

The Public

First Year.

CHICAGO, SATURDAY, APRIL 30, 1898.

Number 4.

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 822, Schiller Bldg., Chicago, Ill.

Post Office Address:

**THE PUBLIC, Box 687,
CHICAGO, ILL.**

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

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

SUBSCRIPTION AGENT FOR OMAHA AND COUNCIL BLUFFS.
MRS. C. D. JAMES, 2208 Douglas St.,
Omaha, Neb.

EDITORIALS

The war revenue bill under consideration in the lower house of congress, shows how true the plutocratic leaders there—to say nothing of the plutocratic papers and financial rings of the country which have egged those leaders on—are to their sordid instincts. Not only will this bill, if it becomes a law, cast the pecuniary burdens of the war upon the poorer classes, those who must of necessity do most of the fighting and suffer most of the hardships and dangers of battle, but, under pretext of offering an opportunity to contribute to war expenses, it will afford the rich

a new opportunity for choice investments.

So accustomed are the plutocrats to successfully buncoing the people, that they make scarcely an effort to hide the detestable character of their war revenue measure. They admit—some of them, like the Chicago Tribune and the New York Evening Post, admit it in terms—that the proposed taxes will be shifted in higher prices from the people upon whom they are ostensibly levied to their customers, and thus fall at last in enormous proportions upon the poor and middling classes. To intelligent minds that would be clear without an admission. Nor is any admission necessary to show that the benefits of the bond issues proposed will be reaped almost exclusively by the rich. But the plutocrats depend for the success of this bunco upon diverting the attention of their victims by appealing to their patriotism. Whoever objects to the infamy of the bill has his patriotism called in question. He is put in the position in which Senator Hawley tried to put Senator Butler when Butler, properly enough, described the bad condition of our battleships. Hawley denounced his words as treason. But Butler replied most pointedly that the treason consisted not in warning the people of these defects, but in having permitted them. The reply had added significance from the fact that Hawley is one of the senators who, in the interest of plutocratic armor plate contractors, has long been winking at the treasonably defective construction of some of our war vessels. Likewise when the plutocrats condemn as treasonable the attempts in congress to amend the revenue bill so as to deprive the rich of some of its pecuniary advantages, and load them with some of the pecuniary burden, the appropriate reply is that the treason really consists in framing a bill which, unless amended, will take advantage of the war to impoverish the poor and enrich the rich.

The plutocratic cry of "treason" has some of the conveniences and all the appropriateness of the pocketbook snatcher's cry of "stop thief!"

Most of the democrats and some of the republicans in congress—the populists will be with them, of course—have expressed their intention of trying to modify the plutocratic character of the war revenue bill. In the matter of taxation, they propose to insert a clause taxing incomes of \$10,000 and above and exempting those below that amount. In the matter of bonding the people for the benefit of investors, they propose to postpone at least the evil day. The government has enough available funds, they maintain, to prosecute the war for a long time, if it will but use them. The cash balance in the treasury is in the neighborhood of \$175,000,000—a third of the amount proposed to be borrowed on bonds. Besides this the uncoined silver in the treasury would, if coined, yield some \$50,000,000 more than the amount of the certificates with which it was purchased. Consequently by resorting to the money in the treasury and to the silver seigniorage, we should be relieved of even the appearance of a necessity for issuing interest-bearing bonds. But, say the plutocrats, the imposition of the income tax would be annulled by the supreme court, and the use of treasury gold and the coinage of silver seigniorage would be equivalent to making a "forced loan." What they mean in their hearts is that if these amendments to the revenue bill were made, the rich would, in the first place, have to give financial help in the war, and, in the second, be deprived of another coveted opportunity to stow away three per cents.

While the supreme court did by one majority—a single judge having changed his mind to suit the plutocrats, and done it over night, so to speak—annul an income tax law enacted in time of peace, it would hard-

ly do so with an income tax law enacted as a war measure. In fact, it expressly disclaimed any intention of holding that such a law would be invalid. There is, therefore, no reason for opposing the income tax at this juncture as unconstitutional. The income tax is by no means a good system of taxation; but it is better than the one which the republican majority of the ways and means committee of the house have framed for raising the expenses of the war. Their system would tax the poor alone; if an income tax feature were added, some of the war expenses would fall upon the rich. For that reason, and that alone, it is objectionable to those who advocate the war revenue measure as it stands.

And "forced loans"—why not? It lies not in the mouth of men who are trying to force a great burden of taxation upon the people to object to "forced loans." What is the difference between "forced loans" and such taxes as those which Mr. Dingley has put into his war revenue bill? Both are forced out of the persons who ultimately lose by them. Such difference as there may be is in favor of the forced loan; for a forced loan may be paid back, whereas taxes never are. This, however, is not the difference which causes taxes on commodities to meet with so much favor among plutocrats, and "forced loans" to incur their very strenuous objection. That phenomenon is explained by the fact that such taxes are forced out of the poor and middling classes, while forced loans are forced out of the rich.

Who shall pay for this war? That is the question which, as it ought to, will now divide attention with military and naval movements. The plutocratic element want it paid for by the class that supplies the fighters, who suffer and die while rich "men of affairs" invite their patriotic souls to a banquet over three per cents. And they have framed a law accordingly. The democrats—democrats with a little "d" let it be understood, and not the Gormans and Crokers, who are with and of the plutocracy in this new raid upon the people—want it paid for, in part at least, by the rich.

Which shall it be? That is now the question.

Mr. Dingley's committee has amended the war revenue bill in one respect that is highly significant of the source from which war revenues are to come. Under this amendment, any person under contract entered into prior to the passage of the revenue act, to deliver goods at a stipulated price, is empowered to add to the stipulated price the tax which this revenue law imposes. For example: A brewery is under contract to supply a certain quantity of beer at so much a barrel, or a cigar manufacturer is under contract to supply a certain quantity of cigars at so much a thousand. After the making of this contract, the war revenue law goes into effect imposing a tax of two dollars a barrel on beer and four dollars a thousand on cigars. Thereupon the brewer adds two dollars a barrel and the cigar manufacturer adds four dollars a thousand to the contract price for their respective goods, and the courts must enable them to collect the full amount. Thus does Dingley himself confirm our assertion that the classes who are to be called upon to do most of the fighting in the war are also to be compelled to do most of the paying. Our war revenues are to be derived through manufacturers from the people who consume their goods.

When Sagasta, the Spanish minister, told a newspaper interviewer that the seizure of the Spanish steamer Buena Ventura by the United States was an act of piracy he was far out of his reckoning.

It must be confessed that this seizure is nothing for our nation to be proud of. No self-respecting American can reflect upon it without a tinge at least of shame. That the war with Spain should actively begin on our side with the capture of an inoffensive Spanish lumberman, is more suggestive of the freebooter spirit than of that love of liberty which really animates our countrymen. For our own part we should have preferred a more dignified if not more dangerous enterprise, to begin with. Row boats, fishing smacks and lumbermen might better be left alone until hostilities have progressed to the point where

their seizure would be a mere incident of desperate fighting, than to be bombarded off the seas and into a prize court as the first and therefore one of the most prominent events of the war. Nevertheless, the seizure of the Buena Ventura was not piracy.

The right to take prizes on the high seas is under international law an undoubted right of belligerents. The only questions, then, are whether the Buena Ventura was a prize, and whether a state of war existed at the time of her seizure. Now, as between the belligerents, a declaration of war is not necessary, to certify the existence of war. The withdrawal of the Spanish minister from our capital, the expulsion of our minister from Madrid, the announcement of the Spanish government that they would not comply with the terms of our ultimatum but would immediately send their fleet to meet ours, all these were acts which under the circumstances placed Spain in a belligerent attitude toward us. And there were many acts on our part which placed us in a belligerent attitude toward Spain. On both sides this attitude of hostility was prior to the capture of the Buena Ventura, and it made all Spanish vessels on the high seas the lawful prize of any of our men-of-war which might effect a capture. The Buena Ventura was such a vessel. She was, therefore, under the circumstances, lawful prize within the purview of international law, though no formal declaration of war had been made; and her capture—small business as it was for an American battleship to engage in before a shot had been fired by either side—was nevertheless not an act of piracy.

It would be churlish to deny a full mede of praise for their generosity to the business men who assure their employes who enlist that their places shall be kept open for them and offer to pay their salaries during absence in the field besides insuring their lives for the benefit of their families; but it is always important to distinguish things that are different. This generosity is not patriotism. As patriotism it would rank only with that of the man who hires a substitute. He pays out money, but he does not offer himself; and nothing short of an offer

of self constitutes patriotism. The man is patriotic who offers his life. The wife is patriotic who offers her husband. But none are especially patriotic who give only money out of a full purse. That is in no sense a gift of self. Yet these business men are above the level of him who hires a substitute. They are at least unselfish. Though their gifts cannot rank as patriotism, they do rank as disinterested charity. For that the men deserve and will doubtless receive the praise of the community and the gratitude of their beneficiaries. These are their due reward. But let no one be so far forgetful of the eternal fitness of things as to rank their generous charity with the patriotism of the men who offer more than money—who offer life itself. There is a disposition to rank it even higher. This is part of the plutocratic spirit of the time, which places money above men.

Whoever wishes to keep ahead of the times and learn the war news before it happens, has only to buy the daily newspaper and accept the guesses of war correspondents for gospel. Already they have discovered the plans of campaign of Spain and the United States, have exposed the underlying motives of these plans, and altogether have put the government of each nation in position to frustrate the maneuvers of the other. Meanwhile they have entertained readers who care more for a moment's excitement than for genuine news, and have enabled their employers to sell unnumbered copies of useless extras. These brilliant fellows, who discover so much that never happens and tell about it in such flaming rhetoric that no reader knows whether it has happened or not, must be distinguished from the plodding reporter who tells his readers conscientiously what is actually taking place and so records the history of the world as it is made. It is he who, in his obscure but most useful place, redeems the daily press from the contempt into which the brilliant space fillers would otherwise bring it with sensible men.

