesh of my sheep? Wherefore clothest thou thyself in garments fashioned from their wool? Give back the flesh which thou hast eaten, and restore again the wool wherewith thy garments were fashioned; then will I go out of thy land; yea, I will fly through the air that I may not touch it."

And Cain was dumb before the just words of Abel.

So Cain slew Abel.

M. M. MILLER.

AN EFFORT AFTER RIGHTEOUSNESS.

The Consumers' league of New York city, a corporation which has for its object the amelioration of the condition of the working women and shop girls and other employes, in and about shops, stores and workrooms in the city of New York, has just published its annual report. From the remarkably interesting report of the president, Mrs. Frederick Nathan, we take this excellent statement in regard to charity:

The first step in the progression of any philanthropic movement is the very important but difficult one to awaken the dormant sense of responsibility in the community for the existence of evils; the next step is to enlighten the community as to the means to remedy the evils.

The study of economics and sociology has caused the public to swerve from its old-fashioned methods of doling out charity and to turn to the more hopeful and truly philanthropic principle of dealing out justice.

The word "charity" in Hebrew (Tsedakah) stands also for "righteousness." If we all would deal righteously by our neighbors, give to all right opportunities and right compensation, we would reserve the use of the word charity for qualities of mind, rather than misuse it by applying it to the mere providing of material needs.

Women in other cities may be able to profit by some of the following facts and suggestions, also taken from Mrs. Nathan's report:

It is interesting to note that the clerks in one of the large department stores on the White List received a percentage on sales during the Christmas holiday season. A newspaper article, commenting on this interesting experiment, mentioned that it not only served to stimulate the sales, but improved the quality of the service, by making the employes more attentive and polite to customers. It was stated that this feature was so marked that it was frequently commented upon by patrons of the establishment.

The governing board is glad also to have had brought to its notice the boxes of an English match manufacturer, who evidently recognizes the princi-

ples which the Consumers' league stands for, as the following sentence is printed on the boxes: "Not injurious to those employed in the manufacture."

I must reiterate my request of last year, that members of the Consumers' league and all others interested in the welfare of working women and children should refrain, as far as possible, from shopping after five p. m., and on Saturday afternoons, so that the early-hour closing and half-holiday movements may be agitated with better results.

I would also urge upon all the importance of refusing to receive packages delivered after six p. m. Delivery clerks have assured me, with tears in their eyes, that if all customers would abide by this rule they would be able to spend their evenings at home or in enjoying a little recreation, instead of working until late hours. If a large enough number of customers would leave word with the superintendents of the various shops that unless they can deliver all packages before six p. m. they do not wish them delivered until the day following the purchase the delivery wagons, instead of being delayed at the shops to suit exacting and inconsiderate customers, would be sent out earlier to meet the demand of the more considerate ones.

THE NEW STEAMER.

"Go," said the editor to the new reporter, "and write up the new English steamer just arrived. Give a thorough account of her from stem to stern."

"From what?" said the young man recently arrived from a far interior state, and to whom a vessel of any sort was a mystery and a wonder.

"From stem to stern," said the editor, fixing a suspicious and threatening eye upon him.

This was the young man's first mission. He was eager to distinguish himself. He had already done so on his village paper, but he wanted a wider field for his aspirations, and had come to New York.

Yet he went out of the office, anxious and doubting. "I will go to the captain," said he; "he will explain to me the ship and its uses. He will tell me all."

"Captain," said he, "I am sent to write up your ship. Oblige me by stating how many masts she has."

"Eighteen," promptly answered the captain.

"Where are they?"

"We have sent them on shore to be painted."

"How much water does your vessel draw?"

"Three inches."

"How do you draw it?"

"By steam-power from the well."

"Were you ever in a storm at sea?"

"Never," said the captain.

"Are you ever seasick?"

"Awfully; can't leave my berth from the time we leave New York till we arrive at Liverpool."

"Are the rest of your officers and crew seasick?"

"Always. We're only on deck and about in port."

"Why, who steers the vessel at sea?"

"The cook; he's the only well man on board."

