

The Public

Dr. H. J. Woodhouse
Nov 3-00 Box 511

Third Year.

CHICAGO, SATURDAY, MAY 12, 1900.

Number 110.

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.

The large and long continued embezzlement of funds in the American postal service in Cuba may well make the Cubans smile in derision. The Filipinos, too, might smile when they hear of it, if American destruction of their homes and wholesale slaughter of their loved ones had not taken all sense of humor out of them. Well may these "weaker peoples," whom we are setting out to civilize, retort: "Physician, heal thyself!"

"The pursuit of riches is not a wrong thing," said John D. Rockefeller to a New York bible class recently. That depends, we should say, altogether upon the method of pursuit. To pursue riches by giving to the world continually of your labor an equivalent for the labor you continually get, is certainly not a bad thing. But to pursue it by acquiring legal power to levy tribute upon your fellows cannot be a good thing either for them or for you.

When American free traders sought a peaceful alliance with England through the channels of civilizing trade, nothing was more obnoxious to the tribe of McKinley than the British flag; but now that an alliance for wars of conquest is on the diplomatic stocks, the British flag has become with the tribe of McKinley almost as dear a fetich as "Old Glory."

Virginia democrats are preparing to disfranchise the negroes of that state by some such subterfuge as that whereby other southern states have done it. This may be good politics, which we doubt; but it is certainly

bad democracy. And that ought to be enough with democrats to kill it. Unfortunately, however, it is much easier in some parts of the country to call one's self a democrat than to stand by democratic principles.

The charitably disposed of this country who wish to relieve famine victims in India are authoritatively advised not to send foodstuffs, but to send bankers' drafts. There is plenty of native grain in India, they are told; the real trouble being that the suffering people are too poor to buy. So it seems that this is not a famine at all. It is a manifestation of poverty. There is no dearth, but indigence. The masses get so small a share of what they produce that they suffer from want in the midst of plenty of their own making.

A local politician of New York calls attention to a remarkable change in this generation in the methods of practical politics. It relates to the raising of campaign funds. "Time was," he says, "when office holders contributed, but a reform has stopped that and has given us in its place something worse." This worse thing that has superseded what civil service reform displaced is the big corporation. It supplies party funds now, and takes its pay in party influence upon legislation and administration.

Senator Tillman, if the papers represent him correctly, must have brought dismay to the camp of the armor plate parasites. He is understood to have discovered that the American government is in possession of a projectile which is demonstrably capable of piercing the best plate known. And inasmuch as this projectile must sooner or later come to the knowledge of other nations, he doubts the wisdom of making any

more contracts for the purchase of high-priced armor plate. Accordingly he has taken steps to have the senate consider the matter in connection with the naval appropriation bill.

Andrew Carnegie's optimistic pro-trust article in the May "Century" is an example of the manner in which so many pretentious discussions of trusts ignore or slur over the vital point. The pro-trust side of the question by no means furnishes all the examples. Our own chosen candidate for president is not without frailty in this respect. But Mr. Carnegie knows better. He shows this when in his article he says that "few trusts have a monopoly through patents or through the supply of raw material or of territory." That sentence recognizes the kind of power that makes evil trusts possible. It is monopoly of patents, monopoly of territory through control of transportation routes, and monopoly of raw materials through ownership of land. But Mr. Carnegie makes light of this deadly power because few trusts possess it, and then goes on to sing the praises of organization and the economies it produces. Of course organization produces economies. Of course it is beneficial, if merely organization. But if it is organization not only for production but also for the combination of such monopolies as Mr. Carnegie indicates, then it means public ruin. Nor is the danger any less because only a few trusts possess these underlying monopolies. The important consideration is not how many trusts possess them, but to what extent they are possessed. If one trust monopolized all patents, all transportation routes, and all land, it would be the absolute master of the world. Yet Mr. Carnegie could still say that few trusts control monopolies. Indeed, he could improve upon himself,

and jubilantly exclaim that whereas once monopolies were controlled by a few trusts, they are now controlled by only one! The portentous thing about this matter is that fundamental monopolies are in fact steadily coming within the control of fewer and fewer trusts. Conditions have even now reached a point where trusts themselves, with all their advantages of organization, must go to the wall unless they are either among the few that possess or share in fundamental monopolies.

Examples of revolt by party men against the dictation of party leaders and caucuses for reasons of high principle are too rare to be passed with scant notice. Especially rare are such instances in the republican party as now organized. Hoar of Massachusetts and Mason of Illinois are great exceptions. Another name has been recently added, that of Wellington of Maryland. A member of the republican party from boyhood, a representative man in the party from early manhood, and the acknowledged head of the party in his state, to him a revolt against the authority of its national leaders could have been no light matter. So far as he or anyone else can now well judge it involves the termination of his long career in politics. But the reasons he gave in his senate speech for breaking away, voting against his party associates and turning the party in his state over to other leadership, mark him as one of the few men in public life who have the courage to bring new questions to the test of ideals instead of caucuses.