The suicide of a young man in Chicago, who, in explanation of his act,

left behind him these written words—"I've been a beggar too long; it's time to stop it; it will be one less begging for a job and one less for the workers to support,"—is a sharp reminder of the deplorable fact that no one need go to Cuba to find reconcentrados. Our own country is full of them. Begging for work, they starve amid abundance. That is no reason why we should not go to the relief of the Cuban sufferers, but it is a reason why we should think of relieving our own. The fact that we can put our finger upon the power that corrals and starves the Cubans, and command it to stop its deadly work, lends dramatic interest to the case of the Cuban reconcentrados; but just as surely is there a power which corrals our own men and women and children, and upon which we can if we but will put our fingers, commanding it to stop its even more deadly work. For the power which does this, we ourselves, having votes to change oppressive laws and failing to use our votes to that end, are responsible. When any man who commits suicide can truly say that he has done it because he despairs of getting a living by work, he condemns us as bitterly and justly as we condemn Weyler. If there were a nation which saw the causes of suffering here as plainly as we seem to see the cause of suffering Cuban reconcentrados, and which bore to us something like the relations that we bear to Spain, it would crush us for our cruelty in maintaining laws that make starvation in the midst of plenty, and despise us for our hypocrisy in fostering conditions at home which are essentially the same as those which in a neighboring island we condemn.

Mark Hanna's senatorial title has been smirched by the uncharitable report of the majority of the investigating committee of the state senate of Ohio. Yet they decide upon well-attested facts. That a bribe was offered a member of the lower house to vote for Hanna at a time when one vote would have turned the scale was proved so far beyond the possibility of contradiction that Hanna and his friends made no attempt to contradict it. This was not because they regarded the matter as too trivial to deserve their attention. They were ac-

tive enough in inducing witnesses who could have testified to enlightening facts to refuse to speak. They also caused the sudden transfer of telltale telegrams from the jurisdiction of the state. And though Hanna's own connection with the undisputed act of intended bribery was made a matter of suspicion, at least, by evidence against his secretary, neither Hanna nor the secretary had a word to offer in explanation or denial. Probably the evidence against Hanna would not convict him before a jury in a criminal court. But is that fact enough to clear his skirts as a senator? Is nothing more required regarding a senatorial title than that its owner cannot be proved beyond a reasonable doubt to have bought it? On the contrary, should not a prima facie case be enough to put him to his proof? And what better prima facie case could be desired than absolute proof that somebody had paid a bribe of \$2,000 for a vote for Mark Hanna at a time when a single vote meant to him victory or defeat? Who would have produced that amount of money for that purpose, except Mr. Hanna? Can Mr. Hanna refuse to meet such a case without a sworn denial at least, and still be presumed innocent of defiling the United States senate by the corruption of his presence there?

Let it be distinctly observed, now while there is good opportunity, that the only English newspapers that are out of sympathy with the United States in its present difficulties are those which represent aristocratic sentiment. While this cannot be said of the French press, it can be said of it that those papers which are pronounced in their democracy are also pronounced in their sympathy with this country. Sentiment is a fact to be reckoned with, and however keenly we may deplore war, there is no escaping the conviction that the character of this war is distinctly marked by a vein of democratic sentiment across the water as well as on the American side.

Thanks to the anti-administration republicans and the democrats in the lower house of congress, one of the dangers of our war with Spain is to be avoided. It is the danger of a stand-

ing army in time of peace. As the army organization bill was reported from Speaker Reed's committee, it increased the regular army to 61,000 men; and though this was to put the army upon a war footing, the bill was so drawn as to make it quite possible to leave the government with an army of that size upon its hands at the close of the war. When it is remembered that the army ring, under whose auspices the bill in question was prepared, have long been itching to increase the regular army, the danger involved in the bill as reported is evident. But just as congress cut the claws of the president's Cuban message, so has it saved us from the danger of a large standing army as a legacy from the war.

About this time begin to look for yellow tinted accounts of military dramatics. When Morro Castle opened fire last week upon a venturesome newspaper boat, and one of the watch officers of the New York, supposing the shots were intended for the fleet, he awoke Capt. Chadwick, who was picturesquely "asleep on the transom of the chart house," so the admiring reporter said, and asked him if it would not be prudent to stop signaling, Capt. Chadwick, with the drowsy air of a melodramatic hero on the Old Bowery stage—unless the reporter did him injustice—rolled over and murmured, contentedly: "They are firing, are they? Well, go ahead with the signaling. I don't see any use for stopping." But unlike the Bowery stage hero, this valiant captain did not even feign sleep after he had rolled over. Though "apparently about to go to sleep again," he "strolled out on the forward bridge"—just strolled—and "looked at the red jets of flame spurting from Morro, as if viewing fireworks." But after awhile his indifference to Spanish marksmanship and gore and other warlike possibilities reasserted itself, and "he turned on his heel and proceeded to fall asleep again in the chart room." This is a specimen of the reports that fill space at the opening of a war. Those who remember the early summer of '61 will recall similar accounts of gilt braid bravery, which became ridiculous as the war progressed and the people grew seri-

ous. It is to be hoped that Capt. Chadwick was not posing in this instance, but was the involuntary victim of some patriotic reporter's freshness.

The natty Seventh of New York appears disposed to keep up its reputation for bravery in time of peace and prudence in time of war. This regiment has been the crack militia regiment of the Empire state since long before the rebellion. Made up of rich young men, it has, for clothes and drill and all that sort of thing, never failed, in peaceful surroundings to cut a dash. But when the rebellion came, those members of the Seventh who were somewhat besides mere holiday soldiers had to go into other organizations to see real service. Not until that conflict had passed safely into history did the Seventh come again to the front as New York's finest. And now that it has another call to do something more than parade for its country, it takes time to consider. "To the Seventh," says a friendly newspaper paragraph, "an enlistment of two years means more than it does to the other regiments. Its ranks are filled with men of affairs. To leave business upon a moment's notice would mean ruin." To suppose that this spirit characterizes all the men of the Seventh would be unfair, but it appears to characterize the regiment as a mass. Now, as in '61, the real soldiers of the Seventh, who are willing to make sacrifices for their country, will have to enlist in some of the regiments to which, not being made up of "men of affairs," an enlistment for two years does not mean so much as it seems to mean to the natty Seventh.

Chauncey Depew has no patience, so he said at a republican club dinner in New York this week, with the senators or representatives who stand out against the bond issue. That's right, considering the man. Chauncey Depew is chief touter at dinner parties for the three per cent. parasites.

Men whose patriotism inspires them to offer their services to their country in this its hour of need, and whose applications for commissions are rejected, need shed no tears over their disappointment. Even if the

demand for commissioned officers does not exceed the supply the demand for privates will. Let them prove their patriotism by enlisting as privates and demonstrate their fitness to command by showing a disposition to serve.

WORK ENOUGH FOR ALL.

When a man searches for work in a great city, as Walter A. Wyckoff tells in the April Scribner's of having done in Chicago, and searches for it in vain, he is not likely to become an easy convert to the proposition that there is work enough for all.

Mr. Wyckoff, it will be remembered, is a young man of wealth, education and refinement, who has temporarily thrown aside his advantages and joined the army of labor, in order to see what the life of the laborer is like, and who has since been writing of his varied and instructive experiences for Scribner's Magazine. His latest reported experiment was in the ranks of the unemployed. With a "partner," who was in fact what Mr. Wyckoff only pretended to be, a laborer hunting for a job as the boy hunted for the woodchuck—victuals depending upon success—he tried his luck in Chicago, where, as he says, "there is work, stupendous, appalling, cumulative in its volume and intensity" Here, with men all about them "staggering under burdens too grievous to be borne," these two men were "idle, yet counting it the greatest boon" to add their strength to the mighty struggle.

They hunted diligently for work, almost in vain. In some places they were denied kindly, in others they were driven out brutally, and when a rough job was roughly offered them, the loading of crates of oranges for a dollar between them, they had been so long without food and become so hopeless in their quest for work that Wyckoff's partner "in a voice that was thick with a heaving sob," said, with subdued exultation: "We'll feed, partner, we'll feed!" And so day after day, though one of the men was a skilled mechanic and persistently sought work at his trade, neither succeeded in getting anything to do but such odd jobs as carrying bundles or helping in the market place, and but few of them.

Near sunset at the close of the week, Wyckoff, standing alone upon the sidewalk, saw in a mansion across the way an old friend lounging at ease before an open fire. The long search

for work and the penalty for failure—an empty stomach, a chilled body and a thoroughly despondent mind—made this sight an urgent temptation. “It was so short a step,” Wyckoff confesses, “by which I could emerge from the submerged, and the temptation to take it was so strong and inviting.” But he resisted. Later in the day his equally unsuccessful and hungry partner by his side, in front of a restaurant window where a cook in immaculate white was turning well browned griddle cakes, he was startled by the despairing suggestion of his partner that “we’d get all we want to eat if we’d heave a rock through this window.”

It would not be easy to convince Wyckoff, after that experience, that there is work enough for all. Or if he, who was only making an inquiry into social conditions, and at any moment could change his status if he chose, might in the comfortable surroundings of his normal life be convinced that this was only the experience of a single individual, his partner would not be so easily convinced. Those workers—and they count up into the millions—whose necessity compels them to hunt for work, and who, whether they are successful or not, learn from the saddest of experience that opportunity to work is indeed a boon, would scout the notion that there is work enough for all. If there is work enough for all, why should any seeker for work fail to find it? Why should those who get it have such a deadening dread of losing it?

Yet William T. Harris, the United States commissioner of education, undertakes in the April Forum to prove that there is work enough for all. And, what is much more to the point, he makes out his case. He does prove that there is work enough for all notwithstanding the tremendous strides in labor-saving invention which apparently lessen opportunities for work. The line of Mr. Harris’ demonstration is that though machinery lessens the work required to satisfy old wants it creates new wants and arouses new desires in a much greater degree. He proves, in other words, that machinery, instead of lessening the total demand for work, increases it.

Apart from his demonstration, which is complete, this is obviously true. There is no limit to human wants short of human power of making things to satisfy those wants. Even if it were possible to satisfy the

wants of the whole race as to quantity, wants would still expand as to quality, and opportunities for work would increase in proportion. In spite of the experience of Mr. Wyckoff and his “partner,” in spite of the vast army of the unemployed, in spite of the fear—founded upon observation or experience or both—from which few are free, however profitable their employment, the fear of losing the work they have and being unable to get other work, in spite of the dread that mechanics have of the introduction of machinery, which, as in the case of the type-setting machine, for example, may throw 75 per cent. of a craft out of work—in spite of all this, and of the general understanding that we have too little work to go around, there is, as Mr. Harris argues, and there always will be, work enough for all.

How, then, are we to explain the condition of which Mr. Wyckoff gives us a luminous account, the condition of the unemployed? If there were work enough for all, would anyone seek work in vain? Would anyone dread the loss of his job as he would a pestilence? Would not the millions who are workless be able to find their billets, and the actual workers have no fear of losing the billets they had got?