After getting much other information, which the captain said he was only too happy to impart to such an interesting young gentleman, the reporter returned and wrote as follows:

"The new steamer Crusader is a splendid specimen of naval architecture. Her keel revolves on hinges, so as to be readily unshipped in a storm, when it is not wanted. The rudder, also, by a patent contrivance, can be drawn out of its socket, and deported on deck during the night and in hurricanes. The Crusader has folding decks which can be doubled up when she has but little cargo, and her tonnage in this way can be decreased from four thousand to two hundred tons. The sail can, if necessary, be used as a sky-sail or wind-sail, and the saving of canvas effected in this manner reduces the wear and tear of her running rigging one-half. The main brace passes from the end of the bowsprit over the fore, main and royal masts, thence down over the spanker-boom to the taffrail, and into the cabin windows, where it is secured by a double-banked sheepshank to the head of the captain's berth. She has compound engines, which boil water at an extremely low temperature. Her screws revolve at the rate of ten thousand times a minute, and can, if necessary, be brought forward and used as paddle wheels. The Crusader is also constructed on the crab principle, and by bracing up everything sharp on the wind and wearing ship frequently she can go as fast sideways as any other way. The engines are furnished with condensers, which condense milk as well as water. Her cabins are constructed on the French-flat principle, there being six stories, with kitchens, etc., for each family of passengers. The Crusader also carries her own docks, and thus saves all expenses of wharfage when in port. She also carries her own quarantine, and so can never be detained if there is any malaria or measles on board. The pilot pilots her all the way across the Atlantic, and comes back with the ship each time. Her compasses in the binnacle give daily the direction in the wind."—Argonaut.

PUBLIC PLAYGROUNDS IN PHILADELPHIA.

Through Mr. Tsanoff's tireless energy, by the spring of 1894 quite a public sentiment was created in favor of the movement, and two playgrounds on a very small scale were opened by some women during that summer. Early in 1895 a permanent playgrounds committee was formed, and in various ways public sentiment was aroused. As a result, the city councils granted \$1,000 for the opening of school yards as children's playgrounds, and four of them were so used during that season. Twelve school yards were opened in 1896; and during 1897 the city councils willingly granted \$3,000 for the purpose, and 23 such playgrounds—several in vacant lots—were in successful operation. Mr. Paul Kavanagh, of the board of education, became thoroughly aroused to the importance of this movement, and as a result of his influence the board of education employed for each school yard playground two teachers, who were helped more or less by volunteer workers; each playground was provided with tents, sand heaps, swings, toys and other good things for the children's enjoyment. The vacant lots were equipped by private subscription. From these playgrounds the children were also taken by young people's societies and other league helpers on frequent trolley outings to Fairmount park and elsewhere, the children usually paying at least part of their own car fare.

The playgrounds did not themselves do the educational work. Mr. Tsanoff says that when one playground in a rough district was opened last spring, its sand piles became, rather, the scene of a desperate grabbing of buckets and shovels. Sand, fists and pails often filled the air, while the cries and complaints of the youngsters added to the confusion. Turning to the swings and see-saws, the caretakers found another crowd of wrangling children, while a shout from the entrance announced the arrival of a "gang" of older boys. The tent collapsed, the swings were monopolized, the sand was scattered over the yard, and the "gang" had more fun than it had enjoyed for many a day. When capture was attempted, the "gang" took to the streets and from a safe distance hurled missiles and epithets at the caretakers and janitor. If a culprit was caught, he hadn't done it, and no one knew who had. When the "cops" were called in, the "gang" was often more than a match for them.

And yet, in a month's time, the sand piles of this playground presented a picturesque scene of quiet enjoyment. Bad boys still came, but they also went, for there was no "gang" to hinder their going. "The boys and girls," says Mr. Tsanoff, "began to look to the caretakers as their friends. Their conduct, language and appearance were really ennobled." "I know that our boy be-

haves differently at home," said one woman, and this was but the expression of the feeling of many. In six hours after the announcement was made last September that this playground must be closed, 180 children had promised to bring two cents each week in order to have it kept open after school hours.

