

The Public

First Year.

CHICAGO, SATURDAY, MAY 21, 1898.

Number 7.

LOUIS F. POST, Editor.

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

For terms and all other particulars of publication, see last column of last page.

Two things need close watching by the people of the United States, at this time of war excitement, when, under cover of a seductive but false patriotism, the beneficiaries of special pecuniary interests find exceptional opportunities to plot and plan for the "glory" and "honor" of their country and the triumph of plutocracy. One of these is the itch for "national expansion;" the other is the measure for raising war revenues.

The "national expansion" idea is well expressed by F. F. Hilder, secretary of the National Geographical Society, in an instructive and interesting description of the Philippine Islands with which he favors the public. Though he admits that we did not start out upon a war of conquest, but took up arms to free Cuba, and while he would have us cling to our original object so far as Cuba is concerned, yet the temptation which Admiral Dewey's victory offers is too inviting for his jingo spirit, and he urges the appropriation of the Philippines. And while we are at it, he would have us take Puerto Rico as well. By way of excuse for these acts of conquest, he suggests that as bankrupt Spain has no ready cash with which to pay a war indemnity, we should "take real estate instead."

The secretary of the National Geographical Society is not alone in putting forth feelers as to "national expansion." About the same time at which he writes come other intimations from Washington, apparently inspired, and from London, too, that it behooves the United States to take

advantage of the opportunity which the war with Spain seems to offer, of becoming one of the great gobbling powers of the earth. The man must be both blind and deaf who cannot understand that the desire for conquest which afflicts fallen man is being gently played upon at this crisis. And if the people do not take warning in time, the end of the war may find this country entering upon a career of "expansion" which will place it at the mercy of the manipulators of a great navy and a large standing army. This is not a necessary result of the war, but it is one which may be reasonably apprehended. If the really democratic elements of the country which approve this war for liberty, do not make themselves clearly understood as being opposed to a war of conquest, the days of the great American republic are numbered, and those of the American empire are at hand.

The one supreme purpose of this war should continue to be what it was at the beginning—the independence of Cuba. Nor should plutocratic schemers, such as Elkins and Hanna are or represent, be allowed to fool the American public by setting up a fraudulent independence there. The Cuban independence which our people have virtually recognized—which Congress did in terms recognize by concurrent resolution two years ago, and which the masses now recognize by uniting the banner of Cuba libre with the stars and stripes—is that of the insurgents. When their flag waves over all Cuba, our work in this war will have been done.

But we should not thereupon abandon the Philippine islands, nor leave Spain in the quiet possession of Puerto Rico. The Philippines have fallen into our hands by the fortunes of war, and though they should not be

retained as a spoil of war, neither should they be passed back to the bloodthirsty rule of the Spaniard. Since they have come under our guardianship, as an incident of a war in which we are engaged, we ought to give them the independence that we have demanded and are fighting for in behalf of Cuba. And as to Puerto Rico, inasmuch as the Spanish government on this hemisphere has been a nuisance, the independence of that island also should be required, and Spain sent once for all—bag, baggage, plunder and blood—out of our neighborhood. To the extent that this war is carried beyond its original purpose of freeing Cuba, we must see to it—if we have any real regard for national honor and human rights—that it is carried only in the direction of further freedom. It is not "expansion" of power, but expansion of liberty, to which American ambition should aspire.

Cautions are abundant, of course, against entrusting Cubans, Puerto Ricans, and Philippine Islanders with independence. It is the old objection to democracy, which has been raised time out of mind to every advance toward self-government. Because a people cannot be expected to govern themselves as their betters would like to see them governed, their betters say they are unfit for self-government. The objection is invalid. If it were reasonably certain that any people are unfit for self-government, it would be still more certain that no other people are fit to govern them. The only remedy for unfitness for self-government is self-government itself. This is true of Cuba, it is true of Puerto Rico, and it is true of the Philippine Islands. If they are unfit to govern themselves, after hundreds of years of government by others, they will never learn to gov-

ern themselves under government by others. Let them, then, try the experiment of self-government at once. Mexico, under self-government, has learned, in spite of extraordinary disadvantages, to govern herself in much less time than Spain spent in educating her colonies. Give the Cubans, the Philippine Islanders, the Puerto Ricans as good a chance as Mexico has had, and if after a couple of centuries they have not improved, it may be more plausibly argued that self-government is no better for a people than paternal government. At present the argument from experience runs the other way.

Probably the protest against Cuban and Puerto Rican self-government will not make much impression upon the American mind. It is too obviously inspired by men who would like to do the governing down there in our name. Of the Philippines, however, so little is known, and of that so little is true, that a notion prevails that the natives are savages who would need to be under tutelage lest they run amuck among the peaceable inhabitants. But the very secretary of the geographical society whom we have quoted above, speaks of the natives of the Philippine Islands as "mild and amiable." What better material could be desired for an experiment in self-government? For conquest, a mild and amiable people might not be well adapted; but for peaceable self-government, why not?

The stories of Philippine savagery evidently have their origin in the acts of reprisal of the natives against their Spanish masters. But these acts show no incapacity for self-government. On the contrary they show that the natives, despite their amiability and mildness, are unmistakably human. The circumstances at the same time indicate that they are not savage. Have they murdered women and children? Yes. But that is not savage under the circumstances. The women and children, and the men, too, whom they have murdered, are Spanish

women, children and men; and the Spanish themselves began that kind of warfare by murdering native men, women and children. What tells strongly for the capacity of the Philippine natives for self-government is the fact that while no Spaniard dare venture among them, white men and women not Spaniards do so with perfect safety. What better proof could be required that the natives are not waging indiscriminate warfare upon civilized people than this fact that they scrupulously confine their depredations to the race which indiscriminately murders their fathers, brothers, sons, wives, sisters, mothers and children? Could Anglo-Saxons be trusted not to retaliate in the same way? If they could be, at what time since the Indian wars in this country did they reform? There is no valid reason for believing that the Philippine Islanders could not govern themselves. Nor is there any real objection to allowing them to try, except the objection that they might prevent the privileged classes of civilized nations from preying upon them.

To be sure, if we allowed Cuba, Puerto Rico and the Philippines to set up independent governments we might have to forego a war indemnity from Spain, for Spain is bankrupt. But we want no indemnity. That circumstances may sometimes warrant war indemnities, we will not dispute, but there are no such circumstances in connection with this war. We have gone to war with Spain to liberate outraged neighbors; Spain has not made war upon us wantonly. We therefore are in no position to ask indemnity, either in money or real estate. To do so would reflect upon our honor as a nation much in the same way, though not to the same degree, that acts of conquest would.

Even at their best, war indemnities are of doubtful utility. They add to the burdens of the vanquished people without relieving the victorious people. Suppose, for instance, that we were paid an indemnity at the end of

this war. Think of the crushing weight with which it would fall upon the poor Spaniards who are already so heavily taxed that they are rioting all over Spain! Yet it would not relieve the people in this country who are providing the funds with which to prosecute the war on our side. It might be made to benefit those of them who continued to be taxpayers; but it would return no taxes that had been paid. Indirect taxes are never returned. The probability is that a war indemnity, if used at all to refund taxes, would be used to refund direct taxes, which are paid chiefly by the richer classes. Of all the taxes of the civil war, for example, only one kind was returned, and that was the tax on land—the one tax which fell in any large amount upon unearned values. True, these observations would not apply to an indemnity in the form of a transfer of sovereignty over Puerto Rico and the Philippines. But the acceptance permanently of that transfer would so utterly discredit our good faith, so completely prove that we had been waging a war of conquest instead of liberation, and withal would put us in so much danger from "national expansion," that even a money indemnity would be at once more safe and more honorable, less mean and sordid.

The second object of popular vigilance at this time—the war revenue measure—is as we write still undetermined in its details. It is in this connection that the pretense of patriotism is most dishonestly set up by the plutocrats. Because some congressmen, more truly patriotic than their detractors, have insisted upon forbidding the issue of interest-bearing bonds, and have tried to shift some of the burden of taxation from the masses of the people to accumulated wealth, they are denounced as traitors who endeavor to embarrass the government. That they are embarrassing somebody is true enough, but it is not the government. It is the plutocratic ring who want to run the government.

The war revenue bill as it came from the lower house to the senate, backed by the votes of most of the republicans and some of the democrats, is utterly wicked. How grossly wicked is demonstrated by Thomas G. Shearman, who, without prejudice or partisanship, has analyzed it. According to Mr. Shearman's analysis this bill puts only 10 per cent. of war taxation upon the principal owners of invested wealth, while it puts 30 per cent. upon the middle class, who have some wealth but depend mainly upon their earnings, and the enormous proportion of 60 per cent. upon those who depend exclusively upon their daily earnings. So it appears that 90 per cent. of these "patriotic" taxes is to be paid by the two classes that will do most of the fighting, while the rich class, though it escapes most of the fighting, will pay only 10 per cent. of the taxes. In other words, the bill is a measure for virtually exempting the rich. Yet the plutocratic press, and plutocratic members of congress, and plutocrats of every degree—from the poverty-stricken lickspittle to corrupt and corrupting "captains of industry"—shout themselves hoarse with the cry that he who wishes to alter this unfair law is "unpatriotic." Dr. Johnson appears to have been not so very wrong when he described patriotism as the last refuge of a scoundrel.

Owing to the strict censorship of the press in both Spain and Italy it is impossible yet to appreciate the seriousness of the riots in either nation. Evidently, however, they are in both a manifestation of industrial war. Each country imposes octroi duties upon merchandise coming into cities. This enormously enhances the price of food to the working classes and makes taxation an obvious burden, thus associating poverty with government. Added to the burden of taxation is the burden in both countries of landlordism. In Italy, the latter is so grievous that in some districts the peasants are forced to live upon putrid corn, and have conse-

quently become afflicted with a species of disease somewhat like leprosy. From the fruits of their hard labor they have hardly anything left after taxes and rents are paid.