The explanation is simple, though Mr. Harris fails to make or even to attempt it. Work is difficult to get, though there is work for all, because by subtle methods, under color of law, opportunities to work are monopolized and withheld. Not that those who want work done deliberately refuse to employ those who want to do it, but that by means of certain special privileges, created by law, some control the avenues to work and prevent the great mass from exchanging work with one another. For work is not something which a few have to give out, and which the rest have to do if they can get a chance. Work is a matter of trade. In the absence of special privilege every one would give out work and every one would do work. That being so, it is evident that if workers could profitably be prevented from meeting and exchanging work, there would be an army of unemployed even with work enough for all. And that is what happens.

Two things besides labor are needed to enable every one to get his share of the work of which there is enough for all. These two things, however, are not machinery and money. Labor makes machinery, and at the worst

it could provide a substitute for money. They are, first, land—soil, space, standing room—in desirable locations; and second, freedom of trade. With these, everybody can work as he wishes to, exchanging his work with his fellows. Without these, everyone is dependent for an opportunity to work, though there be work enough for all, upon the privileged persons who monopolize the desirable land and the avenues of trade.

With such monopolies, an army of unemployed would be inevitable, though there were a thousand times more work than enough to go around. When any body, any class, or any interest, has the power of restricting opportunities for work, the fact that there is enough work to go around is an unimportant consideration. Though there were seats enough in a circus to go around, what difference would it make to men who couldn’t get into the tent?

The contrast between Mr. Wyckoff and his friend, whose luxurious comforts almost tempted the former to abandon his experiment, was due to the fact that the friend was privileged by law to control opportunities to work, and could therefore live in luxury upon the tribute he was able to exact from bidders for a job; whereas Mr. Wyckoff was realistically playing the part of a victim of the system of which his friend was a beneficiary. There was plenty of work in Chicago—more than enough for all; and Mr. Wyckoff would have got what he desired, had it not been that men like his friend had the work cornered.

JUSTIFIABLENESS OF THE WAR.

In considering the question of the justifiableness of our war with Spain, four different points of view must be taken into account. There is, in the first place, the point of view of the peace man absolute, the man who is opposed to war under all circumstances. Then there is that of the ideal anarchist, whose opposition to every form of governmental force leads him, while conceding and defending the right of anyone to fight who wishes to, to oppose all formal warfare under the sanction and compulsion of government. The third point of view is that of the “patriot,” who is for his country right or wrong. Finally, there is the point of view of the man who believes in government, who believes that the war-making

power is a function of government, and who, though his horror of war is equal to that of the peace man absolute, has still greater horror of some things which cannot be put aside without war. There are other points of view, but these four probably include all the honest ones.

The position of the peace man absolute is of the utmost importance in times of peace. Those are times when men can rationally discuss the possibility and advisability of agreeing upon measures for settling international disputes without bloodshed. But in the midst of war, or upon the threshold of war, when the question is not whether some plan for peaceably and justly settling the controversy can be devised, but whether the cause of the war is just, the peace man absolute cannot be argued with. The only question for argument at such a time being the rightfulness or wrongfulness of war over a particular controversy, his denial of the rightfulness of war over any controversy whatever excludes him from the discussion.

This is also true of the ideal anarchist. If there were no compulsory governments, and no international law enjoining upon these governments, under penalty of war, an obligation to compel their citizens to keep the international peace, we might say with the ideal anarchists: "Let us allow everybody who wishes to go to war upon his own account to do so, and abandon compulsory warfare." But so long as we actually have governments and international law, we should involve ourselves in more wars by adopting the ideal anarchist's substitute for compulsory war than we should escape by now and then making war. While the theory of ideal anarchism, like that of the peace man absolute, is important and by no means without merit, it is not a theory which can be beneficially discussed when the only question under discussion, or that can possibly be brought under discussion, is the justice of the cause of an inevitable war.

The "patriot" also, as well as the peace man absolute and the ideal anarchist, must be excluded from this discussion, and for essentially the same reason. While his point of view is abhorrent, and rightly so, to both the peace man and the anarchist, it is like theirs in this, that it ignores a vital question—the justice of the cause of a war. The man who is for his country right or wrong can neither contribute nor receive any

benefit in discussing that question. It is of necessity restricted to those who believe that a just war is justifiable, and that an unjust one is not.

But what constitutes a just war? If a nation unjustly repudiates pecuniary obligations to another nation or its citizens, would a war for the enforcement of those obligations be just? Certainly not. It were better, if the repudiating nation would not submit to arbitration in such a case, to publish the facts and let neighbor nations know the character of this one of the international family. To shed blood for the collection of a debt, however just the debt, is unjust, whether on the part of a nation or of an individual. So would it be unjust to go to war over a mere boundary dispute. When farmers go to law over boundary quarrels, their neighbors think them fools, as they are; but how much greater the folly, and how great the wickedness, of a nation which, over the same kind of quarrel, causes the slaughter of thousands of men. A war with Spain, for having destroyed one of our battleships and murdering her crew, would likewise be unjust. The wrongfulness of Spain's aggression in that case would be over with the single act. No war could restore the lives of the murdered men. It could only sacrifice thousands of other men. But if Spain had imprisoned these men and refused to release them, or, having killed them, had threatened to keep on killing our seamen in the same way at every opportunity, then a different question would have been presented. That would have amounted to a continuous denial of liberty—a wrong which war might remedy. And to remedy that wrong, war would have been just. In other words, the one just cause for war is a continuous denial of liberty; and wars honestly fought to achieve or defend liberty, provided the end cannot be secured without war, are just.

Such a war we believe the war between the United States and Spain to be. It is true that we are not fighting this war either to achieve or to defend our own liberty, yet we are fighting for liberty under circumstances which have made it impossible for us not to fight without proving ourselves indifferent to liberty.

That the Cuban insurrection is a struggle for liberty no one can deny. That the insurgents have a moral right to fight, none but peace men absolute, and natural born slavery lovers will dispute. Under Spanish

rule they have not been free, and under Spanish rule they never would be free. To Spain, Cuba has been simply a source of revenue. The island has been literally mortgaged to the great money lenders of the world, and the proceeds of the loan applied to Spanish uses. The pretense of a republican provincial government and of representation in the cortes is a sham. Until recently chattel slavery was maintained upon the island by Spanish power, as it would have been to this day but for the ten years' war of the 60's and 70's. If the American revolution was a just war, then the Cuban rebellion is just. If the former was a war for liberty, so is the latter. And we have been drawn into it not by the machinations of syndicates nor by politicians seeking to silence agitation for greater freedom at home, but in spite of these machinations, by the sentiment of the common people of our country. This is a war which democracy has incited, and one which will strengthen instead of smothering democratic agitation at home. It is a war to guarantee national independence to a neighbor whose people have fought with a devotion and success paralleled only by the conflict which our own fathers waged a century ago under similar circumstances against a parent government which then bore to them, minus the cruelty, much the same relation that Spain now bears to the Cubans.

It may be freely acknowledged that a political revolution in Cuba will not make Cubans free. Neither did political revolutions in this country make Americans free. But as political revolutions here did lay the foundations of American freedom, on which we have been steadily building ever since, so political revolution in Cuba would lay the foundations for Cuban freedom. Freedom is not secured at once. It is a structure built layer upon layer, and political freedom is the first layer. The war in which we have engaged is to enable the Cubans to lay this foundation securely. We have not sought the war. Our position is not that of an international Don Quixote. Circumstances beyond our control have drawn us into the conflict. But now that we are in it, we find we are fighting for liberty, for the only cause which can justify war.

While peace man absolute, then, may condemn the war, and, from their point of view, ought to condemn it;

while ideal anarchists also may condemn it, as they also from their point of view ought to do, the man who believes that a war for liberty is less horrible than the persistent, not to say barbaric, denial of liberty, cannot withhold his approval. If we as a nation believe in liberty, and in the justice of wars waged in behalf of liberty, then we were bound, under the conditions which had been forced upon us, to order Spain to withdraw from Cuba and to enforce the order if need be by our army and navy.

DULUTH TAX DODGERS.

Some of the shrewder owners of vacant lots in Duluth have invented and are making the most of a new method of evading local taxes without losing the power which their ownership of the lots gives them of appropriating to themselves in increased land values the pecuniary benefits of Duluth's growth. It must be understood that three kinds of taxes rest upon these lots—state taxes, city taxes and county taxes. State taxes have priority of lien upon the property, so that a sale for delinquent state taxes effects a transfer of the property to the buyer entirely freed from all city and county taxes down to that time. Taking advantage of this fact, the shrewd proprietors in question allow their state taxes to become delinquent; whereupon their property is sold for state taxes, and they buy it for the amount of the state tax for which it is sold. Thus they pay no more to the state as a purchase price at the tax sale than they would have to pay in state taxes if they did not become delinquents; but they thereby free themselves from all accumulated city and county taxes which they would still have to pay, if instead of submitting to the tax sale and buying in they paid their state tax as a tax.

Owners of vacant lots are already sufficiently favored by tax laws without being allowed in this or any other way to defraud those laws. They do nothing whatever for the community in which their property lies in return for the increased value which the lots acquire solely in consequence of the growth of the community. If they were in another land or in the penitentiary their lots would grow in value just the same. Lot values are not in the slightest degree produced by the owners. How absurd, then, not to say dishonest, on the part of the officials of a community to allow the owners of vacant lots to avoid the ut-

most taxes that can be lawfully exacted from them. Especially is this so when escape from the enforcement of such taxes can be prevented.

In the case of the Duluth tax dodgers it probably could be avoided. The city of Duluth would be well paid if at these tax sales it were to overbid the shrewd delinquents, to the extent of their city taxes. If that were done, the delinquents would be obliged either to pay the city its taxes or to let the city buy the property. Should they bid high enough at the sale to cover the city tax, the city would at least recover its due; and if they did not, and the city were obliged to take the property, it could lease it to advantage on ground rent as Chicago leases her school lands.

Possibly the laws of Minnesota would make this plan impracticable; but if they would, some plan should suggest itself to the Duluth authorities by which they could save to the people of that city somewhat at least of the value which those people as a community give without consideration to the owners of vacant lots.

NEWS

The rebellion against the authority of Spain in the Philippine islands, noted on page 12 of our first number, on page 11 of the second number and on page 11 of the third, promises to make those islands an important battleground of the war between Spain and the United States.