At another playground a tactful teacher won the bad boys by asking their help as heads of departments. "One," says Mr. Tsanoff, "was governor over the swings, another over the hammocks, another over the sand-piles, and another over the ice water. The boys took pride in this," he adds, "and became decent citizens of that young community."

The summer outings witnessed at the beginning experiences similar to those of the playgrounds. This may be sufficiently illustrated by the conduct of one boy who in 1895 jumped into the pail of lemonade "just for fun." The conditions were somewhat improved during 1896, but last year the young people who had entertained the same children for three successive seasons were forced to exclaim: "Are these really the children we had before?" The rowdiness had disappeared, the children had learned to wait their turns at the lunch-tables and to ask the waitresses for what they wanted.

By these playgrounds and outings Mr. Tsanoff and those who have helped him have accomplished two things: (1) They have brought together the rich and the poor, the cultured and the ignorant, for mutual understanding. (2) They have presented ideals to the children without calling them "ideals." The fun of fighting and mischief-making is gradually being replaced, through the influence of the playground, by the fun of a free activity that brings self-respect, regard for law and order, and a desire to be helpful to others.

The success of the playgrounds led Mr. Tsanoff, in the fall of 1895, to undertake the establishment of a model playground, "to serve," he says, "as an object lesson to the city in its endeavors to provide play facilities for its children." After some agitation, John Dickinson square, which is nearly three acres in extent, was procured from the city for this purpose. After a still longer time, through the efforts of Mr. A. S. Eisenhower, commissioner of the city property, who had also secured the square for a playground, \$5,000 was granted by the city councils. The work was, therefore, begun several months ago. This same body has recently granted \$7,000 more, and the \$12,000 from the city has been largely supplemented by private subscriptions secured by Rev. J. L. Jones, of the Culture Extension league, to whom, indeed, belongs the chief credit for carrying through the work. As a result, the Model Playground of Philadelphia is now completed, and we may use Mr.

Tsanoff's description of its plan. "In the middle," he says, "is an open circular area, to be flooded during the skating season and used as a romping ground during the rest of the year. This is surrounded by a bicycle track, fenced for safety. Outside of this are found various provisions for the children's enjoyment, such as tennis courts, swings, parallel bars, swinging rings, and sand piles; also a music stand, sanitary provisions, etc. All is surrounded by a promenade path where mothers may wheel their baby carriages, and where rows of seats invite the visitor to rest under overhanging shade trees. Two sides of this playground have each a pavilion, one for the boys, the other for girls. These are designed to supply the place of the playground in winter and during stormy weather." — The Outlook.

A SEVENTEENTH CENTURY PROPHET.

"The Law of Freedom in a Platform: or True Magistracy Restored," is the quaint title of a little pamphlet published in 1652, which is described and quoted from by L. H. Berens, writing in *The New Age*.

"Of the personal history of the author, one Jerrard Winstanley," Mr. Berens says, "I have as yet been able to learn little or nothing. Quoting from Whitelocke, Thomas Carlyle, in his 'Oliver Cromwell's Letters and Speeches,' mentions him, only to dismiss him with a characteristic sneer. But the most superficial perusal of his pamphlet suffices to show that one is in the presence of a mind of no common order, a mind well stored with the learning of his time, singularly free from superstitions of any kind, logical, penetrating, uncompromising, inspired by noble aspirations, and animated by a love of humanity and a desire for progress."

On the title page the work is:

Humbly presented to Oliver Cromwell, General of the Commonwealth's Army in England, Scotland, and Ireland. And to all Englishmen my brethren whether in Church-fellowship or not in Church-fellowship, both sorts walking as they conceive according to the Order of the Gospel; and from them to all the nations in the world.