To some it will seem strange that the suffering among Italian peasants is greatest where the land is richest. In localities where soil and climate make it possible to raise three crops a year the peasants are worse off than where only one crop can be raised. But in fact there is nothing strange about this. The same thing may be observed in the United States—indeed, all over the world. For example, what richer land have we in the United States than in our great cities. Though it may not be fertile, it is far better than fertile land. Yet it is right in our cities that poverty is keenest. The reason here as in Italy is that where the land is best the competition for the privilege of using it is most intense. Consequently the owner can rack rent his tenants more harshly there than where the land is poorer and competition for it is consequently less pressing. Landlordism and taxation evidently lie at the bottom of the Italian difficulties. This is probably true also of Spain, but the war is a disturbing factor there. In Italy not only is there no war, but there is a good king, as kings go, a good government for a paternal government, and the cause of rioting is clearly traceable to the fundamental cause of all such commotions—landlordism and oppressive taxation.

In our own country the same causes of discontent exist as in Italy, but they are hidden from public view. Though we have not the octroi in name, we have it in substance. No officer stands at the gates of our cities to levy a tax upon vegetables as they come in from the country; but officers sit at the city hall to collect license taxes from market gardeners, who add those taxes to the price of their commodities. How does that differ in principle and effect from an octroi tax? Only in this, that those who pay

it do not know that they pay it. The same is true of all the business taxes that we impose. Every storekeeper is made a collector of what are in effect octroi taxes, and in ignorance of the great burden of taxation that rests upon them, the poor of the United States are loaded down with taxes as they are in Italy. Coupled with this tax burden is also the burden of landlordism. We do not distinguish our landlords as a separate class, but rents, heavy rents, fall all the same upon our industrial classes. So heavy are these rents that speculative minds are tempted by them to buy up land for which the rent would still be low and hold it for a rise. This has been done until nearly all the vacant land of the United States is monopolized. In consequence, all kinds of employment are abnormally restricted, and men walk the streets begging, not for pennies, as do the beggars of Italy, but for work.

Occasionally this condition is brought dramatically to public attention, by the vivid writings of a Wyckoff, or the despair of some poor victim of our unhappy industrial maladjustments. An instance is before us. One day last week Albert Noha, of 1008 West Eighteenth street, Chicago, committed suicide so as to give his family the benefit of his life insurance policy. His motive was inability to secure employment. This is only one instance among thousands, happening all the time, and differing only in detail. Through landlordism and the octroi principle of taxation, the American people are being differentiated into classes of leisure and wealth on one hand, and of poverty, dependence and despair on the other. Should this process continue, the beginning of the end may be inferred from the bread riots of Europe. Social disease—and this is social disease—is the inevitable precursor of social disaster.

The appointment of civilians to important military offices is breeding a scandal for the administration. In

the civil war such appointments were unavoidable, but there is no excuse for them now. They are gruesome acts of favoritism; gruesome because they trifle with the lives of men of genuine patriotism who have volunteered where volunteers are needed—in the ranks. It cannot be inspiring or reassuring to these volunteers, who have lives to lose, to see the names of inexperienced civilians, having nothing to recommend them but their family relationship to politicians, in the list of military appointments. The military office for a civilian to begin to hold in time of war is that of private; and if the civilians who are seeking office were really anxious to serve their country, they would show their sincerity by enlisting. Then if they proved themselves worthy of commissions, no one would criticize; while, if they gave no such proof, they would do no harm.

The law which a few states have enacted compelling candidates who have been nominated for office by two or more organizations to go upon the official ballot as candidates of only one, is a "gang" law. It is clearly intended to restrict opportunities for independent voting. No matter which party may be responsible for it, this law is in the interest of political rings and bosses. Since we have party columns on official ballots, it ought to be possible for third parties to effectively indorse acceptable candidates of either of the older parties. But that cannot be done under the law to which we here refer. Partial fusion of any kind under that law is impossible. To make a fusion, one of the fusing parties must absolutely surrender its identity. If a republican or a democratic candidate were indorsed by a reform organization, he would have to decline either the nomination or the indorsement. Such an objectionable law is possible only where party rings have been able to efface from the Australian ballot system its most valuable feature. That system contemplates the arrangement of names upon official ballots in al-

phabetical order, party affiliations being indicated by putting the names of parties after each candidate's name, descriptively, as it is done in Massachusetts. With a system of that kind there would be no temptation to pass such a law as we have described above. But when party columns were forced upon the Australian ballot reformers by "gang" politicians, the way was opened for political tricks like that of the law against fusions. Instead of facilitating independence in politics, this law interferes with it; instead of weakening party machines it strengthens them. It should either be repealed outright, or be made ineffective by the adoption of the Massachusetts system of the alphabetical ballot.

LOOK AHEAD.

The time has fully come in the progress of the war when peace men, those who believe in peace for a deeper reason than mere desire for quiet—who believe in it as the complement of liberty—should see the wisdom and importance of at least suspending their denunciations of the war. So long as there was any possibility of averting war, they would have been false to their convictions not to have opposed it vigorously. But all such possibility has now gone by. They can no more prevent the prosecution of the war, nor bring it to an end before it shall have been fought out, than pigmies can move mountains. The war is a fact. It is a fact, too, which men who believe in liberty and who love justice must soon consider in connection with political, industrial and social questions infinitely more vital than the question of war or no war. By ignoring this fact, and isolating themselves from the current of popular thought, they only fritter away influence that might be extremely useful when those questions come up for adjustment.

To such men, the experience of the democratic party in the civil war ought to be a salutary lesson. By opposing the prosecution of that war, after war had become inevitable, the democratic party threw away all possibility of effectively participating in the settlement of the great questions

which the war left over. As to many of those questions—the ones, for example, which related to the centralization of power, to the substitution of nationality for federation, and to the development of monopoly—the democrats were right. But so completely had they discredited themselves with public opinion, that they were powerless to prevent the spirit of monopoly and centralization from playing at will upon the harp strings of patriotism. Had the democrats recognized the palpable fact that there was a war, and that it was not and must not be allowed to be a failure, but must be fought to a decisive victory for the permanency of the federation and the abolition of slavery, the subsequent history of this country would have been happily different from what in some respects it has been. The possibilities, at any rate, of the expansion of national power and the contraction of individual and local liberty, would be far less than they are.

That there is a jingo spirit in the present war is true. But the war is not all jingo. Very little of it is jingo. Yet it may become thoroughly jingo if the aggressively anti-jingo element, forgetting that liberty is more important than peace, identifies itself in public estimation with Spanish barbarism and tyranny. Such streaks of jingoism as there are in the war, cannot be eliminated by characterizing the war itself as a jingo expedition. To the average mind this is an untrue characterization. Never before in the history of our own or any other country have the people gone into war with so little soda water patriotism. Yet they have not lacked enthusiasm of the serious kind. On the whole they have acted like men conscious of engaging in the performance of an awful duty. But let the men who despise soda water patriotism once create a widespread impression that opposition to the war is identical with opposition to what the war represents in the public mind, and jingoism will have full sway in settling the questions which the war will leave behind it.

And such questions as they, in their significance if not in their immediate bearings, will be!

At the forefront we shall have to meet the question of Cuban independ-

ence—of the right of the people of that island to work out their own liberties in their own way. Already the god Jingo has raised his head and demanded that Cuban independence be sacrificed upon the altar of “national expansion.”

Then there will be the question of the disposition of the Philippines. Whether to sordidly sell those islands to some European nation; or to languidly hand back the inhabitants to the merciless cruelties of the Spaniards who have outraged them for three hundred years; or to ambitiously appropriate the islands to ourselves in the interest of “national expansion;” or, with a sturdy love for liberty, to take advantage of our opportunity to empower the Philippine Islanders to establish a government of their own and work out their liberties in their own way. Such are the forms which that question will probably assume.

Both questions are full of significance with reference to our own freedom. Just as we move in their settlement in the direction of liberty or of authority, so will we move in settling our own home questions. If we aim to extend greater freedom to others whose destiny has by the fortunes of war fallen under our control, we will for the same reason—because our sense of liberty is expanding—seek greater freedom for ourselves. Our treatment of Cuba and the Philippines will indicate whether our ideas of liberty are advancing or receding.

Even the question of perpetual peace will be in evidence. It is possible to bring the principle of peace into public contempt by identifying it with stubborn opposition to a particular war already raging, which commends itself to sober men who believe in peace with liberty.

Peace men have a higher mission than to isolate themselves when war is on. By doing so they strengthen the arm of the jingo expansionist, and give aid and comfort to the monopolist who, to subjugate his fellow citizens, plays upon the “patriotic” passions which war easily excites. The true mission of the peace man is less to oppose particular wars than to conserve his influence for the things that make for peace.

And in doing this, peace men must

remember that they are dealing with men and not with automatons, and that they must affect public opinion if they would accomplish results. But how will they affect public opinion if they persist in identifying what they stand for—methods of establishing liberty, and things that make for peace—with opposition to a generous war for the peace of a war-racked neighboring island and the liberty of its inhabitants? They will affect public opinion with reference to those things pretty much as the “copperheads” affected it with reference to the grave questions of local self-government that were left over by the civil war.

We shall soon need the influence of peace men who believe in other things than peace, in adjusting questions of greater importance to mankind than the question of one war more or less. But if they maintain their present attitude, we shall find their influence when it is needed all worn out with futile opposition to a public sentiment that is now unalterably fixed. In that case, jingoism, “national expansion” and monopoly, well identified with a war for liberty and peace, would have clear sailing; and the war, instead of being as it might be made, a stride in the direction of justice and therefore of peace, would give new masters to Cuba and the Philippines, strengthen the power of monopoly in our own country, and still further postpone the era of universal peace.

THE HOAR AMENDMENT.

Unless the lower house of congress refuses to concur in a joint resolution passed by the senate on the 10th of May, the legislatures of the several states of the union will soon be called upon to ratify or reject the following proposed amendment to the federal constitution:

The term of office of the president and vice president of the Fifty-sixth congress shall continue until the fourth day of May, in the year 1901, at noon; and the fourth day of May, at noon, shall thereafter be substituted for the fourth day of March as the commencement and termination of the official term of the president, vice president, senators and representatives in congress.