On the 23d the English governor at Hong-Kong, who administers that colony under the cession to Great Britain of 1841, notified the American consul that the American fleet must depart by the afternoon of Monday, the 25th, and ship no warlike stores or coal beyond what might be necessary to carry it to the nearest port. This fleet is under the command of Commodore Dewey. It consists of the cruisers Olympia, Baltimore, Raleigh, Concord and Boston; the gunboat Petrel, and a dispatch boat, a store ship, and a collier. On the day of the British notification, cable dispatches from Hong-Kong reported that the rebels were in control of the Philippines outside of Manilla, the capital, which is situated on Luzon island, and that they had chosen a president and cabinet and hoped to maintain a government after the manner of the Cubans. Two days later the dispatches from the same source told of the expected

departure of the president, whose name is Aguinaldo, from Singapore, on the Malay peninsula to the Philippines, to lead a land attack upon the Spanish at Manilla with 30,000 rebel troops. Meanwhile, Commodore Dewey's fleet had left Hong-Kong for Mirs Bay, about 30 miles to the northeast, whence it sailed on the 27th for Manilla. The ships were at that time cleared for action. On the same day a dispatch to Madrid from the Spanish naval station at Manila announced that the Spanish squadron at the Philippines was moving into position to meet the United States squadron. A battle is expected on the 29th or 30th. The Spanish fleet which defends Manilla is made up of four cruisers—one of wood, two of iron and one of steel—and five small gunboats and a transport.

The president transmitted to congress on the 25th copies of the Spanish correspondence, together with an explanation of the present relations between that country and this; and in view of his having proclaimed a blockade and called out troops, he recommended the adoption of a joint resolution declaring the existence of a state of war. Both houses immediately adopted and the president signed a bill which, first, declared that war exists and "has existed since the 21st day of April, A. D., 1898, including said day, between the United States and the kingdom of Spain;" and, second, directed and empowered the president to use the land and naval forces and to call out the militia to the extent necessary to prosecute that war.

The events of the week culminating thus in a formal declaration of war, began with the president's ultimatum, mentioned on page 7 last week as having been conveyed to Spain. Its text was officially published on the 21st. It advised Minister Woodford of the signing by the president of the congressional resolution printed in full last week on page 7, and directed him to communicate the resolution to the government of Spain, and to make a formal demand from our government 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." The document concluded as follows: "If by the hour of noon on Saturday next, the 23d day of April instant, there is not communicated to this

government by that of Spain a full and satisfactory response to this demand and resolution, whereby the ends of peace in Cuba shall be assured, the president will proceed without further notice to use the power and authority enjoined and conferred upon him by the said joint resolution to such an extent as may be necessary to carry the same into effect."

This ultimatum reached our minister in Madrid late at night on the 20th. Early on the 21st, before he could formally present it to the proper Spanish authority, he received his passports from the Spanish government and an official notification that as the president had "sanctioned a resolution of both houses which, disputing the legitimate authority of Spain and threatening immediate armed intervention in Cuba, is equivalent to an evident declaration of war, his majesty's government has ordered his minister at Washington to retire without loss of time from American territory, with all members of the legation." The notification continued: "Through this fact, the diplomatic relations that have so long existed between the two countries are interrupted, all official communication ceasing between their respective representatives, and I take occasion to communicate the same to your excellency in order that you may adopt on your side dispositions convenient to yourself." This official notification to Woodford was followed by a semi-official note to our government in which the latter was advised that the Spanish fleet was now on its way to meet that of the United States.

The Spanish minister had already withdrawn from this country to Canada, as stated on page 7 last week, and soon after the receipt of his passports Minister Woodford handed over the American legation at Madrid to the British charge d'affaires, who, under instructions from Great Britain, now represents American interests in Spain. Woodford immediately left Madrid, escorted to the railroad station by a strong Spanish guard, and arrived at Paris on the 22d. At Valladolid, on his way to the Spanish frontier, his train was threatened by thousands of excited Spaniards, and the civil guard, which had been deputized by the Spanish government to protect him, were obliged to draw their swords to keep back the

mob. At Tolosa a sergeant of the civil guard, accompanied by a private, boarded the train and demanded the custody of Joaquin Moreno, Woodford's private secretary, as a Spanish subject. Woodford placed himself in the way of the guard and refused to give up his secretary, whereupon the demand was withdrawn.

The blockade mentioned above, in connection with the president's message, was proclaimed by him on the 22d. Reciting the congressional resolution, published on page 7 last week, and his opinion of the necessity of a blockade, the president proclaimed that the United States has ordered and will maintain a blockade from Bahia Honda to Cardenas, on the north coast of Cuba, including all intermediate ports, and of the port of Cienfuegos on the south coast, no vessels to be permitted to enter or leave any of the blockaded ports under penalty of capture. Neutral vessels lying in the port at the time of the proclamation were allowed 30 days in which to leave. An examination of the map of Cuba will show that this blockade closes the ports of Havana and Matanzas, as well as those mentioned in the proclamation, but leaves open the ports to the east, which, it is believed, the insurgents can capture.

Hardly had the blockade been proclaimed than it was established. The American fleet under Capt. Sampson—temporarily raised to the grade of rear admiral—which had been stationed at Key West, arrived at Havana at six o'clock on the afternoon of the 22d. The first seizure of the war, involving the first shot fired, occurred in connection with this movement. It was the capture by the Nashville, on the morning of the 22d, of the Buena Ventura, a Spanish ship, loaded with lumber, cattle and miscellaneous freight, and bound for Rotterdam. She had a crew of 30 men. A shot was first fired by the Nashville across the Buena Ventura's bow, but as she paid no attention to this, continuing on her course, three six-inch shells were thrown directly at her. One struck her forward of the engine-room. This brought her to, and the surrender was soon after completed. She was taken into Key West, the first prize of the war. Later on the same day the New York captured the Spanish merchant steamer Pedro, about 15

miles east of Havana, and in the evening the Ericsson captured a Spanish fishing schooner. The Porter made the fourth capture, that of the Spanish steamer Mathilde. Four more captures were made on the 23d and 24th; and on the 25th the lighthouse tender Mangrove supported by the battleship Indiana, captured the Spanish steamer Panama, loaded with passengers and supplies from New York. Sagasta, the Spanish prime minister, is reported as having denounced the captures made before the declaration of war, as piracy.

Near midnight on the 22d Gen. Blanco appears to have taken violent notice of the hostile demonstrations of our fleet by firing ten shots from Morro Castle, in Havana harbor; but the first firing positively known to have been directed at the American force from the Spanish came from masked batteries at Matanzas on the 25th. They were fired at the torpedo boat Foote, which was taking soundings 300 yards from shore, but went wide of the mark.

A manifesto, however, had been issued by Gen. Blanco, on the 21st, in which he called the Cubans to arms to resist "invasion" by the United States. On the 26th he issued another proclamation, in which, speaking of the United States as having "insolently begged for the island of Cuba," he called upon all movable forces "to drive back this ambitious stranger, who, disregarding reason and right, tries to appropriate to himself this rich flower bed of our crown."

On the 24th the Spanish censor at Havana forbade the going out of further telegraphic correspondence to American papers.

For an hour and three-quarters on the 27th the New York, the Puritan and the Cincinnati bombarded the Spanish forts at Mantanzas.

On the 21st, the day before the blockade, as soon as the Spanish government had declared their intention of regarding the signing of the congressional resolution already referred to and printed in full on page 7 last week, as a virtual declaration of war, Gen. Miles began to consult with Brig. Gens. Nunez and Castillo, Cuban insurgent leaders, with reference to plans of campaign in Cuba; and on the 25th First Lieut. Andrew S. Rowan, of the Nineteenth United States infantry, acting under orders from the war department, was landed

on the Cuban coast, somewhere west of Santiago, on a mission to arrange with the Cuban insurgents for cooperation with the United States troops in an invasion of eastern Cuba.

Though the president so far recognized a state of war as beginning on the 21st, as to proclaim the Cuban blockade on the 22d, he took no further hostile action until the expiration of the time limit mentioned in his ultimatum. This came on the 23d, at noon, and early in the afternoon of that day he signed a call for 125,000 volunteers for two years or the war. So as to avoid unnecessary commotion on Sunday orders to the governors of states were withheld until Monday, the 25th, when they were issued and met with a favorable response from every state. The organized militia of the states began mobilizing on the 26th at their several rendezvous.

The news from Spain has been neither full nor clear, but it indicates excitement and confusion. At the session of the Spanish senate on the 21st, speeches in support of the ministry in its war policy were made, among others, by Gen. Campos and by the leader of the republican party. Both speeches were for war. The whole Spanish cabinet was reported as having on the same day resigned, in order to make it easier for the queen regent to consult leaders of all parties. Most of those she consulted advised, so it was said, the retention of the present cabinet. On the 24th the ministry officially announced the breaking off of diplomatic relations between Spain and the United States and the existence of a state of war, annulling all treaties. It reserved liberty of action as to privateering, gave American ships anchored in Spanish harbors 30 days to depart, declared its intention to respect enemies' merchandise under neutral flags, if not contraband of war, and neutral merchandise, not contraband, under enemy's flags, and to treat non-American vessels committing acts of war as pirates, even if provided with letters of marque by the United States. It also declared Spain's intention of insisting upon the right to search upon the high seas, and accepted the doctrine of the Paris convention of 1856 that a blockade to be obligatory must be maintained with sufficient force to prevent access to the enemy's shore.

Prior to thus putting out Spain's

declaration of war, the Spanish ministry on the 18th issued a memorandum to the European powers, published April 23, offering, first, to submit the Maine question to arbitration; second, to order Gen. Blanco to retire into the western provinces of Cuba and to apply 3,000,000 pesetas—\$600,000—to the relief of the Cubans, and to accept relief from the United States; third, to cooperate with the Havana parliament in adjusting the autonomy of Cuba; and, fourth, as the Havana parliament does not meet until May 4th, to proclaim an immediate armistice. This memorandum was followed by a circular note supplementary to it, which note, after charging the United States with ambition to acquire new territory, predicts that that government will not declare Cuba pacified until the island is ready for annexation. The object of the note is obviously to arouse the powers to intervene for the purpose of checking the alleged disposition of the United States to control the American continent.

In the same direction were the messages of the queen regent to the European sovereigns, reported on the 25th by way of London. In the one received by King Humbert of Italy the queen says that she feels it her duty to address herself to all European sovereigns with reference to the conduct of the United States in spurning Spain's most sacred rights "under the pretext of delivering a people who are faithful to their mother country," and to warn them that in the future the United States will, in similar manner, spurn the sacred rights of other nations. She appeals to the sovereigns to unite in defense of European interests in America.