To Oliver Cromwell Winstanley says:

That which is wanting on your part to be done is this: To see that the oppressor's power be cast out with his person; and to see that the free possession of the land and liberties be put into the hands of the oppressed commoners of England. . . . For now you have the power of the land in your hand, you must do one of these two things: First, either set the land free to the oppressed com-

moners who assisted you . . . and so take possession of your deserved honor. Or, secondly, you must only remove the conqueror's power out of the king's hand into other men's, maintaining the old laws still; and then your wisdom and honor will be blasted for ever; and you will either lose yourself, or lay the foundation of greater slavery to posterity than ever you knew.

Of "the burthen of landlords," he writes:

And is not this a slavery, say the people, that though there be land enough in England to maintain ten times as many people as are in it, yet some must beg of their brethren, or work in hard drudgery for day wages for them, or starve, or steal, and so be hanged out of the way, as men not fit to live on the earth? Before they are suffered to plant the waste land for a livelihood, they must pay rent to their brethren for it. Well, this is a burthen the creation groans under; and the subjects (so called) have not their birthright freedom granted them from their brethren, who hold it from them by club law, but not by righteousness.

But you will say, Is not the land your brother's? and you cannot take away another man's right by claiming a share therein with him. I answer, It is his either by creation right or by right of conquest; if by creation right he call the earth his and not mine, then it is mine as well as his, for the Spirit of the whole creation, who made us both, is no respecter of persons. And if by conquest he call the earth his and not mine, it must be either by the conquest of the kings over the commoners, or by the conquest of the commoners over the kings. If he claim the earth to be his from the king's conquest, the kings are beaten and cast out, and that title is undone. If he claim title to the earth from the conquest of the commoners over the kings, then I have a right to the land as well as my brother, for my brother without me, nor I without my brother, did not cast out the kings, but both together, assisting with person and purse, we prevailed, so that I have by this victory as equal a share in the earth which is now redeemed as my brother, by the law of righteousness.

On the question of compensation he argues as we do in our day:

When tythes were first enacted and lordly power drawn over the backs of the oppressed, the kings and conquerors made no scruple of conscience to take it, though the people lived in sore bondage of Poverty for want of it; and can there be scruple of conscience to make restitution of this which hath been so long stolen goods? It is no scruple arising from the righteous

law, but from covetousness, who goes away sorrowful to hear he must part with all to follow righteousness and peace.

On the question of riches, Mr. Berens declares Winstanley "is as clear and decisive as a Ruskin; some may even think more clear." Hear the old prophet:

But shall not one man be richer than another? There is no need for that; for riches make men vain-glorious, proud, and to oppress their brethren, and are the occasion of wars. No man can be rich but he must be rich either by his own labours or by the labours of other men helping him. If a man have no help from his neighbours, he shall never gather an estate of hundreds and thousands a year. If other men help him to work, then are those riches his neighbours' as well as his; for they be the fruits of other men's labours as well as his own. But all rich men live at ease, feeding and clothing themselves by the labours of other men, which is their shame and not their nobility; for it is a more blessed thing to give than to receive. But rich men receive all they have from the labourer's hand, and what they give, they give away from other men's labours, not their own. Therefore, they are not righteous actors in the earth.

A warning which we Americans may well heed is contained in this practical definition of monarchy:

Monarchy is twofold, either for one king to reign, or for many to rule by kingly principles; for the king's power lies in his laws, not in his name.

To the bar of eternal justice old Jerard Winstanley carried his plea, and his voice still speaks for us:

Hear, O thou Righteous Spirit of the whole creation, and judge who is the thief, he who takes away the freedom of the common earth from me, which is my creation-rights. . . . Or I who take the common earth to plant upon for my free livelihood, endeavoring to live as a free commoner in a free commonwealth, in righteousness and peace.

BUSINESS, POLITICS AND MARRIAGE.

Lyman Abbott is one of the men who are deeply concerned lest woman may go beyond the confines of her natural sphere. So deeply is he concerned that he opposes woman suffrage because he fears it may impose upon woman a duty which she is not prepared to accept. As if any human legislation could impose upon any persons any duty which is not theirs by nature! Legislation may prevent the performance of duties, but it cannot create duties. That matter, however, is only incidental. We are at present interested in some of Dr. Abbott's preaching about the sphere of woman, which fur-

ther illustrates the narrowness of his views upon that subject.