Meantime the people should consider the propriety of such an amendment, with a view to influencing the

action regarding it of their respective legislatures.

The object of this amendment was explained in the senate by its author, Senator Hoar, of Massachusetts, as being two-fold. What he termed the lesser reason for it is that as the people have come more and more to desire to witness the inauguration of presidents, a less inclement day than the 4th of March usually is should be selected for that event. But he stated the more important reason for the change to be that as the second session of congress now lasts only from the first Monday of December to the 4th of March, which is too short a time within which to give proper attention to the appropriation bills, that session ought to be extended as the amendment proposes.

To describe the amendment as vicious might be harsh; but a very much milder term would not fit the case. On the surface it appears to be of slight importance. For that reason alone it should be rejected. The cumbersome proceedings for amending the constitution of the United States should never be invoked for trifling purposes. But this amendment is worse than trifling. Not only would it arbitrarily extend the terms of senators, and of the president and vice president now in office, for two months beyond the period for which they were elected—a petty objection, perhaps, though one that ought not to be incurred except for an important purpose not otherwise attainable—but it would put a serious obstacle in the way of securing an amendment which, while meeting the graver reason offered for this, would recognize one of the great principles of democratic government that we now ignore.

Under the existing system to which the amendment in question relates, the president does not take office until four months after the people have called him; and representatives in congress, though they nominally take office within four months after election, do not do so in fact, except when an extra session is called, until 13 months after. These long intervals between the election of public servants and their entry upon their duties tends to separate them from the people and to weaken the voice of the

voter in public affairs. They are, therefore, undemocratic.

Moreover, they are contrary to the popular methods of all countries which are advancing in democracy. In Great Britain and her dependencies the time between a parliamentary election and the convening of the new parliament is inconsiderable. The popular mandates there are instantly obeyed. When the people vote upon an issue, the legislators whom they choose to execute their commands enter upon the duty at once. No time intervenes within which the defeated party may annul the popular mandate through hold-over officials, or special interests may wean the new legislators from the principles to which their constituencies have pledged them. The defeated party goes instantly out of power, if it were in power before; and the victorious party, coming fresh from the people, acts under the spur of public opinion on burning questions. The heat of the contest has not had time to cool when it finds itself in power and called upon to act.

It is only in this country, among the democratic countries of the earth, that the legislative servants of the people are kept out of office so long after election as to forget the lessons of the election. A notable instance was Cleveland's second administration. He and the members of his first congress were distinctly commissioned by the people to abolish protection. There was no other burning question in the campaign. But four months elapsed after the people had spoken before he took his seat, and 13 before the members of congress had a chance to act upon the issue upon which they were elected. Meanwhile Cleveland, never very earnest, perhaps, respecting that issue, ignored the popular mandate and lifted a subordinate issue, "sound currency," to first place; and congress, when it got to a chance to act, had so far forgotten the issue upon which it was elected that the very corporate influences which had been defeated by the people were triumphant at Washington. That would not have happened if the president had been inaugurated and congress had met immediately after the election.

We often think of Canada as anxious for annexation to the United States. But we are mistaken. The Canadian sentiment for annexation is astonishingly weak. Nor is this because Canadians cling to monarchical government. They do not. They are as democratic as we. Whatever other reasons might weigh with them against annexation, one is insuperable. The Canadian would not abandon his "responsible" system of government. He has a government now which is directly and promptly responsible to the people, and he shrinks from swapping it for ours, under which the voice of the people is silenced by legislative straight-jackets. In other words, the Canadian's objection to annexation is not that his sentiments are monarchical, but because they are too democratic to submit to our legislative formalities, most important among which is the one that puts off so far from elections the induction of the president and representatives into their offices, and thereby severs one of the most important links that bind public servants to the public.

With this Canadian sentiment, every American of democratic instincts, who understands the situation, is in sympathy. Our system of long intervals between the election and the installation of legislative servants, weakens the influence of public opinion upon legislation. Modified only in degree, it is the same in principle as life tenures would be. If, therefore, an amendment with reference to this subject is to be submitted to the states, it should be one requiring the congress to which representatives are elected in November, 1900, to take their seats on the first Monday of the following December, and the president elected that year to be inaugurated on that day. Or, if balmy weather be desirable for inauguration ceremonies, the amendment should change the date of presidential and congressional elections to March or April, beginning with 1901, and fix the first session of the congress then elected, and the inauguration of the new president, for a day in May immediately following the election.

By the former plan the graver reason for the Hoar amendment would be met, for the incoming instead of

the outgoing congress could give all the attention that might be needed to the appropriation bills for the ensuing year. The latter plan would answer both objects which Mr. Hoar professes to be desirous of serving. It would give us a salubrious inauguration day, provided his own chosen month of May did not prove fickle; and as congress would then have a full year at its disposal for each session, it would afford ample time for the perfection of the appropriation bills of both sessions. And what is of vastly greater importance, if this country is to be governed by the ballot box, either plan would make the government at Washington respond instantly to the wishes of the people as expressed at elections.

But the amendment proposed by Mr. Hoar would very likely for a long time prevent the adoption of either of these plans. It is so difficult to secure constitutional amendments, when any great interest opposes them, that if such an amendment as Mr. Hoar proposes were adopted, a powerful argument against either plan here proposed would be found in the fact that the subject had been already disposed of. Indeed, it is not so certain that this may not be the real purpose of Mr. Hoar's apparently innocuous little amendment. While explaining his amendment on the floor of the senate on the 10th of May, Mr. Hoar said that he had never heard but one plausible objection to it, which was—that the amendment ought to be changed so that the new congress would meet immediately after the election, and that the popular will, which is expressed in the change of political power in a new election, should find expression in legislation without even the intervention of a single month or a single year.

And then he added:

Some persons with whom I have talked on this subject have held that view, but I think that the time is brief enough. This great political being of ours ought to take a little time to change its mind. It is not always convenient for the gentlemen who are elected to the house of representatives to leave all their business and repair to the seat of government within a week or two after the result of a doubtful election is declared; and it is well, I think, that the heats, excitements and passions which sometimes—not so much of late as in former years—prevail in this country in a sharply con-

tested election should have a little time to pass away before the permanent and deliberate will of the people is enacted seriously into the statutes.

Evidently Mr. Hoar sees the hostile relation between his amendment and one which would enable congress to meet immediately after the election of its members. Would it be unfair, then, to infer that he has introduced one in order to head off the other? He flatly expresses his preferences for the present system, so that the country "may have a little time to change its mind," so that the excitements of a sharply contested election shall have "time to pass away before the permanent and deliberate will of the people is enacted seriously into statutes." Pray how is the "permanent" and "deliberate" will of the people on burning questions to be determined, if not in exciting elections? Can there be any motive for allowing time for the excitement to pass away, except that the legislators chosen at such elections may substitute their will for the will of the people who commissioned them? To enable them to do so may be wisdom, but if it be, it is the wisdom of plutocracy. In a democratic government the place for what Mr. Hoar aptly calls "this great political being" to change its mind, the place for it to manifest the subsidence of its excitement over burning questions of public policy, is not in the halls of legislation, but at the ballot box. We should make it clearly understood that legislators are public servants, and neither public masters nor public mentors.

The proposer of the Hoar amendment, Mr. Hoar himself, has thus given sufficient reason for the democratic sentiment of the country in all parties to oppose and defeat it. If there were no other objection to it, its adoption would be a stumbling-block in the way of the kind of amendment that ought to be adopted.

"IF CHRIST WERE HERE?"

This was the subject of a sermon delivered recently by Lyman Abbott in Plymouth church, and subsequently published in *The Outlook*. If Christ were here in this nineteenth century, as he was in Palestine in the first, what sort of man would he be, and what kind of life would he lead?

That was the question which Dr. Abbott put, and to which his answer must in the main be most satisfactory, except to those who in the hardening processes of conventional piety have lost all sense of the mission and character of the Nazarene carpenter. In one respect, however, this answer seems to us faulty—radically so. We refer to Dr. Abbott's saying that if Christ were here now, he might be a man of wealth. That is unthinkable.

No man of wealth is known to our civilization, who earns all his wealth. Many of them earn nothing. But even men who do useful work—and they are doubtless the men of wealth whom Dr. Abbott has in mind—though they work with extraordinary industry and skill and productiveness, they do not, if they are rich enough to be accounted men of wealth, earn more than a small proportion of the wealth they command and call their own. Upon examination, their fortunes will be found to depend, directly or indirectly, not upon the usefulness of their labor, but upon unjust privileges created by law. What goes, therefore, to make them wealthy, is unjustly diverted from their brethren. They may not be conscious of the injustice, but it is upon injustice that the superstructure of their wealth is built, nevertheless. No man in our civilization is esteemed wealthy who does not get from others more service in the aggregate than in the aggregate he need return to others. Dr. Abbott cannot name an exception. How, then, could we expect Christ, if he were here, to be a man of wealth?

He could not be an Astor, for instance, living in luxury upon the increment of city land, to which all contribute; nor a Rockefeller, drawing fabulous sums from the monopoly of mineral resources and rights of way for pipe lines. And in saying this we impute no personal wrongfulness to either Astor or Rockefeller. We simply intend to imply, what all intelligent persons know to be true, that the wealth of the Astors and the Rockefellers is largely unearned by them. It is unthinkable that Christ, if he were here, would, like them, be a wealthy man.

Dr. Abbott endeavors to make a

distinction between men of wealth who do, and those who do not, serve their fellows. He explains that if Christ were a man of wealth, "his problem would not be how to make one dollar get two more dollars, but how to make one dollar render the largest service that one dollar can." But that explanation will not do. It is unthinkable also that Christ, if he were here, would appropriate unearned dollars even to do good with them.