Hints come of possible uprisings in Spain by the revolutionists and also by the Carlists. Don Carlos, from his hotel in Brussels, made public a declaration on the 21st, in which he said that while reticence was his duty at this crisis, he could not withhold an expression of his conviction that had the Carlists been in power war would have begun two years ago. He refused to say whether his supporters would in all circumstances support the present dynasty against the United States. Don Carlos is the exiled claimant to the Spanish throne. His claim is based upon the Salic law, which limits succession to

the throne to males, and obtained in Spain until 1829, when Ferdinand VII. abolished it by imperial decree. Upon the accession to the throne of Isabella II., Ferdinand's daughter, pursuant to this decree, the Don Carlos of that time, a brother of Ferdinand, attempted to revive the Salic law, which would have given the throne to him. His rebellion, which was suppressed, was the first Carlist movement. A second broke out in the early seventies and was put down by the father of the present infant king.

As to the revolutionary party nothing is known here at the present writing except that upon the occasion of the recovery from illness of Sepor Castelar, the republican leader, about 20,000 Spanish republicans signed an address to him in which they virtually offered him their services if he would proclaim a republic. There are hints also of uprisings of socialists and anarchists, as well as republicans, upon which it is supposed a declaration of martial law may be made.

Meanwhile questions of belligerent methods and neutrality have agitated different countries. In the British house of commons on the 21st, Mr. Balfour, in behalf of the government, stated that notification from the United States had been received announcing that it would not exercise the right to search neutral ships for enemies' contraband goods; and that although no answer had yet been received upon the subject from Spain, the same answer was confidently expected. As to the question of treating coal as contraband of war, Mr. Balfour explained that the government could not lay down the principle that it is contraband under all circumstances, that being a question in each case for the prize courts to determine. The British charge d'affaires at Madrid was instructed on the 21st to urge upon Spain a declaration of her intentions as to the maritime rules of the treaty of Paris of 1856, and in her declaration of war, quoted from above, she did so.

It was announced on the 23d that the United States government had served notice on the Portuguese government, to which the Cape Verde islands belong, that the Spanish war ships must be sent away from St. Vincent at once or be detained there during the war. On the 27th the fleet was reported as still at St. Vincent, but cable advices to Washington on the 26th were to the effect that it was

preparing to quit in response to orders from the Portuguese government.

The president on the 26th proclaimed the attitude of the United States as to belligerent rights. There are six clauses in his proclamation, which are in substance as follows: (1) Neutral flag protects enemy's goods, if not contraband; (2) neutral goods, if not contraband, are protected by enemy's flags; (3) blockades must be effective to be binding; (4) Spanish merchant ships in American ports have until May 21, 1898, for loading and departing, and are to continue their voyage in safety; provided, however, that they contain no military or naval officers or contraband goods; (5) Spanish merchant vessels having departed from a foreign port to the United States prior to April 21, 1898, may enter the United States, discharge cargo, and safely depart to any port not blockaded; (6) the right of search is to be exercised with strict regard for the rights of neutrals, and mail steamers are not to be interfered with, except on strong suspicion.

Great Britain having issued a proclamation of neutrality, ordered the torpedo boat Somers, recently bought by the United States, to be taken out of British jurisdiction by the 25th, and the United States government has in consequence decided to leave her there during the war. In some quarters it is considered that the apparent strictness of Great Britain, as to the Somers and as to the fleet at Hong-Kong—spoken of above—are in accordance with prearrangements with the United States, so that England may consistently act in sympathy with this country if other countries show favors to Spain.

In newspaper interviews had during the week the consuls general to the United States from Ecuador, Nicaragua, Salvador, Honduras, Costa Rica and San Domingo, declare that their countrymen sympathize with Spain, but that their governments will observe strict neutrality.

The Irish national parliamentary party held a special meeting in the house of commons on the 26th, and on motion of Dillon, seconded by Davitt, passed a resolution tendering "its warmest sympathy and good wishes to the government and people

of the United States in their humane efforts to liberate the people of Cuba."

The Mangrove was reported as having just left Key West on the 22d with a complete cable laying and cutting outfit for the purpose of cutting the cable between Cuba and Spain. This report led to an inquiry of the ministry in the British house of commons on the 26th, respecting interference with cables. Mr. Balfour, in reply, expressed the British view to be that belligerents, on grounds of military exigencies, would be justified in interfering with the cables between the territory of an opposing power and another part of the world.

A majority of the investigating committee of the Ohio senate have reported that an attempt was made last winter to bribe John C. Otis, a member of the house, to vote for Marcus A. Hanna for United States senator; that Henry H. Boyce was the principal offender, and that Maj. E. G. Rathbone and Maj. Charles F. Dick—the latter being Mr. Hanna's secretary—procured, aided and abetted Boyce to commit the crime. Senator Garfield presented a minority report to the effect that no competent or credible testimony confirmed any portion of the charge that Mr. Hanna either directly or indirectly offered Otis money for his vote.

IN CONGRESS.

Week ending April 27, 1898.

Senate.

The sundry civil appropriation bill, which had been under consideration for two weeks, was passed on the 21st, and on the same day the naval appropriation bill was taken up and passed. Pending the consideration of the latter a resolution was adopted enabling the president in his discretion to impose and to raise an embargo on coal and other war materials. The house bill for the organization of the volunteer army was then amended and passed. A resolution was adopted to restore Nellie Grant Sartoris to American citizenship.

In secret session on the 22d, the report of the conferees of the two houses on the volunteer army bill was agreed to. No business was done in open session except to arrange for the funeral of Senator Walthall, of Mississippi, who died on the 21st.

The session on the 23, which lasted only from 12 to 12:43, was devoted

entirely to the funeral services of Senator Walthall.

On the 25th the house bill declaring war with Spain reached the senate in the middle of the afternoon, after the reading of the president's message on the same subject, and at a secret session was adopted.

Only routine business, interspersed with desultory debate, was done on the 26th, and on the 27th the session was unimportant and brief.

House.

On the 21st the joint resolution to enable the president to prohibit the exportation of coal and other war material was passed. Two resolutions calling upon the president for information were adopted. One asked for the correspondence between Gen. Lee and the state department since May 1, 1896, if not incompatible with public interests, and the other asked what steps, if any, had been taken to protect the lives and property of Americans left by the American consul at Matanzas. The resolution to restore Nellie Grant Sartoris to American citizenship was passed.

The report of the conferees on the volunteer army bill was received informally and adopted without debate on the 22d. The conferees had reached an agreement with the senate lessening the term of volunteer enlistment from three years, as originally proposed by the house, to two years. The contested election case of Patterson against Carmack was then disposed of the minority report in favor of Carmack, the sitting member, being carried over the majority report by a vote of 139 to 120, to the manifest gratification of the democrats. Carmack is the democratic member from the Memphis district of Tennessee. The house adjourned early in the day out of respect to the memory of Senator Walthall.

The war revenue measure was introduced on the 23d by Chairman Dingley, of the ways and means committee. As reported, it puts no tax upon tea or coffee, but it is calculated to raise from fermented liquors, \$35,000,000; from tobacco, \$15,000,000; from cigars, \$5,000,000; from tobacco licenses, \$5,000,000; from stamps on documents, checks, telegrams, etc., \$30,000,000, and from minor taxes enough to bring the aggregate up to about \$100,000,000 per annum. The tax on beer and fermented liquors is put at two dollars a barrel, that on tobacco and snuff at 12 cents a pound, that on cigars at from two to four

dollars per 1,000, according to weight, and that upon cigarettes the same. Besides taxes provision is made for a loan of \$500,000,000 in bonds, and \$100,000,000 in certificates of indebtedness, both at three percent. The regular army organization bill was passed on the same day. It fixes the maximum of the regular army at 61,000 men, but upon motion of Baily, democrat, of Texas, who objected that this might result in increasing the standing army in time of peace, it was agreed that the army at the end of the war should be reduced to a peace footing.

On the 25th the president's message on the Spanish situation was received soon after the session began and was referred. Almost immediately afterwards the republican majority of the committee on foreign affairs submitted to the democratic minority a bill declaring war. The minority approved it and without dissent the bill passed in one minute and 40 seconds after its introduction.

The war revenue bill was reported back on the 26th, and arrangements made for debate to begin on the 27th and to continue through the 29th, on which day, at four o'clock, the vote is to be taken.

The three days' debate on the war revenue bill began on the 27th and continued through the day and a short night session. All democratic and populist speakers opposed the bond feature of the bill.

NEWS NOTES.

—Wheat for May delivery rose at Chicago on the 26th to \$1.25 a bushel.

—The 76th birthday of Gen. Grant was celebrated in different parts of the country on the 27th.

—By an order of the post office department issued on the 26th, all mails from the United States to Spain, except closed mails passing through from neutral countries, are discontinued.

—The West Point class of '98, 59 members, was graduated on the 26th. The class was distinguished by Frank Boggs, of Pennsylvania, who stood No. 1 in every study, and had had no demerits charged against him for a year.

—Richard Smith, formerly editor of the Cincinnati Gazette, and long vindictively held up to ridicule by the New York Sun as the "Good Deacon Smith," whose benevolent intentions were constantly frustrated by "wicked partners," died at Cincinnati on the 22d. He had not been in journalism for several years.

—A group of English capitalists, including Baron Rothschild and Earl Mayo, calling themselves a Pekin syndicate, have, after long diplomatic manoeuvring between England, Russia and France, secured from China a 60-year concession of coal fields in the Shansi province, covering an extent of 250 miles by 40.

—The resignation of Postmaster-General Gary was announced on the 21st, and on the same day Charles Emory Smith, of Philadelphia, was appointed to succeed him. Mr. Smith has been the editor of the Philadelphia Press since 1880. During President Harrison's administration he was American minister to Russia.

—Lieut. Ramon de Carranza, until recently an attache of the Spanish legation at Washington, has challenged Capt. Sigsbee, who commanded the Maine, to fight a duel, and threatens to brand him as a coward on the 28th, if the challenge be not noticed by that time.

—John Sherman, the United States secretary of state, resigned that office on the 25th, assigning as his reason that he did not feel physically able to continue at the head of the department. Judge Day, the assistant secretary of state under Secretary Sherman, succeeds to the office which Mr. Sherman has resigned.