He dwells upon the temptations which confront a woman of the higher education and larger life of our day. While protesting that he would not have her shut out from business, the law, medicine, the pulpit or politics, he insists that it is impossible to open these vocations to her without tempting her to take ambition as her part in place of love; and "over against any notion," he says, "come how or whence it may, that it is a nobler thing to be in business or in politics or in literature than it is to love with fidelity one man, and be his companion, consecrated to him, and joining her life with his, I raise my voice here and everywhere."

Very good. But would Dr. Abbott not raise his voice also against a similar notion with reference to men? Would he have men take ambition as their part rather than love? Is it nobler for men to be in business or politics or literature than to love with fidelity one woman and be her companion, consecrated to her and joining his life to hers? On the contrary, is not marriage a mutual relationship, which is as truly the noblest thing for the husband as for the wife? What significance, then, is there in Dr. Abbott's protest?

He and all objectors like him completely ignore the truth that business, politics and literature, not less than wash tubs and cradles, are among the partnership duties of married life. The wife who intelligently shares her husband's interests in business, politics or literature, is all the more truly his wife, all the more truly his companion; she thereby all the more truly joins her life with his, just as the husband who intelligently shares his wife's interests in the cradle, and if need be in the wash tub, all the more truly joins his life with hers. Wives whose intellectual and affectional horizon is the four walls of their homes, may be likened to husbands whose horizon is their business or political or professional interests. Such husbands are not truly married to such wives. On the one side there may be a good housekeeper, and on the other a good breadwinner; but there is no consecrated companionship, no joining of life to life.

Marriage means union for the whole 24 hours of the day. Just as it takes both husband and wife to make a true domestic home, so it takes both husband and wife to make a true business home. Though they need not work all the time together, part of the day at home and part of the day in business, yet each must have a lively and intelligent interest in the work and interests of the other. This mutuality of interest cannot exist as to any business from which women are excluded, nor as to public affairs in which women have no voice. The very exclusion

makes an impassable barrier to both mind and affection.

To open the doors of business and politics to woman is not to abolish or weaken marriage; it is to broaden it, to deepen it, to strengthen it.—Louis F. Post, in *Cleveland Recorder*.

HOW A KNOT IS A MILE.

A knot is the nautical term for a geographical or nautical mile, which is one-sixtieth part of a degree of the great circle of the earth. In England and the United States the length of a mile is established by law, and for this reason is called a "statute" mile. The nautical mile is 6,080.27 feet, the statute mile 5,280 feet.

When a captain of a vessel wishes to ascertain the speed at which his boat is going he uses what is called a log line. This line is paid out astern. There are a number of divisions on the log line, each one-one hundred and twentieth of a nautical mile, and these divisions are indicated by "knots" on the line. A flat piece of wood is usually attached to the end of the line. This float is weighted on one side, so that it will float upright, and is attached to the line in such a manner as to stay at right angles and not drag through the water.

The part of the line between the log and the first knot is called the stray line. The first knot is placed at a considerable distance from the float and is very prominently marked.

To use the log line the float is thrown over from the lee quarter of the vessel and the line is then unwound from the reel as fast as the vessel sails.

At the instant the first point of division passes from the reel a half-minute sand glass is inverted, and when the sand has all run out the reel is stopped. The number of equal spaces that have been unwound indicates the number of nautical miles the ship is sailing per hour, for half a minute bears the same relation to an hour that one of the divisions of the line does to a nautical mile.—*The Great Round World*.

THE SPANISH SOCIALISTS.