Mere men may be and remain the beneficiaries of unearned wealth without guilt. On one hand they may not know that their wealth is unearned. In the complexity of our industrial conditions, under which the function of serving the community by work and the privilege of plundering it by monopoly are blended in what is known as "business," it is not remarkable that men who have never earned a dollar, and have never rendered a service except with dollars that somebody else had earned, should be unconscious of the illegitimate character of their wealth. Much less remarkable is it that in these circumstances men who earn some of their wealth and do not earn the rest, should suppose that they earn it all. On the other hand, wealthy men, though aware of the unearned character of much of their wealth, may believe, what is perfectly true, that as the conditions which give them this wealth are not personal but social, they can be reformed only by social action. There is no obligation upon such men to give away their wealth, nor to ignore the opportunity for making it which society insists upon thrusting before them. If they use their influence to enlighten society, and to cause it to alter those conditions so that no one can have the advantages of monopoly, they do not only all they are in conscience required to do, but all that it is possible for mere men in their individual capacity to do.

Not so with Christ. As we can conceive of slaveholders as being personally innocent of the crime of slavery, but not of Christ as a slaveholder, so, though we recognize the innocence of wealthy men, we cannot think of Christ as wealthy. If he were here now, he might, as Dr. Ab-

bott suggests, be found making furniture in Grand Rapids, digging coal in Pennsylvania, or hammering on some anvil, or following a plow. Indeed, it is at some such work that we should expect to find him, for it was in a kindred vocation that he labored for a living when he was here. But we should not expect to find him a man of wealth. Though mere men may be rich without therefore being personally evil, it is as inconceivable, while the wealth of the wealthy is made up of the losses of their brethren, that truth and justice incarnate should be a man of wealth, as that truth and justice incarnate should own slaves.

BASIS OF RAILROAD RATES.

The fact that the University of Pennsylvania supports a professor of transportation, will come to the attention of most people as a novelty; but to anyone who understands the University of Pennsylvania it will be no novelty to learn that, inasmuch as the university has such a professor, he is a special pleader for railroad monopoly. That he should be anything else and continue to hold his place, would be inconceivable. Special pleas, however, are always interesting, be they never so irritating to a well-ordered mind, and this professor's argument in support of the doctrine of rates known as "all the traffic will bear," and its corollary which Vanderbilt frankly phrased as "the public be damned," is no exception.

The Pennsylvania professor admits that upon the face of things it would seem that railroads should fix charges in accordance with cost of service. But this he says would be impracticable because "it is impossible to determine accurately the elements which enter into the cost of performing the particular transportation service"—the cost, that is to say, of carrying each particular parcel or passenger. Value of service, therefore, he regards as the more desirable basis of rates; meaning by value of service what the service is worth to shippers and passengers,—“all the traffic will bear.”

Any thoughtful man would be apt to inquire why it is that dry goods stores are able to fix their charges

in accordance with cost of service if railroads are not. How is it any more feasible for storekeepers than for railroad companies "to determine accurately the elements which enter into the cost" of handling each particular yard of goods? And the inquiry would be pertinent.

The truth is that in fixing prices or rates both the dry goods store and the railroad are governed both by the value of the service to those to whom it is rendered and by the cost of rendering it. No one will pay more for a service, either by a dry goods store or by a railroad, than it is worth to him; and nobody, be he storekeeper or railroad company, can permanently render service for less than cost. Between cost of service, therefore, and its value to the persons served, the rates of service, whether for the service of dry goods stores or of railroads, must be fixed. But at what point prices or rates will rest between these two extremes, depends upon competition. If competition be normal, prices and rates will tend from the value of the service to the persons who receive it downward to its cost to the persons rendering it. And if normal competition continue, prices and rates will ultimately rest at the cost of rendering the service for which they are charged. This is what is meant when it is said that prices are governed by cost of production.

Let the principle here briefly stated be once grasped, and it is easy to understand why dry goods stores are able to fix their charges in accordance with cost of service. If they could, they would fix them at the value of the service to the persons served, in accordance with the doctrine of "all the traffic will bear," but competition forbids that. And steadiness of competition forces their charges down permanently to the point of cost of service, below which they cannot go. It must not be understood, however, that the storekeeper fixes his prices by entering into elaborate calculations, assigning to the price of each piece of goods he sells so much for rent, so much for taxes, so much for freight, so much for superintendence, so much for interest on purchase price of the goods, so much for the wages of the clerk in selling the particular piece, and so

on. His calculations in these respects are based upon the cost in general of conducting his business, and they are stimulated by the forces of competition which press against him on all sides. No committee, with all dry goods stores under its control, could fairly regulate his prices for him, either upon the basis of cost or upon any other basis. The work of such a committee would of necessity be arbitrary. But storekeepers, left free to fix prices in accordance with their business instinct but subject to the pressure of competition, do serve the public at prices which roughly but fairly correspond to cost of service.

If now, it be asked why railroads do not render their service upon the same principle, instead of charging all the traffic will bear, the answer is obvious. While they, like the storekeeper, naturally seek to charge for their service all that the service is worth to the persons served, they are not held in check, as is the storekeeper,—their prices are not forced down to the point of cost, as are his,—simply because they do not operate under the same pressure of competition. Railroads are monopolies. They control highways, and people desiring their kind of service must employ particular railroads. Even where there is competition it is so weak that pooling becomes possible, and the shipper if not subject to one railroad is made subject to a railroad pool. Consequently, railroad rates, left unrestricted by law, do not tend naturally as do store prices, to fall from the highest extreme of "all the traffic will bear," to the lowest extreme of cost of service.

And when legal regulation is introduced, the regulators find themselves in the position they would be in if empowered to regulate store prices without the aid of free competition. They are confronted with the necessity of making calculations which it is beyond the power of any man or set of men to make. It is true, as the professor of transportation of the Pennsylvania university says, that railroad companies cannot possibly determine with accuracy the elements which enter into the cost of service, and so regulate their charges in accordance with cost; but the reason for this the professor carefully conceals,

if he knows what it is. It is because railroads are monopolies. If roadbeds were maintained as public highways, as they ought to be, and railroading were thus made competitive, railroad rates, like dry goods store prices, would very quickly adjust themselves to the cost of service. But if that were done, there would be no further demand for professors of transportation, especially in the University of Pennsylvania.

NEWS

At the time of writing last week Admiral Sampson's fleet had left Key West under sealed orders, Commodore Schley's was awaiting orders in Hampton Roads, and the location of the Cape Verde fleet of the Spaniards was a mystery, though rumors of its appearance off Martinique, in the West Indies, were numerous. These rumors were authoritatively denied, however, as reference to page 10 of last week's issue will show. They were in the category with the rumor noted on page 11, that Sampson had annihilated the Spanish vessels and on the 11th of May was bombarding San Juan, on the Spanish island of Puerto Rico. As to the bombardment of San Juan, the rumor was only one day ahead of time. Admiral Sampson, with nine ships, faced San Juan, before sunrise on the morning of the 12th. Word had been sent ahead that the place would be bombarded, and women, children, aliens and non-combatants were notified to leave. The Iowa opened fire and was followed by the Indiana, after which the bombardment became general. Fort Morro, on the point at the entrance to San Juan Bay, was soon in ruins. The bombardment lasted three hours, and when Sampson drew off he said that he was satisfied with the morning's work; that he could have taken San Juan, but had no force to hold it; and that he had only administered punishment, having come for the Spanish fleet and not for San Juan. The extent of damage done to the Spanish is still unknown. The Americans lost two men. One of them was killed; the other died from the intense heat. Seven were wounded. Only two Spanish shells exploded on the American ships—one on the New York and the other on the Indiana. Admiral Sampson's official report of the bombardment was as follows:

St. Thomas, May 12.—A portion of

the squadron under my command reached San Juan this morning at day-break. No armed vessels were found in the port. As soon as it was sufficiently light I commenced attack upon the batteries defending the city. This attack lasted about three hours and resulted in much damage to the batteries and incidentally to a portion of the city adjacent to the batteries. The batteries replied to our fire, but without material effect. One man was killed on board the New York and seven slightly wounded in the squadron. No serious damage to any ships resulted.

SAMPSON.

Hardly had the report of the bombardment of San Juan been received when dispatches from London confirmed the rumors of last week regarding the sighting of the Cape Verde fleet of the Spanish off Martinique, by telling of its arrival, on the 12th, at the port of Fort de France on that island. The Furor, a torpedo boat destroyer belonging to the fleet, took on coal at Fort de France and immediately put to sea. Our scout, the Harvard, one of the fast liners which have gone into the service for the war, was in the harbor at the time, and has remained there ever since, undergoing repairs. The real reason may be that upon leaving she might be pounced upon by some part of the Spanish fleet. The Spanish torpedo boat Terror, also of the Cape Verde fleet, which put into Fort de France with the Furor, has likewise remained. She is reported as badly injured and without money to pay for repairs. It may be, however, that she is awaiting an opportunity to follow and destroy the Harvard.

The whereabouts of Admiral Sampson's fleet since the bombardment of San Juan has not been known, except that it was near Puerto Plata, Hayti, on the 14th, that it passed Cape Haytien, Hayti, on the 15th, and was near there on the 16th. On the 17th it was reported from Washington, with apparent authority, that Sampson had gone south through the Windward Passage, between Hayti and Cuba. One thing was certain, that Sampson had been doing his utmost to find the Cape Verde fleet ever since the latter was reported from Martinique. For two days the Cape Verde fleet covered its tracks. By leaving some of its ships near Martinique so as to give an impression that it was still there, or by starting rumors to that effect, it caused its reported arrival at Curacao, nearly 600 miles southwest of Martinique to be doubted. But the Span-

iards, or the body of their fleet at least, had slipped over to Curacao, arriving there on the 14th. This was regarded as a disclosure of the Spanish admiral's intention to elude Sampson. On the 15th the Spaniards left Curacao, going west. It was supposed that they were endeavoring to make a landing in Cuba, either at Cienfuegos or Havana, which would account for Sampson's having gone down through the Windward Passage. They were not heard of again until the 18th, when they were reported from Kingston as having been seen late that afternoon from Morant Point, at the extreme east of the island of Jamaica. They were then said to be heading for Santiago de Cuba, and moving with great speed.