—The riots in Puerto Rico noted on page 10 last week were reported on the 22d as having spread over the entire island. It was reported on the same day that a revolution was in progress in the district of Ponce; and on the 24th seven refugees from Puerto Rico, who had just landed at St. Thomas, reported that famine is at hand in the island and that martial law prevails.

—Theodore Roosevelt, formerly police commissioner of New York, but now assistant secretary of the navy, was selected on the 25th by the president as lieutenant colonel of a regiment of "rough riders" to be raised in the Rocky mountains. Dr. Wood, of the regular army, who distinguished himself in the Apache campaigns against Geronimo, is to be the colonel.

—Nicola Tesla claims to have discovered a method by which a battleship can be blown up by conveying an electric spark to her magazine. He gives no explanation beyond the statement that he would operate upon the principle of his discovery relative to the transmission of messages by electricity without wire.

—The supreme court of the United States has made a decision sustaining the constitutionality of the Illi-

nois, law for the taxation of inheritances by a graduated system. The law in question imposes different rates of taxation upon different classes of inheritances, and is the law which ex-President Harrison, who made the argument against it in the supreme court, characterized as "communistic."

MISCELLANY

THE ANSWER.

A Rose in tatters on the garden path
Called out to God, and murmured
'gainst His wrath,
Because a sudden wind in twilight's
hush
Had snapped her stem alone of all the
bush.
And God, who hears both sun-dried
dust and sun,
Made answer softly to that luckless
one:
"Sister, in that thou sayest I did not
well,
What voices heard'st thou when thy
petals fell?"
And the Rose answered: "In my evil
hour
A voice cried: 'Father, wherefore falls
the flower?
For lo, the very gossamers are still!'
And a voice answered: 'Son, by Allah's
will.'"

Then softly as the rain-mist on the
sword
Came to the Rose the answer of the
Lord:
"Sister, before I smote the dark in
twain,
Or yet the stars saw one another plain,
Time, tide, and space I bound unto the
task
That thou shouldst fall, and such an
one should ask."

Whereat the withered flower, all content,
Died as they die whose days are innocent;
While he who questioned why the
flower fell
Caught hold of God, and saved his soul
from hell.
—Rudyard Kipling.

A POOR MAN'S WAR.

The New York Evening Post affects to be puzzled by the circumstance that the masses as a whole want war, if war be necessary, to drive Spain from a hemisphere where she has written her indelible history in blood during 400 years, while moneyed men as a body cry for peace at any price. "The poor and ignorant men," the Post puts it, "who are to be the greatest sufferers by it in the end, are in favor of war, while the well to do and intelligent, or in other words, the employers of labor,

the men who understand the conditions of business, write or telegraph (to congressmen) in favor of peace."

There is another way of putting it. If it is true that to be well to do lessens a man's inclination and ability to look beyond his own immediate financial interests to the public interest, diminishes his sensibility to the sufferings of others, reduces his concern for his country's duty and good name, and atrophies his capacity to make personal sacrifices for the common weal—if this is true, as the Post implies, then it is self-evident that that land is to hastening ills a prey when wealth accumulates and men decay. It may be good business sense to echo the gambler who didn't care a rap what happened so long as it didn't happen to him, but it is mighty poor citizenship—the kind that in politics helps to buy elections and takes a profound interest in civil service reform, and considers the social problem solved by an annual subscription to organized charity.

The rich are of no different clay from the poor, but prosperity does have a narrowing effect upon commonplace minds and hardens small hearts. It is not all gain for little men to escape from poverty and the cares and trials which commonly serve to keep sympathy alive. The readiness of those who have most to lose by war—as the Post points out—to make sacrifices for oppressed and starving people they have never seen and never will see, and the reluctance of the more fortunate to take any chance of losing anything of their abundance in the same cause, is accepted by everybody as a matter of course. The statesmen who are proceeding openly and cheerfully to dip the government's hand into the already rifled pockets of the masses do so with perfect confidence that the owners of the pockets will bear the new draft gladly. There is among politicians entire faith in the generosity of the multitude, in the multitude's willingness to place patriotism and love of what appeals to it as right above every selfish consideration. But when it comes to touching pockets that are well filled, politicians hesitate. The same statesmen that for the public need raise the price of tea, coffee, beer and tobacco and expect no murmurs, become timorous and apologetic in asking a little from those who have most. It is found that the taxes levied on the comforts of the poor will not raise a sufficient revenue and it is given out that a tax on incomes may be proposed, "but only as a last resort." Also it is announced that a way can be found to reach incomes that the su-

preme court will approve. This dire possibility may possibly have something to do with the Post's almost emotional interest in the subject of war taxes.—Arthur McEwen, in the National Single Taxer.

THE RIGHT OF INTERVENTION.

The real question, upon which the issue of peace or war now hangs, is the condition of Cuba and the right of the United States to intervene. We may safely compare the situation with the case of private individuals. Even where there are courts of justice in full operation, and policemen at every corner, yet a private citizen has a right to seize and detain any person who is, in his sight, committing a crime of violence. Thus any man may and should arrest a known murderer, or any man whom he sees attempting to commit an act of gross personal outrage. The only difference in such a case between a constable and a private citizen is that the constable may justify his act by proof of reasonable suspicion, while the private citizen can justify only by proof of the actual crime or attempt to commit the crime.

In like manner, any nation is morally justified in interfering with acts of gross cruelty and outrage by the government of another nation. It is under no obligation to do so; and it is very seldom wise for it to do so; because it seldom happens that one nation has the means of administering full and equal justice between another government and its citizens. But it has the same abstract right to interfere which any citizen has to interfere for the prevention of acts of cruelty among his fellow-citizens.

Moreover, just as a private citizen would have the right to call upon officers of the law to intervene in case of long-continued disturbance in his neighbor's house, so any nation which finds its own peace and commerce grievously disturbed by long-continued civil war in an adjoining country acquires a right to intervene. Suppose the father of several half-grown boys, living next door to you, should, with ever so much justice, seek to repress an insurrection on their part, by physical force, but with no result except to prolong, for several days and nights, a doubtful fight, accompanied by screams, oaths and destruction of property within the house, such as would not suffer your family to sleep, you would have a right to call a police officer, who would, in his turn, have both the right and the duty of suppressing the disturbance, without regard to the merits of the quarrel. If the revolt of the sons were

ever so unjustifiable, yet, if the father could not subdue it without creating a nuisance to all his neighbors, he must take the chances of being turned out of doors by his rebellious sons.

In like manner, where rebellion is prolonged for years in any country, other nations which find their peace disturbed by such prolonged rebellion, have a right, after reasonable warning, to intervene and restore peace, without supreme concern for the merits of the quarrel.

The utmost caution and moderation are indispensable when applying these principles to any particular case. It is our duty, as a nation, since we are compelled to act as judge in our own cause, to give the benefit of every doubt to the other side, and to take no step of the justice of which we are not so fully persuaded as to command substantial unanimity among our own people.—Thos. G. Shearman, in The Outlook.

VACANT LOT CULTIVATION IN PHILADELPHIA.

Extracts from the report of the Philadelphia vacant lots cultivation committee for the season of 1897:

The work of aiding the unemployed poor by allowing them to cultivate vacant city lots, and aiding them in such cultivation by plowing the land for them and furnishing seed, tools, fertilizer and kindly advice, was actively begun in this city about April 1, 1897.

Securing land suitable for the work was the first and perhaps the greatest difficulty to overcome. Much land was offered which was wholly unsuited, on account of the lots being too small, too widely separated, too rough or too wet for garden purposes—even that which was selected for use was all sod land, poorly suited to the uses for which it was desired, not having been either cultivated or fertilized for many years.

Sufficient land was obtained in six separate tracts for only one hundred gardens of one-quarter to one-half acre each. Each tract of land was called a farm, and numbered, and each farm was divided into gardens, as soon as it was prepared for planting, 76x150 feet.

Each applicant was required to sign an agreement pledging himself to cultivate the land loaned throughout the entire season, planting a succession of crops as fast as circumstances would permit, and to keep on a card, furnished for that purpose, a correct account of all time spent in cultivation of the garden, also an account of all vegetables grown in the garden, whether sold, used or given away. The gardener also agreed to follow the instructions of the

superintendent or assistants. A failure to comply with any of these conditions meant a forfeiture of the cultivating privilege.

Each gardener was given two bushels of potatoes and other seed sufficient to plant his garden. If he wasted them or lost them he was required to buy others to take their place. In only a few cases, however, were seeds misused. Each gardener was required to furnish his own tools, a hoe and rake being about all that was required. The committee sold tools on time to anyone not able to pay cash, so that no one, however poor, was turned away for the want of them.

The ninety-six families who worked idle lots this season have produced an average of \$62 each, or \$5,955 all told. The amounts are taken from the cards carefully kept by the gardeners, and are fairly accurate statements. The eagerness for gardens, the splendid manner in which fully ninety per cent. of them have been cultivated, the very few forfeitures that have been made during the season, and the great improvement observed in both health and morals, show clearly that the poverty of these people is not entirely the result of laziness upon their part.

Among those who received gardens were discovered some most heartrending cases of poverty and suffering; people who were not willing to beg or accept charity.

The first man who applied for a garden furnishes a most striking example of beneficial results. When he came to Dr. Morton's office, only a day or two after the first mention of the plan in the papers, he was so weak and emaciated that the doctor declared he was afraid the poor fellow would be unable to get out of his office without assistance. He was a widower with four children, three girls and a boy, the oldest girl about seventeen. He had been unable to get work of any kind for six months or more. The boy, a mere lad, was earning three dollars per week. The oldest girl kept the house and the other two were too small to go out and work.

He was one of the first to receive a garden, which contained only about one-fifth of an acre. He observed that a certain part of another farm was being left untouched on account of being very rough, full of holes and covered with stones and bricks. Part of this farm was below the street grade and subject to overflow, but it was larger than the others—nine-tenths of an acre. He offered to exchange, saying he did not mind the extra work. His offer was accepted. In a very few days the

stones and bricks had been thrown into the holes and covered with dirt. The low place had been filled in. It was a work in which the whole family joined. A small house was rented in the immediate neighborhood in lieu of the one room near the foul alleys of the city slums.