As the European newspapers arrive the farcical nature of the recent general election in Spain becomes apparent. The alleged freedom of the ballot in that rotten monarchy consists in voting for one or the other dominant capitalistic parties or be denounced as a traitor to the flag, and several weeks ago the people were bullied and coerced into electing liberal candidates and supporting Sagasta's Cuban policy or suffer dire consequences. Nevertheless two socialists succeeded in overcoming all obstacles, including ballot-box stuffing and repeating, and secured seats

in the new parliament. It is worthy of note that the socialists demanded that in case of war with the United States the rich be made to fight as well as the poor, and they also favored giving freedom to Cuba. However, they were not in favor of the kind of "freedom" that meant to throw off the monarchical yoke and foist upon the Cubans the tyranny of capitalism as exercised by the exploiting owners of the land and the tools of production and distribution. In a word, they demanded economic as well as political freedom, and the Spanish socialists certainly deserve great credit for boldly standing out against overwhelming odds and championing the cause of the oppressed and robbed Cubans in the very citadel of the Weylers and Blancos.—*The Cleveland Citizen*.

THE CHARACTER OF OUR LEGISLATION.

In my opinion all the ills we suffer from to-day as a nation are caused by unjust, hasty, dishonest and discriminating legislation. If you will carefully investigate existing conditions and past legislative history, you will irresistibly be led to this conclusion.

For the last quarter of a century nearly all important legislation in this country, state and federal, has been in the interest of the few and against the rights of the many. Class legislation has been stealthy, but it has been the order of the day, and it has been successful. No fearless student of our legislative history can honestly deny this fact. The evil consequences and financial losses resulting from this unfair discrimination in special legislation against the people are deplorable and beyond computation. It has robbed thrift, arrested enterprise, paralyzed progress, stifled ambition, assassinated the hopes of the toilers, centralized power, and made the rich richer and the poor poorer.

It has fostered syndicates, created monopolies and nourished trusts. It has plundered the producers, wronged the wage-earners and caused the commercial industries of our land to languish and to die. It has made mammon a fetish, hoarded money, centralized wealth and threatens the very stability of our institutions. If it continues, is it any wonder far-seeing patriots fear for the life of the republic? The demand from all over the country for a national bankruptcy law directs attention to our sorrowful situation and accentuates the evil tendencies of the time.—William Sulzer, in the House, February 18.

Astonishing disclosures as to the difficulty of securing recruits for the army are made by the Philadelphia Ledger. Stations have been opened in that city, and on Saturday 100 applicants were ex-

amined. Only four of the 100 could pass the test and were accepted. Thousands of men have offered to enlist in Philadelphia since the war excitement began, but only about 125 have been accepted, all of the rest having been turned away on account of mental or physical disability, principally the latter, since the mental requirements include nothing harder than simple mathematics, and previous experience is not essential, as in the case of the navy. The Ledger thinks that such figures indicate a degree of physical stamina among the applicants so low that it should engage the attention of scientific students. The only consolation it can offer is that "it is not improbable that many of the applicants were of the sort that have failed to meet the physical requirements of ordinary trades and industries."—*N. Y. Evening Post*.

The lesson was from the Prodigal Son, and the teacher was dwelling on the character of the elder brother. "But amid all the rejoicing," he said, "there was one to whom the preparation of the feast brought no joy, to whom the prodigal's return gave no pleasure, but only bitterness; one who did not approve of the feast being held, and who had no wish to attend it. Now can any of you tell me who this was?" There was a breathless silence, and then: "Please, sir, it was the fatted calf."

The socialists, who have taken the lead in the crusade in Italy against dueling, and with one exception refused all challenges, have now presented a bill to parliament for the abolition of the existing law, and the substitution of the articles applying to wounding and killing in ordinary crimes.—*New York Evening Post*.

In a recent address in New York city Henry D. Lloyd said strikingly "that the only people who despair of democracy are those who never understood or have wronged it."—*Chicago Commons*.

God and one may be a majority, but crucifixion and fagots may antedate the counting of the votes.—Hon. Thomas B. Reed.

Master, if there be doom,
All men are bereaved;
If in the universe,
One spirit receive the curse,
Alas for heaven!
If there be doom for one,
Thou, Master, art undone.
—Robert Buchanan.

READERS who find this paper interesting or useful, are requested to bring it to the attention of their acquaintances, and also to forward the names and addresses of such persons as they think might become subscribers after seeing sample copies. For full information, see the publisher's notice at the top of the first column on the first page.