As soon as the Cape Verde fleet was known to be in American waters, not only did Sampson's fleet set out to meet it, but Com. Schley's flying squadron at Hampton Roads was ordered out with the evident purpose of cooperating in some way with Sampson. On the 13th the flagship Brooklyn, with Com. Schley aboard, the torpedo boat destroyer and scout Scorpion, and the battleships Massachusetts and Texas, accompanied by a collier, left Hampton Roads, and moved southward. On the 14th all the ships of the squadron except the cruiser New Orleans, had left the Roads, and on the 15th the squadron had anchored off Charleston, S. C. When it was announced that Sampson's fleet had gone south through the Windward Passage, it was also stated that Schley's squadron was off the Florida coast proceeding toward Havana; but on the 18th Schley was at Key West.

Spain's whole fleet is not on this side the ocean. Some of her staunchest ships are at Cadiz, Spain, unless they have secretly left. Many rumors have been flying around about this detachment. Sometimes it was preparing to go to the Philippines to drive out Dewey, while at others it was ready to make a dash across the Atlantic and shell American cities. On the 16th, for example, the report was to the effect that this reserve fleet had left Cadiz on the 13th, and was due at the Canaries on the 16th, its object being to cut across and ravage the American coast while Cervera made a demonstration to draw the American fleets into the Caribbean sea, and on the 17th it was reported that the same fleet would be ready for

sea; and on the 17th it was reported from Madrid. On the 18th rumors came to the effect that Polo, the late Spanish minister at Washington, was arranging at Montreal, Quebec, for an attack by the Cadiz fleet upon the American coast. These rumors indicated that the fleet would obtain coal supplies from Spanish vessels off the islands of St. Pierre and Miquelon, south of Newfoundland, the coaling station of the French squadron.

Persistent rumors of an attack upon the American coast, especially at Boston, had been circulated all the week. They created a scare in New England, which was intensified by an order of the 13th from the war department directing the removal of women and children from Fort Warren, in Boston Harbor, pursuant to which the wives and children of officers and men were hurried to Boston. On the same day two cruisers hurriedly left the harbor. They cruised off Massachusetts Bay and returned on the 14th with the report that they could find no signs of Spaniards. After that the scare in New England began to subside.

Five men of the American side were killed on the 11th off Cardenas, on the north coast of Cuba. They were part of the crew of the torpedo boat Winslow. One was Worth Bagley, an ensign, who graduated from the naval academy at Annapolis upon the opening of hostilities; two others were John Daniels and John Meek, firemen; John Tunnel, cook, was the fourth, and John Varveres, oiler, the fifth. These casualties occurred in a battle lasting 35 minutes between the Winslow, the gunboat Wilmington, and the auxiliary tug Hudson, on the American side, and four gunboats supported by masked batteries on the side of the Spanish. The Winslow was making observations, when the Spanish opened fire and the Wilmington ordered her to attack the Spanish gunboats. This she did, immediately becoming the target for the Spanish fire, and soon receiving a shell which burst her boiler and disabled her steering gear. The firing continued from the shore for 20 minutes longer without doing further damage until, just as the Hudson was about to get the Winslow in tow, a shell exploded on the latter, instantly killing the men named above and wounding the lieutenant in command and four others. The Winslow was brought

into Key West, where the bodies of the killed, except that of Ensign Bagley, which was sent to his home in Raleigh, N. C., were buried. These were reported as the first deaths in the war on the American side.

The principal cables at Cienfuegos were cut by the Americans on the 11th, but the work cost the life of one United States marine who was killed instantly and of two more who were mortally wounded. It was done under the direction of the cruisers Nashville and Marblehead. Two of the cables ran from Cienfuegos to the West Indies, and a third, about which little is known, was local. The work was so hazardous that volunteers were called for, the officers being unwilling to order out any man. It had to be performed in open boats, close to the shore and under a terrific fire from the enemy. At first the volunteers were confused by the smokeless powder which the Spaniards used. As one account puts it: "There is something uncanny about hearing bullets all around you and seeing no smoke." Bullets fell in a storm about the men as they grappled for the cables, one of which they caught in the height of the fire and cut it. In a few minutes they had caught and cut another. But under the increasing fire, their own ammunition being almost exhausted, they were forced to withdraw before finding the third cable. The cables cut were the two running south and west; it was the local cable that was not found.

The first land fight of the war took place near Cabanas, in the province of Pinar del Rio. It was in connection with the attempt to land supplies for the insurgents from the Gussie, whose mission was noted on page 11 last week. Capt. Dorst, of Company E, First United States infantry, who commanded the expedition, landed his men at a point where ambushed Spaniards attacked them. A sharp fight resulted. Only one American was injured and he but slightly. At least one lieutenant and two privates of the enemy were killed. Couriers were safely landed and it is believed that they reached the insurgent camp, but owing to the strict and strong patrol which the Spanish had established, the insurgents could not come to the Gussie and receive the supplies intended for them. The expedition, therefore, was a failure. Capt. Dorst, reported that it might have been successful if the newspapers had not

given so much publicity to it before it started from Tampa. This put the Spanish on their guard and enabled them to patrol the coast strongly. The Gussie returned to Key West on the 15th, and soon after her return, newspaper correspondents were warned against publishing accounts of naval movements in advance.

Cable communication with Manila was supposed to have been reestablished on the 12th, with the Manila end of the cable on board an American ship. On that day a dispatch from Admiral Dewey, bearing that date, was given out at Washington, in which he said that the situation had but slightly changed since his report of the battle, and described the rescue by him of steel breach-loading rifles from the sunken Spanish ships, and his taking possession of stores from the arsenal. He was also credited with having destroyed the Argos, and as maintaining a strict blockade. The report as to the blockade, and as to the Manila cable being on board an American vessel, was confirmed on the 13th by a dispatch from Lloyd's agent at Manila to his principals in London, cabled on the 13th from Hong Kong. But a later dispatch from Dewey made it doubtful that the cable had been reestablished. This dispatch, instead of being sent from Manila by cable, had left Manila by dispatch boat on the 13th and been cabled from Hong Kong on the 15th, and it contained no reference to the Manila cable. It reported, however, that Admiral Dewey was retaining a blockade; that he believed the rebels were hemming in the city by land, though they had made no demonstration; that he could take Manila at any moment, but believed it would soon surrender for want of provisions; and that he had captured the Spanish gunboat Callao, which came into the harbor with colors flying from a cruise among the Philippines, in total ignorance of the Manila battle and even of the existence of war. Other dispatches received here on the 15th by cable from Hong Kong, which had left Manila on the 13th, showed that the Spanish admiral had not been assassinated by the insurgents as reported (see page 13 of last week's issue), but was at Manila recovering from the wounds he had received in the battle. To a German naval officer he explained his defeat by saying that the Spanish gunners had been without target practice for two years and could not fire

with accuracy; and he admitted that the total equipment of the Spanish vessels, including the shore batteries, made a greater fighting strength than that of the American squadron. It appears from the last named dispatches that the Spanish expected the battle to be fought off Corregidor island, at the entrance to the bay, and were so confident of victory that most of their ships were double manned so as to enable them to man the American ships which they expected to capture. To this overcrowding the great loss of life is attributed, the latest estimate of which by the Spanish at Manila is, killed 321, and injured 700. These figures, however, are regarded by the Americans at Manila as an underestimate.

A curious side light on the situation in the Philippines, as between the Spanish and the insurgents, is thrown by Isabelo Artacho, an insurgent leader, who has obtained an injunction at Hong Kong restraining Aguinaldo, another insurgent leader, from withdrawing from certain banks \$100,000 deposited to his credit by the Spanish government. The papers in the case relate a story of a bargain made by the insurgent leaders with the Spanish by which \$800,000 was to be paid to them to surrender. Half was paid to Aguinaldo and others at Manila, which was distributed among the insurgent officers. The other half was sent to Hong Kong for distribution among Aguinaldo and 35 other leaders. Artacho is entitled, according to the terms of the corrupt agreement, to a share of this amount, but Aguinaldo refuses to account. The surrender for which the bribe was paid took place on the 15th of April. As soon as the lawsuit was begun the banks were instructed by the Spanish government not to pay any of the insurgents.

Maj. Gen. Wesley Merritt left Washington on the 12th, on his way to the Philippines, to take command of the troops to be sent there. He is second in rank to Gen. Miles, and his second in command in the Philippines is to be Maj. Gen. E. C. Otis, who will leave San Francisco with the first body of troops to go. On the 16th Gen. Merritt was reported from New York in a newspaper interview as saying that he would not go to the Philippines with the force offered him. It was proposed, he said, to give him 15,000 men, only 1,000 of whom were regulars, and he would not go unless

he had at least 4,000 more regulars. He explained that he could not drill the volunteers sufficiently in time to make his force effective with less than 5,000 regulars. Attention to this interview was attracted in Washington and Gen. Merritt promptly telegraphed the secretary of war that the interview was in every way incorrect and unauthorized. At Washington it was announced on the 18th that Gen. Merritt would be given the 5,000 regulars that he wishes, and would in addition be given 25,000 volunteers, instead of 14,000.

The Charleston left Mare Island, near San Francisco, Cal., on the 18th, with ammunition for Dewey, but without troops; and Gen. Otis arrived in San Francisco on the same day and immediately began organizing the army for Manila.

All commanding officers at Tampa were ordered on the 12th by Gen. Wade, who is in command there, to place their forces upon a marching basis in readiness to go upon transports at a moment's notice.

Lieut. Andrew S. Rowan, who went on a mission from the department at Washington to the Cuban insurgents, as noted on page 8 of No. 4, and had left Nassau in the Bahamas on his return, as noted on page 11 last week, arrived at Key West on the 13th. He reported Bayamo, on the southern coast of Santiago de Cuba, as having been captured by the Cubans under Gen. Garcia and being now governed by them. It was here instead of in the mountains that he found Gen. Garcia's headquarters. Garcia's whole army he says is at the disposal of the United States. Bayamo was the only town besides Manzanillo and Santiago de Cuba, which the Spanish held in the east end of the island.

Juan Francisco Jova, commissioner from the insurgent Gen. Gomez to the United States government, arrived at Key West on the 17th. He reported an order issued May 1 by Gomez, calling upon all families driven into the towns by the reconcentration decrees, to return to their homes, and guaranteeing them insurgent protection; and he says that multitudes are taking advantage of the offer and actually receiving the protection promised.