Every inch of the soil was utilized. A rosy hue took the place of the pale, wan cheek of a few weeks before. And now the harvest home has come, and in the winter's store can be enumerated: Thirty bushels of potatoes, one hundred quarts canned tomatoes, fifty quarts canned corn, twenty quarts canned beans, thirty gallons pickled cucumbers, thirty gallons sauer kraut, fifteen gallons tomato catsup, five gallons pickled beans, five gallons tomato preserves, four bushels turnips, one bushel carrots, one thousand or more fine celery stalks and many other things. Besides, much has been sold during the summer. Warm clothing has replaced the badly worn garments of nine months ago. A few pieces of furniture have been added. The boy has been provided with a small capital for his little business (that of selling deviled crabs, sandwiches, coffee, etc., at the ferry landing), and now often comes home with as much from one night's sales as he formerly had at the end of a week. A more complete transformation can scarcely be imagined. A happier home could scarcely be found.

One poor fellow who is a cripple, and on that account unable to do heavy work or get a job in shop or factory, and as a last resort pushed a cart about the streets, selling apples, etc., was given a garden. At that time he and family—a wife and two small children—lived in one small room on one of the narrow streets, for which they paid \$1.50 per week, or over \$6 per month. In June, a time came when he could not pay his rent, and all were thrown into the street. He told of his sad condition and asked permission to come to the open lots and live in a tent until he could make a little money. "Come if you like," was the reply, and at the same time he was handed a small sum of money. He half apologetically added: "I can't get a room until I have money to pay one month's rent in advance;" and as if some great favor had been granted him, he thanked the superintendent many times.

That evening a little camp fire blazed brightly in the open field, and around it gathered a father, mother and two babes. In a small heap near by lay all their earthly possessions, not more than two wheelbarrow loads. As soon as the evening lunch (or a loaf of baker's bread

and water) was dispatched, the preparation of a shelter began. A bedstead was set up as a first step. Narrow strips of lumber were nailed to the four corners, extending up about six feet, and two other strips were set up about six feet in front of the bed, and to the tops, half way up the sides of these were nailed other strips. Around this framework old pieces of matting were tacked as a wall, and over the top an old carpet was thrown for a roof.

Imagine this poor man's surprise and horror, and the poor wife's feeling of despair the next morning when a policeman confronted them with the inquiry: "Has a building permit been secured for this house?" and when a negative answer was given he replied: "It is against the law to build without one." But, slowly turning, he walked away. There seemed to be something in his manly look which said: "I shan't insist upon the enforcement of this law, however, in your case." Other strips of lumber and some old tin were brought from the dump, and the house was enlarged until it finally had three rooms, one six by ten feet, one four by six feet and one six by six feet.

Contentment and joy for a few days filled every heart, but, alas, sorrow was near at hand. The storm of July 23 carried away some of the roof and the rain and hail came in. Everybody and everything was soaking wet. The babe, a delicate little creature of seven months, was too frail for such exposure. The rain continued almost daily for some two weeks or more. A fever set in. The doctor came, but the fever increased. An effort was made to get the little fellow into a hospital. In one there was scarlet fever and the others did not receive children so young. When these facts were made known to the father, who clearly saw that his babe could not survive under the conditions surrounding it, knowing full well that starvation and exposure (for such it really was) would do their work of death in a few days at most, he cried out in despair: "My God, is there no way out of this hell on earth? What a relief death would be, and God only knows I wish it would come to relieve that little sufferer." "How can you say such a thing?" was asked. "I know," said he, "if the child gets well there is a life of privation and suffering before it, and why should a man wish his child to live and endure such a life?" When finally a hospital was found (the Mary Drexel Home for Children) it was too late. In a few short hours the little sufferer found relief from pain forever, and another weight was added to the load that seemed already too heavy for any poor mortal to bear.

This poor fellow's garden, however, was a great success. A carefully-kept account shows a return of \$75, a part of which (\$6) has been used to buy a larger and better house, in which they are spending the winter, and he now feels confident of getting a start again if he can get a garden next season.

THE RED CROSS IN OUR MIDST.

The increase of charity organizations, which is so prominent a feature at the present day, is cause for sorrow rather than for rejoicing. The multiplication of free hospitals, of one-cent meal stands, of soup kitchens, of charity wood yards, of fresh air funds, and all the countless schemes for benefiting the poor that are now in full play among us, are but multiplied evidences of the diseased and out-of-joint condition of the body politic.

These organizations are very like the Red Cross societies, whose members follow in the wake of contending armies in the field to mitigate the horrors of war. Such societies are not wanted in times of peace, only when war opens is there call for their services. And when in times of war they issue calls for more volunteers it simply means that the horrors of war are increasing.

So, too, with charity organizations. Their very existence is a sign that a state of industrial, social, fratricidal war exists, and their multiplication is a sign that the ravages of this war and the devastation that follows in the wake of its struggles are becoming more and more appalling.—The New Earth.

THE CHARACTER OF THE REACTIONARY PARTY IN GERMANY.

The agrarian protectionists not only wish to annul the commercial treaties, because these hinder them from raising the protective duties on agricultural imports (these duties are by no means low—for instance, 35 marks per ton on rye or wheat), but the extreme members of the party advocate the abolition of the gold standard and the adoption of a so-called bimetallic—in reality a silver—standard. The most rabid among them oppose the cutting of canals, because foreign produce would thus enter Germany on cheaper terms. In short, the agrarian protectionists oppose the natural evolution of all economic progress. They are the natural allies of all the reactionary elements in Germany, the worst enemies of material progress and of political development in consequence.

I must point out another circumstance deserving attention. The old Prussian feudal aristocracy (Junkerthum), forming the pith and marrow of

the agrarian movement, has never been well off; but for the last twenty years they have suffered from the competition with the whole world, which is felt so keenly in all old countries, in the reduction of the rent of land. They have sunk deeper and deeper into debt, while the standard of material comfort has risen throughout all classes in Germany. The "Junker" has long since given up the hope of making both ends meet by his own industry, and while endeavoring to raise the rent of land by various kinds of protective measures, he is really at the same time struggling for bread and butter and upholding a tradition of political supremacy.

No government can really satisfy these claims, and hence each in turn is compelled, sooner or later, to oppose the agrarian movement. However, considering the strong influence the Prussian "Junker" exerts in the army, in the ranks of government officials, and at court, practical statesmen deem it advisable to avoid any open rupture with the pack of famished wolves. * * *

* But all skirmishes are only so many pauses on the eve of the great political struggle which must one day be undertaken with the "Junkers," that old Prussian remnant of feudalism, economically and politically an anachronism in modern society. The fate of the "Junker" was sealed, notwithstanding any partial successes, ever since Germany began her mighty march forward on the lines of industrial progress. Not all the dust cast up by our petty party wrangling can conceal the magnitude of those wider issues which have been really raised by the rapid industrial development of the country.

All our political parties are undergoing a process of change, and it is only a question of time when they will make room for larger groups. The two most interesting phenomena in the field of German politics are the inevitable decay of the old Prussian landed aristocracy (Junkerthum) on the one hand, and the ascendancy of social democracy on the other. Both these phenomena are intimately connected with the evolution of Germany as an agricultural country into a modern industrial state. Both phenomena are products of natural development which certainly are calculated to bring about political crises, but they do not threaten the existence of the German empire. The German nation is sound at heart and in vigorous health. There is every reason for a German to look forward with hopeful trust not only to the economic, but also to the political development of his country in the future.—Theodor Barth, in The Review of Reviews.

LINCOLN'S PERSONALITY.

Lincoln's heterogeneity was manifest even to the exterior senses, and was emphasized upon close study. He was six feet four inches tall, but his short trunk—torso in the classic phrase—was out of all relation and harmony with his long legs and arms. Had all else been in keeping with his diminutive trunk, he would have been a passable dwarf; had his abnormal legs been joined to a homogeneous body, he would have passed for a moderate giant. His great antagonist, Douglas, was 14 inches his inferior in stature when they stood together, a difference which was reduced to four when they sat. As a phrenological example, Lincoln's head was not a complete success; it was not only too small for so big a man, his hat measuring but $7\frac{1}{4}$, but the forehead was comparatively narrow and retreating, and thus the organs of causality and comparison, which, by the test of his exemplified talent, should have been unusually large, were, contrariwise, abnormally small. It is but just to the so-called science of phrenology to say that, as might be expected, his organs of combativeness, firmness, benevolence, secretiveness, adhesiveness and approbateness were large; while those of self-esteem, hope, reverence, destructiveness and acquisitiveness were small.

His countenance, when animated with the inspiration of social contact or the simplest agreeable emotion of any sort, possessed a magnetism and gave evidence of a bonhomie which were indefinable, and which could never be forgotten by those who had felt the charm.

He had

A most bewildering smile; there was a glance
Of such playfulness and innocence
That, as you looked, a pleasant feeling
Came
Over the heart, as when you had heard a
sound
Of cheerful music.

Awkward and ungainly as he manifestly was, there nevertheless was in his tout ensemble an indefinable something that commanded respect.

His attire was homespun, faded and negligé, much like that of an Illinois farmer in his second-best, or market-day, suit. His clothes did not fit him. His baggage while on circuit did not occupy much over a square foot of space; he carried hardly the necessary appliances of civilized life. In his daily walk and conversation, and about the commonplace matters of social economy, he was artless, unsophisticated and unassimilated; no man of his social rank and experiences ever wore his

rusticity and guilelessness so persistently. Literally he was

Of manners gentle, of affections mild;
In wit a man, simplicity a child.

In his exterior affairs he had no method, system or order. He had no library of any sort, law or other, at any time. He had no clerk, stenographer or typewriter; no letter-copying book, no scrap or commonplace book, no diary, no index rerum, no cash or account book, no daybook, journal or ledger. When he received money for law practice he gave his partner his share at the time, or wrapped it in a bit of paper, awaiting an opportunity to divide. Even when he was president, when he wanted to preserve an official memorandum of any kind, he noted it on a card, and put it in a drawer or, mayhap, in his vest pocket. But in his mental processes and operations he had a most complete method, system and order; while outside of his mind all was anarchy and confusion, inside all was symmetry and precision. His mind was his workshop; he had little need of an office or pen, ink and paper; he could perform his chief labor by self-inspection and reflection.

His daily life at home was of the simplest order; no working man or day laborer exhibited less style or pretensions. Imagine a lawyer and politician of his rank going out on the commons every evening, searching for, driving up and milking his cow, cleaning out his stable, grooming his horse, chopping and carrying wood for the kitchen fire, and going regularly to the grocery and carrying home the supplies. And yet he did all these things habitually, not from any desire of ostentation or by reason of eccentricity, but from motives of the strictest utility—and this even on the evening of May 18, 1860, and afterwards, when the telegraph from Maine to California and from Minnesota to Florida was vocal with his, as the unique and honored name. His disinclination to employ a clerk, errand boy or servant arose from his unfamiliarity with petty enterprise, and from his secretiveness, self-reliance and desire of independence. Indeed, self-dependence and mental isolation were among the very strongest elements of his character.—Henry C. Whitney, in Arena.