The Oregon, the Marietta, and the Nichtheroy, now the Buffalo, left

Bahia, Brazil on the 11th, bound north; and on the 18th it was given out officially at Washington that they were now safe. Their whereabouts, however, were kept secret, though they were supposed to be either with Sampson's fleet or off Martinique.

A fire broke out on the 16th in the coal bunkers of the American auxiliary cruiser St. Paul, of which Capt. Sigsbee, who commanded the Maine, is in command. It was with difficulty, and only after nearly half a day's fighting the fire, that the vessel was saved.

The new American battleship Alabama was launched on the 18th at Cramps' shipyard, Philadelphia.

Throughout the war there has been a feeling that French public opinion and the French government are hostile to the United States. Color was given to the notion by the hostility of the more aristocratic of the French papers. At one time during the past week this feeling came near being put to the test diplomatically. The commander of one of our dispatch boats in the West Indies had complained that his cable notice to the department at Washington of the arrival of the Spanish fleet at Martinique was detained 24 hours, thus giving the Spaniards a chance to get away from Sampson. In consequence, it was rumored on the 13th that the administration was inclined to call France, to which nation Martinique belongs, to account; but the matter was met by the manager of the French cable at Port de France, with a denial that any dispatches for the United States were detained. In the same connection Jules Meline, president of the council and premier of France, gave out an interview on the 13th, in which he said that in his personal judgment the sympathies of Frenchmen could not be opposed to a nation "which sends her army and navy to convert an oppressed land into an independent republic, precisely as France sent her soldiers and sailors to fight for the United States in the war of independence." He added: "The royalists of France may like to hobnob with their friends over the border, but the recent elections show that republicanism has never been so strong in this country as it is to-day."

In Spain the ministry has resigned. At midnight on the 12th it was reported from Madrid that only the sec-

retary of the colonies, the foreign minister, the minister of marine and the minister of public works, had resigned; and on the 15th the report was enlarged so as to include all the members of the Spanish cabinet. It was then believed, however, that Sagasta would be asked to form a new cabinet. On the 16th this belief was verified. The queen regent did call upon Sagasta to form a new cabinet. The retiring cabinet represents the liberal party. It was formed last October, soon after the assassination of Canovas, the conservative premier. On the authority of a correspondent of the London Times, the resignation of the cabinet was due to a difference of opinion among the members as to whether to prosecute the war with the United States vigorously, or to seek a peaceful solution by invoking the friendly intervention of European powers. Unable to agree the cabinet resigned. The resignation took place on the 8th. Sagasta has since complied with the queen's request. His new cabinet is the same as the old one as to the ministry of war, of finance and of justice. Following is the personnel:

President of the council of ministers, Senor Praxedes Sagasta; minister of foreign affairs, Senor Leon y Castillo; minister of war, Lieut. Gen. Correa; minister of marine, Senor Aunon; minister of the colonies, Senor Romero Giron; minister of finance, Senor Lopez Puigcerver; minister of the interior, Senor T. R. Capdepon; minister of justice, Senor C. Groizard; minister of public instruction, Senor Gomazo.

In a speech at Birmingham on the 13th, Joseph Chamberlain, secretary of state for the colonies, referred to the United States as "a powerful and generous nation, speaking our language, bred of our race, and having interests identical with ours." This was preliminary to his saying: "I would go so far as to say that terrible as war may be, even war itself would be cheaply purchased if in a great and noble cause the stars and stripes and the Union Jack, should wave together over an Anglo-Saxon alliance." The sentiment was received with prolonged cheering, and is regarded in Europe as indicating a warlike alliance between the English speaking races against the rest of the civilized world.

Rioting was renewed on the 13th at Naples, Italy. The rioters tried to build barricades in the streets, and were fired upon and pursued by the

troops. This commotion caused a mutiny in the jail, where several prisoners were killed by the soldiery. People from Trieste, Italy, on the 13th, said that the rioting had nowhere abated, but that the government suppressed the news. News leaks out, however, of fresh conflicts between the peasants and the troops outside of Milan, and the universities at Naples, Bologna and Rome have been closed while newspapers are still suppressed.

William E. Gladstone, the "Grand old Man" of England, died at Hawarden May 19 at five o'clock in the morning. He had suffered for several weeks with a cancer back of the nose, which was the cause of his death. Mr. Gladstone was 89 years old. He entered parliament 66 years ago. In earlier life he belonged to the conservative party, but he left it in 1851 and acquired the affectionate soubriquet of "the Grand Old Man" as leader of the liberal party, a position which he occupied actually and virtually for more than 30 years.

IN CONGRESS.

Week ending May 18, 1898.

Senate.

On the 12th the senate passed the labor arbitration bill with amendments. Among the amendments was a provision forbidding the issue of injunctions compelling railway employes to continue in service against their will. Another bill passed on the 12th removed the disabilities imposed by the Fourteenth amendment to the constitution, upon participants in the rebellion.

On the same day the house war revenue bill was reported by the senate committee, which recommends the striking out of all provisions for issuing bonds and certificates of indebtedness, and proposes an issue of \$150,000,000 greenbacks, the coinage of the silver seignorage, and the taxation of corporations on gross receipts. The minority report recommends the retention of the bond feature, but would reduce the amount of bonds from \$500,000,000 to \$300,000,000. Minor alterations are proposed by both reports. Debate on the measure began on the 16th, there having been no session until then after the 12th, and was continued on the 17th and 18th.

House.

No important business of general interest was transacted in the house

after the 11th until the 17th, when a bill for an eight-hour day in government service and on government works was passed. Another labor measure was passed on the same day. It provides for the organization of a non-partisan commission to consider legislative problems affecting labor. The commission is to consist of 19 members—five from the house, five from the senate, and nine from different industries and employments, the latter to be appointed by the president.

The majority of the committee on foreign affairs reported on the 17th in favor of annexing Hawaii. Annexation was opposed by the minority of the committee and a protectorate recommended.

On the 18th a bill to prohibit at any time the making public of facts about fortifications was debated and recommended.

NEWS NOTES.

—The earl of Aberdeen has resigned as governor-general of Canada.

—Henry Rawlins, the supposed Spanish spy, whose arrest was recorded on page 12 last week, has committed suicide.

—The present French ministry claims a majority of 90 in the lower chamber as the result of the recent parliamentary elections.

—Last week at New York an exhibition was given of an invention for blowing up warships by means of electricity without wires.

—On the 17th a great fire broke out in Attleboro, Mass., destroying property to the value of more than \$1,000,000, including 16 jewelry factories.

—Michael J. Schack, the inspector of Chicago police who was noted for his connection with the Chicago anarchist cases, died at Chicago on the 18th, of pneumonia.

—Walter Wellman, the Arctic explorer, sailed on the 17th for England, whence he is to go to Norway, to make a start for the north pole about the 20th of June.

—At a mass meeting of the socialistic labor party of New York, held at Cooper Union on the 17th, the war with Spain and the talk of a possible English alliance were denounced.

On the 17th the supply of wheat at Minneapolis was the lowest ever known; yet the price at Chicago on the 18th had got down from \$1.85, where it was on the 10th, to \$1.50 and below.

—Cunningham, a town of 400 people, situated 53 miles west of Wichita, was totally destroyed by a tornado on the 17th. Three lives were lost. The loss would have been greater, but the storm was seen three minutes before it struck

and the people had time to get into their cellars.

—The people's party of Illinois excluded the fusionists from the state convention on the 17th and nominated a "middle of the road" ticket. Thereupon the fusionists made a new state organization.

—On the 14th Richard C. Gunning, a tax assessor of Chicago, was convicted of palpable omission of duty in having adjourned the board of review without first hearing the complaints of taxpayers.

—William J. Bryan was authorized on the 17th by the governor of Nebraska to organize the Third regiment of Nebraska volunteer infantry. Mustering offices have been established in several counties of the state.

—Charles W. Spalding, late president of the Globe savings bank of Chicago, who had been convicted of embezzling bonds of the state university of Illinois, was taken from Chicago on the 14th to the Illinois penitentiary.

—By the breaking on the 17th of the cable of an elevator in a Boston (Mass.) building in process of construction, when the elevator was at the eighth floor, seven laborers were instantly killed and three badly injured.

—A terrific cyclone swept eastern Iowa on the 18th in a northeasterly direction. It crossed the Mississippi at Preston and did great damage also in Illinois and Wisconsin. At this writing 23 deaths are reported.

The forward half of the revenue cutter *Graham*, belonging to the Ohio naval reserve, which had been cut in two to be carried through the lakes and the *St. Lawrence* to Montreal, went to the bottom near Ogdensburg on the 17th.

—The executive board of the United Mine Workers of America, of which M. D. Ratchford is president, calls for a boycott of West Virginia coal. The reason is the refusal of West Virginia coal operators to pay their miners fair wages.

—Remenyi, the violinist, died on the stage of the *Orpheum Vaudeville Theater*, San Francisco, on the 15th. In response to an encore he had just drawn a few notes from his violin, when he pitched forward almost over the footlights. He did not recover consciousness, and died in 20 minutes.

—The remark of a member during a speech on the 18th in the Canadian parliament, that while the people of Canada sympathize with the United States he would like to see it punished a little at first because it had not treated Canada decently, was received with emphatic cries of dissent, and the prime minister as well as other speakers on the floor deplored this expression of hostility.

—As a sequel to his discovery of the tomb of King *Thothmes III.* at Thebes,

M. Loret is reported by the London Times as having discovered and opened the tomb of Amenophis II., a king of the eighteenth dynasty, who reigned some 1,500 years B. C. The find is among the most interesting ever made in Egypt. None of the four bodies has been embalmed, but, owing to the dryness of the atmosphere, they are all in a most complete state of preservation; the features still remain perfect, and they have the appearance of being asleep. The tomb is a chamber of magnificent proportions in perfect preservation. The walls are entirely covered with paintings, the colors of which are as vivid as if laid on only yesterday.