SOME FACTS ABOUT THE COMMERCE OF THE GREAT LAKES.

The latest government records show us that of the world's tonnage, 18,240,000 tons, the total American tonnage is 4,769,020 tons, and of this 1,483,068 tons are to be credited to the lakes. This last season's building is another sur-

prise to us. The great lakes have had 116,937 tons of new vessels launched upon them, while the total output of the entire seaboard, Atlantic, Pacific and the gulf included, was only 115,296 tons.

People who have never been near the lakes find it hard to realize that such mighty vessels as the new steel steamer Robert Fulton are built for that traffic. She is 440 feet long and, in a 14-foot draft, carries 4,260 tons, at a speed of ten miles an hour when towing a consort of like tonnage. Think of the freight one of these ships will carry. The Empire City left Duluth one day last summer with a cargo of 205,445 bushels of wheat. This means 308 carloads, or eight trainloads, aggregating two miles in length, or, in other words, the product of 13,696 acres; and it cost but \$4,640 to transport this cargo to Buffalo! Later the George Stephenson left Chicago with 323,000 bushels of oats, on a 16-foot draft.

Imagine the territory tributary to those inland seas. More than half of the entire continent depends upon them for cheap transportation. Sixteen states, all of Canada and over three-quarters of the Japan-China oriental trade are levied upon for lake freight. One-quarter of our people derive direct benefits from this traffic. It taps our great western country, whose corn crop alone outvalues the world's output of gold; a country that raises 300,000,000 bushels of wheat a year, or, all told, 90,000,000 tons of cereals, and will yield up over 15,000,000 tons of iron ore this season!

Chicago alone shipped 89,000,000 bushels of grain by the lakes last year, and, great railroad center that she is, ships more tons eastward every week by water than she does by rail. Her port does an annual business of 13,000,000 tons. The Lake Erie ports shipped over 8,940,000 tons of coal last year, mostly westward, and the western ports returned the vessels east, laden with 9,657,921 tons of iron ore.

One-eighth of the entire commerce of the United States passes through the "Soo" canal, whose traffic aggregates 7,000,000 tons greater than that passing through the Suez canal and represents one-sixtieth of the entire commerce of the world! The wonderful canal systems of England, Ireland and Scotland that yield a revenue of \$100,000,000 yearly carry only 36,000,000 tons. The Nicaragua canal when completed, and at a cost of nearly \$200,000,000, can carry only 6,000,000 tons.

There are over 100,000 entries and clearances per year of vessels at the great lake ports. The commerce of the lower lake ports alone equals that of the Mediterranean, which is always cited as most marvelous. New York can show but a little over one-quarter so many. Liverpool has a trifle over a third, and the entire seaboard of the United States, Atlantic, Pacific and

gulf, has less than two-thirds as many. Our American railroads, which cost over \$10,000,000,000 to equip, carry only four times more freight than do the lakes during the season.—The Cosmopolitan.

GOD'S MEMORY.

Saint Francis was himself God's remembrance of the poor.
Hast thou considered, O my soul, this truth,
And all the benediction which it brings,
That God needs man? For helpless babe that clings,
He needs a mother's tender care. In sooth,
Her love is utterance of the Divine.
He needeth friends to bring heart close to heart;
He needeth lovers, when he would impart
Some touch of Heavenly rapture or a sign
Of what shall be hereafter. So take heed
That thy own life shall stand—an open door
'Twixt God and man—to comfort and restore.
See that thou close it not to any need.
Be thou God's memory, or, dearer still,
His sweet forgetfulness of wrong and ill.

—Ella F. Mosby.

THE CORONATION OF WILHELMINA OF HOLLAND.

Unless the unforeseen happens, unless imbroglions arise between the powers of Europe, or diplomacy takes some new turn on the questions vexing the continent, one of the greatest events of the coming fall will be the installing of the young queen of the Netherlands, Wilhemina, which is to take place in the Nieuwe Kerk (New Church) in Amsterdam, at midnight, on September 6. The ceremonial, it is true, will not have a tittle of the brilliancy that marked the recent coronation of Russia's czar; it will be simple and without display; and yet there will be much that is curious and interesting in its details. No public act of coronation is to be performed, and there will be no investiture of royal power. Simply, before the combined houses of the stats general, the parliament of Holland, with the president of the upper house at her right hand, the queen will take the oath to maintain the constitution and guard the liberty of her subjects; the president of the upper house will follow with an oath of homage, and each of the 140 and more legislators assembled will swear fealty and faith before his new sovereign.

For seven years all Holland has been waiting for this event, watching its miniature queen, a child of but ten years when her father, William III., died, grow into her present attractive

maidenhood. Dutch boys and girls, according to the custom of the country, do not become of age until they are 23, but the constitution provides otherwise in the case of a sovereign. Thus on the 31st of August, her eighteenth birthday, the days of the queen mother's regency will be over and Wilhelmina will be in fact as well as in name ruler of the Netherlands.—The Cosmopolitan.

DECLARATIONS OF WAR.

Declarations of war, in spite of recent significant instances, have been going into desuetude. There have been only 11 instances of a formal and solemn declaration of war since 1700, though the present century has seen over 60 wars or acts of reprisal begun without formal notice to the powers attacked. But the last two great European wars witnessed a return to the old practice. In 1870 a formal declaration of war from the French charge d'affaires at Berlin preceded the outbreak of hostilities, and partook of the nature of a warning to Russia; and in 1877 a dispatch declaring war was handed to the Turkish representative at St. Petersburg.

Except in the great instances of 1870 and 1877 the wars of this century have been waged without formal notice to the powers attacked. This has been the practice of both England and America. In 1812 the United States began war with England by seizing all British vessels in their harbors and invading Canada; and in 1854 the British fleet entered the Black sea with orders to compel the Russian squadron to return to Sebastopol, before the ambassadors had been withdrawn on either side.—London Law Times.

TRAIN DE LUXE FOR SIBERIA.

The Russian government has recently had built a train of cars as a sample of the railroad coaches that it proposes to put upon its line, which, when completed, will run from St. Petersburg on the Baltic to Port Arthur on the coast of China. The four coaches of which the train is composed are said to be superior to anything that has ever before been constructed or used in Europe. There are staterooms for the passengers, a saloon or parlor car, a dining car, bathrooms, telephonic communication from one car to the other, and, as a distinctly new feature, a section is set aside as a gymnasium. This latter feature is introduced for the reason that, when the line is completed, it will be about twice the length of any railway system in the world, and it is assumed that the passengers traveling over this long distance will require some form of physical exercise as a

means of keeping themselves in a good state of health. The opportunity will thus be afforded of pulling chest weights, punching the bag, hauling one's self up upon rings and in other ways setting the blood in circulation, and after a half an hour or more spent in this way a bath can be taken, and the traveler approaches luncheon dinner in a physical condition to do it full justice.—Boston Herald.

WHY INDIA IS POVERTY-STRICKEN.

When one hears of "over-population" as a cause of Indian poverty, is it meant that the people are too numerous for the land to supply them with food? Food is exported from India every year, so that cannot be the meaning. Is it meant that they cannot purchase foreign goods, having, in consequence of the pressure of numbers, to expend all their energies in raising food? The export of raw cotton, opium, and jute is sufficient to pay for the cotton goods, which are the only foreign manufactures the mass of the Indians use. The Indians need no foreign luxuries; they export food, and yet one is told there is "over-population." But there is one thing one has forgotten. There is one foreign luxury, the most expensive of all luxuries, and in that the people of India are forced to indulge—the luxury of alien government and alien exploitation.—India.

Mr. J. A. L. Waddell, of the American Society of Civil Engineers, has just published a valuable manual on bridge-building under the title "De Pontibus." His use of Latin the author explains in the following humorous but doubtless truthful paragraph: "For five consecutive years of his early life the author devoted more than half of his working time to the study of the Latin language; and this is the first opportunity which has occurred during the 22 years of his professional career to put the knowledge (?) so obtained to any practical use. Moreover, he fears that if he be so fortunate as to be able to practice his profession another 22 years no other occasion will occur to use it, so he feels the necessity of grasping this unique opportunity of a lifetime."—The Outlook.

An association has purchased the house No. 413 South Tenth street, in which Henry George was born, and the intention is to convert it into a library and reading-room to perpetuate the memory of the single-tax advocate. It is probable that a number of Henry George's personal effects, with some original manuscripts, will be collected and preserved in a room in this house, but the plans are not yet sufficiently

advanced to warrant an extended explanation. Henry George had many personal friends in this city, in addition to a large following of single-taxers, and this movement to honor his name will be heartily indorsed.—Philadelphia Record.

The case was a damage suit. A country lad, 17 or 18 years old, a son of the plaintiff, was put on the stand to testify as to a line fence. He gave his testimony in so low a tone that Judge Hutchinson said to him:

"Speak so these gentlemen can hear you," pointing to the jury.

"Why," said the witness, with a beaming smile, "are these men interested in pop's case?"—Chicago Evening Post.

"Many years ago," says Bishop Whipple, of Minnesota, "I was holding a service near an Indian village camp. My things were scattered about in the lodge, and when I was going out I asked the chief if it was safe to leave them there while I went to the village to hold a service. 'Yes,' he said, 'perfectly safe. There is not a white man within 100 miles!'"—The Outlook.

The Americans do not understand by what a legitimate and respectable bond Cuba is linked to Spain, and the Spaniards do not perceive that Cuba is linked to the United States by other very real bonds which it is impossible not to take into account.—Baron Pierre de Coubertin.

"Have you ever noticed how war promotes a literature of its own?" "Yes; that is one of the horrors of war."—Philadelphia North American.

LOVE IN A NOAH'S ARK.

Only a wooden lady,
With but half an arm at most;
Yet her look is so quaint,
And so fresh is her paint,
My heart is forever lost!

Only a wooden lady
Is all that your eyes can see;
But the straight up and down
Of her plain wooden gown
Has a hundred charms for me.

Only a wooden lady!
But that doesn't alter my plan,
For, in spite of that clause,
I can love her, because
I'm only a wooden man!
—Annie C. Davis.

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.