MISCELLANY

DAYS.

Daughters of Time, the hypocritic Days,
Muffled and dumb like barefoot dervishes,
And marching single in an endless file,
Bring diadems and fagots in their hands.
To each they offer gifts after his will,
Bread, kingdoms, stars, and sky that holds them all.
I, in my pleached garden, watched the pomp,
Forgot my morning wishes, hastily
Took a few herbs and apples, and the Day
Turned and departed silent. I, too late,
Under her solemn fillet saw the scorn.
—Ralph Waldo Emerson.

POINTS ABOUT OUR LITTLE BROTHERS.

The bird has his share of curiosity, but he likes a few leaves between you and himself when he studies you. As you go up the road he meditates: "Well, here's an unhappy creature! He's lost all of his feathers, except a few around his mouth, and his skin fits him wretchedly. Guess he'll shed it by night, so we can work it over into nests. It's a queer fungus he has on his head. What is he doing with that shiny stick, and why does he point it at me? I don't like that look in his eye. I've seen it in a weasel that was robbing my nest, and a wildcat I met in the woods. I'd like to know—Horrors! I'm off! What a noise! He made it come out of the stick! Dust, too! And he threw something at me. I've lost two of my tail feathers. He needs them to put on his face, I suppose. His mate has picked off his own. We learn something every day, and now I know another kind of animal to keep away from." He has flown away. Listen: Deep in the wood he calls to his wife; one of the sweetest, most modest of notes. And you would kill

that little creature? You would violate his trust in you? You could kill a baby.

Look into this pool and watch the crab. Isn't he like a human being? You have seen men eat in just the way he is eating that mussel. He has opened it, somehow, and is turning it around and around, holding it off now and again to look at it, and you can almost see his studious scowl. How busy he is! How his claws work at the morsel as he squats on a block of peat, precisely like a gluttonous fellow in a tavern with his elbows on the table! Minnows line up before him, expecting crumbs. He cries: "Scat!" You don't hear him, but he makes a dash of two steps, and away they go.

How clean and orderly the insects are! They seem to need freedom from dust and dirt, in order to keep the delicacy of their senses. You have seen how choice they are of their antennae, for those "feelers" are half eyes to them; indeed, the snail has his eyes on the end of them. This ichneumon fly, on a wall, leans away backward when he takes a dry wash, in order that the antennae may clear the brick as he bends them downward. And if you "nag" a grub with a hair or straw, how often he develops temper—plain human temper—like that of a man struggling with the tin cuffs and collar of his Sunday shirts, or of a woman who finds that the man in the seat in front of her at the play persists in wearing his high hat during the performance.—Charles M. Skinner, in *The Outlook*.

SCIENTIFIC SOBRIETY.

Liquor has until recently played so important a role in warfare, to the horrors of which it has in no small measure contributed, that the fact of Sir Herbert Kitchener's recent victory at Atbara having been won by a force composed exclusively of total abstainers calls for serious consideration and attention. It is probably the first occasion that so brilliant a feat of arms has been achieved by a body of white troops who for months previously had not been permitted to touch a drop of any kind of stimulant whatsoever. For if not only "Tommy Atkins" of the line, but even his comrade, "Sandy" of the Highland regiments, whose name suggests whisky, have refrained from alcohol in any form whatsoever, and have restricted themselves to tea, lime juice, and Nile water, it cannot be attributed to any conscientious scruples on their part or to the sudden development of high-fledged principles on the score of drink, but solely to the establishment

of a new system by the British military authorities, which is exciting a good deal of interest on the part of the war departments of continental Europe, and which, in view of the conflict now in progress between this country and Spain, may likewise commend itself to Secretary Alger and Gen. Miles.

It seems that for some time, by orders of Field Marshal Lord Wolseley, the British commander-in-chief, careful and exhaustive experiments have been in progress with a view to ascertaining the relative effects of alcohol and of total abstinence upon the physical endurance and staying qualities of the troops. Advantage has been taken both of the annual maneuvers, as well as of these petty wars of which England has a few on hand in one part or another of the world almost all the time, to examine carefully the question. One regiment would be deprived of every drop of stimulant, while another belonging to the same brigade would be allowed to purchase as usual its malt liquors at the canteen, and a third, probably a Highland corps, would receive a sailor's ration of grog in the form of whisky. In each instance the experiment went to show that, whereas at first the corps which had received an allowance of grog surpassed the others in dash and in impetuosity of attack, yet that after the third or fourth day its members began to show notable signs of lassitude and a lack of spirit and endurance. The same manifestations, though in a minor and slower degree, were apparent in the regiments restricted to malt liquors, whereas the men who had been kept from every kind of stimulant increased in staying power, alertness and vigor every day.

The result of these experiments led the British war department to decide, not on the ground of principle, but solely for the sake of maintaining the powers of endurance of the troops now engaged in the Soudan campaign, not to permit a single drop of stimulant in camp save for hospital use. Spirits, wine and malt liquors have been barred from the officers' mess table as well as from the regimental canteen, and from generals in command down to the drummer boys and the camp followers liquid refreshments have been restricted to tea and oatmeal water.

When one remembers how devoted the Englishman is to his beer and the Scotchman to his "mountain dew," modern history abounding in the upsets of cabinets ill advised enough to attempt an increase of the tax on these stimulants, which are regarded not as luxuries, but as actual necessities of life, the boldness and likewise difficul-

ties of the innovation will be appreciated.

But the scheme has fulfilled all expectations. Thanks to total abstinence, the men have been able to make forced marches of the most extraordinary character across the burning desert and under a blazing sun, the heat of whose rays can only be appreciated by those who have lived under the equator.

The Soudan is famed for its deadly climate, which either kills or prematurely ages the majority of white folks who penetrate beyond its frontiers. Indeed, it has often been nicknamed, and with good cause, too, the "Man Eating Soudan," by reason of the number of white lives that it has consumed. Yet, in spite of this, there has never been a campaign where there has been so little sickness, where so few men have been compelled to fall out, even in the longest marches, and where the troops have been got into such magnificent physical and moral training that they would actually cover 30 miles of sand with empty water bottles, without slaking their thirst once from the beginning to the end of the march, at the close of which they would still find themselves sufficiently fresh and vigorous to win a hard-fought victory such as that of Atbara.

Although the British admiralty has not yet followed the example of the United States, which has long since abandoned the daily ration of grog to the men of its navy, and which prohibits the use of stimulants on board when at sea, yet orders have recently been issued to the commanders of all British men-of-war in commission that in lieu of the double rations of grog formerly served out to the crews when going into action, not a drop of alcoholic liquor, no matter whether spirit, wine, or malt, is to be allowed when there is any fighting to be done. In order to satisfy the thirst engendered by the heat, exertion, and smoke inseparable from a naval combat, supplies of oatmeal and water for drinking are arranged all over the ship.—Chicago Tribune.

THE PRESENT CONDITION OF THE PANAMA CANAL.

Extracts from an article on "The Trans-Isthmian Canal Problem," by Col. William Ludlow, U. S. A., published in Harper's Magazine for May.

The Panama project has claimed serious attention from the outset. With the exception of San Blas, it is the shortest (of the possible trans-isthmian routes); with the exception of Nicaragua, its summit elevation is the least; and the natural harbors at each end are capacious, and can be made to accommodate the heaviest class of vessels.

By the construction of the Panama railroad it gained the additional important advantages of rail transportation throughout its length, and of established lines of communication with foreign centers by sea from both ends.

The principal drawbacks are the heavy rainfall—10 to 12 feet at Colon—the heavy floods of the Chagres and the necessity of controlling them, and the evil repute of the vicinity for unhealthfulness. To these another formidable obstacle is added in the treacherous nature of the materials through which the cut has to be made, but this was not known until the excavations were actually begun in 1884.

The most moderate estimates that could be made of the cost of the work discouraged undertaking it, until the brilliant success of the Suez canal, under De Lesseps, concentrated French interest on the project, and stimulated the expectation of a still more important conquest and even greater pecuniary rewards.

It is needless to follow in detail the history of this gigantic enterprise, that, at the time of its collapse in 1888, after five years of active prosecution, had absorbed a total expenditure of \$300,000,000, with the work less than one-third done, the worst of it yet to do, and none of the serious problems, such as the control of the Chagres and the practicability of making the deep cut, even approximately solved.

The isthmus was an orgy of reckless expenditure, and the millions poured in from Europe disappeared as if by magic, until at last the stream ran dry and wholesale ruin ensued.

The coup de grace was delivered by the Culebra mountain, through which the huge cut, ultimately intended to be 300 feet in depth, was in progress. The heterogeneous mass, whose unstable and treacherous constitution had not been investigated before attacking it, included clays of various kinds, some of them extremely plastic, and when the excavation had reached a comparatively early stage the south slope slipped gently forward and paralyzed the undertaking by a silent demonstration of its futility.

The fundamental error made by De Lesseps and his associates was in basing the Panama plans and estimates upon the most favorable results obtained in the Suez constructions, without making adequate or any allowance for the radically different conditions. Suez was merely 100 miles of level digging through sand, in a region where the rainfall is but an inch or two in a year, the climate comparatively cool and healthful, a large supply of native la-

bor, and the mechanical resources of Europe at no great distance; but, notwithstanding these advantages, the work, planned on an estimate of \$40,000,000, cost \$110,000,000, on a reduced cross-section, before it was opened.

The physical conditions on the isthmus are the precise reverse of those in Egypt, and the cost of every item of work was enormously greater. A material increase was inevitable, even with the most careful and economic management. The scarcity and diminished effectiveness of labor, losses from disease and sickness, the interference and burden of the heavy rainfall, would at least have doubled the cost, and to these drawbacks were added political disturbances and local acts of violence, with a home administration of unparalleled extravagance.

The old company left behind it assets that have been reasonably computed as amounting to \$60,000,000 or \$70,000,000, including the ownership of the Panama railroad, and estimating the actual value of the work done and the immense plant collected—much of it in readiness to use.

With this as a basis, and with a working capital of \$12,000,000 or \$15,000,000 restitution money recovered from bankers, contractors and others who had unlawfully obtained possession of it, a new company, with a total change of personnel and methods, has been for three years pursuing an extended system of engineering research into the particulars affecting construction and cost—boring, gauging, leveling, experimenting and computing—with the purpose of effecting a thorough study and making final plans and estimates before again submitting the project to public consideration. At the same time a considerable amount of actual work has been done, as set forth in the annual printed reports, and a force of between 3,000 and 4,000 men been kept at work, mainly at the Culebra pass, but with preparations for extending the work to other points.

Pending the completion of the studies in the field, an engineering commission has been formed, to whom the finished plans and estimates are to be submitted for consideration and report; and if this commission, which, it may be stated, includes a distinguished American engineer, Gen. Abbott, of the United States army, shall confirm the results of the latest examinations and find the proposed constructions practicable and adequate, and the estimates sufficient, the project is to be made public and endeavor made to secure the financial aid to carry the enterprise to a conclusion.

The reports state that this is to be done during the present year.

A LITTLE REPUBLIC TO BE EXPECTED.

It was not until 1841 that Costa Rica made any pretensions to independent sovereignty. Since then she has enjoyed almost continuously the blessings of peace. For the last thirty years she has not suffered the shock of a pronunciamento; and her presidents have been elected by ballot under constitutional regulations. She has never interfered in the affairs of her neighbors, although her good offices have often been exercised in the settlement of their differences. It was through her aid that Walker and his fellow filibusterers were overcome and driven from Nicaragua; and, although there have been frequent misunderstandings, she has never engaged in a war. It is also remarkable that although the percentage of foreigners among her population is larger than that of any of the neighboring states, no claim has ever been presented to Costa Rica for damages or injury caused by the arbitrary acts of her authority against a citizen of another nation. Elisee Reclus, the famous savant, in his "Geographie Universelle," calls Costa Rica "a model republic;" and in many respects she sets an example worthy to be followed by the other Latin-American states.

Costa Rica suffers from a scanty population; for, although it has increased 50 per cent. in 15 years, the total does not exceed 300,000. But, next to Uruguay, the little country has the largest amount of foreign commerce per capita of any of the American states. In the United States, according to recent calculations, foreign trade averages \$26.52 per capita; Costa Rica shows an average of \$68.66.

Coffee is the chief product of the country, Costa Rica having been the first of the Central American states to develop its culture. A large quantity of fruit is shipped to the United States, with which a weekly steamship connection exists. Most of the coffee goes to Europe; not more than one-third of it to the United States. The greater part of Costa Rica's imported goods come from England, France and Germany. This is chiefly due to the fact that her importing and exporting merchants are Europeans, and exchange their invoices for bills of lading for coffee exported to the European market. Recently, however, quite a number of Americans have settled in Costa Rica, and the relations between the two countries will thereby be much benefited.

The educational system of Costa Rica is more extensive and better sustained than that of any other of the Central American republics. The primary schools are free, and are supported by the government under a system similar to that of the United States. A compulsory education law is in force, except in the very sparsely settled districts, where its operation would be a hardship to the people. The reports of the bureau of education at Washington show that there is a larger percentage of the population attending school in Costa Rica than in any other American country except Uruguay, and that the number and improvement of the schools have kept pace with the advancement of the country in other respects. In 1886 there were 260 primary and secondary schools, with an average attendance of 20,000 pupils. In 1897 there were 353 schools, with an average attendance of over 30,000. There were colleges for both sexes, as well as a national university supported by the government, with faculties of law, medicine, surgery and engineering, which is attended also by students from the neighboring states. The government pays for the tuition of a certain number of students at foreign universities as an encouragement and reward for those who distinguish themselves in their studies, and to provide instructors for its own schools in branches of science and art that are undeveloped in Costa Rica.

Costa Rica was the first of the Central American states to extend the telegraph and the telephone to all its centers of population, and to introduce electric lights, underground sewers and other modern improvements into its cities. The people are progressive and proud of their achievements. They love peace and order; and, although there are occasional political disturbances, it is more difficult to start a revolution in Costa Rica than in any other country between the Mexican border and the isthmus. Property is safe; the presence of foreigners is welcome, and the government offers liberal inducements for the investment of capital and the settlement of its public lands.

The resources of the country are similar to those of Nicaragua. There is an abundance of timber and mineral deposits; the valleys have a deep and fertile soil for agriculture; while on the northern frontier is a large area of grazing land capable of sustaining millions of cattle. The water power is abundant and convenient, and by and by Costa Rica will increase her wealth by the introduction of mechanical industries; but labor is so scarce and the

cultivation of the soil so profitable that thus far these opportunities have been neglected.

With the exception of the United States, Costa Rica is the only country in America that maintains the gold standard of money; and it has an excellent foreign credit, which has been secured by the punctilious observance of its obligations, the prompt payment of its interest and the honest and economical management of its finances. Rafael Yglesias, the president, has just been elected to a second term, according to the custom of the country; and if he continues the wise administration of affairs that hitherto has marked his career the immediate future promises rapid advancement for the little republic.—Wm. Eleroy Curtis, in *The Forum*.

WOMAN'S SUFFRAGE IN NEW ZEALAND.

In New Zealand women have the right to vote for members of the legislature. The law extending suffrage to them went into effect in 1893. The population of Christ church (census of 1891) was 31,454. The first election under the law was held in November, 1893. Number of men who voted, 6,313; number of women who voted, 5,989. These figures ought to convince us that women are not as indifferent about politics as some people would have us believe. In New Zealand, as a whole, the estimated adult female population was 139,915; of these, 109,461 qualified and registered their names on the rolls—78.23 per cent. of the whole. Of these, 90,290, went to the polls and voted. Do men ever turn out better than that in America or elsewhere?

Here is a remark to the other sex's credit, too—I take it from the official report: "A feature of the election was the orderliness and sobriety of the people. Women were in no way molested."

In the New Zealand law occurs this: "The word person whenever it occurs throughout the act includes women." That is promotion, you see. By that enlargement of the word, the matron with the garnered wisdom and experience of 50 years becomes at one jump the political equal of her callow kid of 21.—Mark Twain, in *More Tramps Abroad*.

A PROPHECY FOR FREE CUBA.

Mr. Charles F. Lummis, who has made careful investigations of conditions in Central America and Mexico, has recently written, and the Harpers have published, "The Awakening of a Nation; Mexico of To-Day." Even to most of those who have had the utmost confidence in the ability of the

mixed races of Spanish America to govern themselves, and to create out of the ruins of Spanish tyrannies self-controlled, self-respecting nations, some of Mr. Lummis' statements must be as surprising as they are gratifying. Mr. Lummis says:

To-day Mexico is—and I say it deliberately—the safest country in America. Life, property, human rights are more secure than even with us.

From a state of anarchy, tempered by brigandage—wherein it was better to be president than to be right, and better to be a revolutionist than either—she has graduated to be the most compact and unified nation in the new world. She has acquired not only a government which governs, but one which knows how to govern—and contemporaneously a people which has learned how to be ruled.

• Two Scotchmen out hunting discovered a couple of bear cubs in a cave at the end of a passage formed by a cleft in a mountain side. In order to prevent a surprise by the elder bruin, who was out on a foraging expedition and liable to return at any moment, Sandy stationed himself at the passage entrance, where the bear could not pass except between his legs, while his friend hurried to get the cubs fixed so as to carry them away conveniently. He had hardly got to work when he heard a scuffle and an angry growl in the passage. "What's the matter, Sandy?" he cried, in alarm. Sandy replied, apparently under a very severe strain: "Ye'll ken if the tail breks." So will the robbers of the people "ken if the tail breks."—E. Corkill, in *The New Earth*.

Good roads are the means through which can be done in rural districts much that settlements may try to do. Open the country neighborhoods to the visits of mail carriers and to the free exit and interchange of produce and personality, and the isolation which makes the village lad flee to the city and shuts the farmer in to his own thoughts and his family away from human company, and the problem of the country will be well on the way to solution.—Chicago Commons.

The president and his administration, according to the Tribune, have been giving some advice to the press which we sincerely hope it will take to heart. They acknowledge the successes of American journalism, but remark, en passant, as it were, "that self-laudation and exaggeration detract from rather than add to the brilliancy of these achievements." These observations have a wider reach than the president gives them. In boasting of themselves and their exploits the journals cannot help

boasting of everything American under the sun, so that in reading their "war articles" we sometimes feel as if we were seated around an Indian council fire listening to Sitting Bull or Hole-in-the-Day telling of his exploits, telling what a "big Injun" he is, what a man for taking scalps and making enemies run.—New York Evening Post.

The Singapore Free Press says that the people of the Philippines, though they are little known, are intelligent to a degree, and are claimed to be in advance of the Japanese and to be quite capable of guiding their own destinies.

Occasional Customer—"Luigi, I want a pair of shoestrings." Street Merchant—"No shoestring! Flagga! Fi' cent. Remember ze Maine!"—Chicago Tribune.

Wife (to her husband)—"I say, my dear, how badly the tailor has put this button on your waistcoat. This is the fifth time I have had to sew it on again."—Tit-Bits.

Who is the infidel? 'Tis he
Who puts a bound on what may be;
Who fears time's upward slope shall
end

On some far summit—and descend;
Who trembles lest the long-borne light,
Far-seen, shall lose itself in night;
Who doubts that life shall rise from
death

When the old order perisheth;
That all God's spaces may be cross't
And not a single soul be lost—
Who doubts all this, who'er he be,
This is the infidel. 'Tis he.
—Sam Walter Foss, in *The Arena*.

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

Single copies, five cents each.

Published weekly by

THE PUBLIC PUBLISHING COMPANY, Room 822,
Schiller Building, Chicago, Ill.

Post-office address:

THE PUBLIC, Box 687, Chicago, Ill.

SUBSCRIPTION AGENTS:

Western Reserve, Ohio, OTTO PFISTER, 316
American Trust Building (Telephone, Main 1069),
Cleveland, Ohio.

Omaha and Council Bluffs, Mrs. C. D. JAMES,
2208 Douglas Street, Omaha, Neb.