Senator Wellington's crisis was on the occasion of the Puerto Rican debate. Explaining his position, he said:

My ideas of the principles upon which our government is founded; my desire to preserve from blot or stain the national escutcheon; my remembrance of the solemn and oft-repeated promise of the American authority to the inhabitants of Puerto Rico; my devotion to the constitution as I understand it; my purpose to act justly, benevolently, and, if need

be, charitably toward my new fellow-citizens, each and all rebel and rise up in outraged indignation at the attempted injustice of this bill. I cannot support it. I refuse to give my adherence to it. No influence shall persuade, no authority shall control, me or cause me to favor it. I oppose it with all the vehemence of a positive nature. I have been a republican ever since I can remember. The years of my youth and manhood have been dedicated to the service of the republican party. In company with a determined band of fraters of my political faith I labored unceasingly until my beloved state was redeemed from democratic domination. I gave the best years of my life to this endeavor, which was crowned with superb success. I have loved and served the republican party because I believed in the warp and woof of its victory were bound up the advancement and progress of my country, the elevation of men, and the perpetuity of self-government. But, sir, I am not charmed by a name when the principle be lost. The republican party by its name cannot lead me against my conviction to do that which I believe to be unrighteous and unjust. I will not follow upon the new adventure which would compel me to discard at the first step the noble sentiment which I have ever held to be the strongest reason for the existence of the republican party. Sir, I oppose this bill for the reason that it seeks to impose a tax upon citizens of the United States in Puerto Rico in defiance of the principles upon which our government is founded.

It is not altogether clear that the admirable opinion of Judge Lochren, of the United States circuit court at St. Paul, in the case of the imprisoned Puerto Rican who murdered an American soldier in that island, is more than what the lawyers would call obiter dictum. As the trial had taken place before a military tribunal after peace had been declared, it was therefore claimed in behalf of the prisoner that his conviction was illegal. But Judge Lochren holds that military law was at the time the sole authority in Puerto Rico, and consequently that the conviction by a military court was legal. It would appear that this decision might rest quite as securely upon the imperialistic theory as upon any other. But Judge Lochren rests it in his opinion upon the theory that Puerto Rico became with the ratification of the treaty of cession a part of American territory and that its in-

habitants fell within the full protection of the American constitution. Taking the opinion and the decision together, it looks very much as if the distinguished judge had patterned after that illustrious judicial example which before our civil war gave "the law to the north and the nigger to the south." For while he says that—

all the provisions of the constitution in respect to personal and property rights, including the right to trial by jury in criminal prosecutions, became at once, when the cession was completed, a part of the supreme law of the land—

of Puerto Rico, he nevertheless sends the prisoner back to prison, although there had certainly been no trial by jury in that case. There is something about the decision which suggests the possibility of making it an authority for trying Filipinos by American military commission.

Whether the foregoing is a fair interpretation of Judge Lochren's decision or not, a clear note is sounded by his opinion. After referring to the fact that the men who founded our general government established it upon the asserted theory that all just powers of government come from the consent of the governed, he deals this blow at Mr. McKinley's colonial policy:

It will be, indeed, marvelous if it is made to appear that these men who then founded our national government so constructed it that it is capable of ruling with unlimited power a subject people who have neither guaranties to protect them nor any voice in the government. This is foreign absolutism—the worst form of tyranny.

He goes on in the same strain:

The argument much repeated that if the national government of the United States has not the power to deal with these new territories untrammelled by the constitution its power is less than that possessed by other governments of the civilized world is admitted. It proves nothing. The national government of the United States is one of limited powers. . . . The novel doctrine that the power of congress to govern territory ceded to the United States may be confessed by a foreign sovereign, by and through the terms of the treaty of cession, and that the general government can exercise powers thus granted by a foreign sovereign

independent of and in disregard of the constitution, until congress, mayhap in the future, shall by its enactment see fit to extend the constitution over the territory, is contrary to the holding of the supreme court of the United States, to the effect that the general government is one of enumerated powers and can claim and exercise no power not granted to it by the constitution, either expressly or by necessary implication.

It must be held that upon the cession by Spain to the United States of the island of Puerto Rico that island became a part of the dominion of the United States, as much so as is Arizona or Minnesota, and that the constitution of the United States, *ex proprio vigore*, at once extended over that island, and that this extension of the constitution gave congress, whose every power must come from that instrument, the authority to legislate in respect to that island as a part of the United States territory. It follows that all the provisions of the constitution in respect to personal and property rights, including the right to trial by jury in criminal prosecutions, became at once, when the cession was completed, a part of the supreme law of the land.

Bishop Potter gives the imperialists cold comfort when he explains his reason for coming to the support of their side of the Philippine controversy. By way of illustrating his change of front he says:

If my son should come to me and say he proposed to marry a young creole woman with seven children I would call him a great ass. But if he came to me and said he had already contracted such a marriage I would still try to sustain intimate relations with him. What we have done has established just such a relation as that.

But the bishop is mistaken. We have really established none. The relation we have tried to establish might be better explained by a slight variation of the bishop's illustration. Suppose the creole woman and all her seven children had been fighting the bishop's son, tooth-and-toe-nail, to prevent the marriage, and that he had gone to killing off the children so as to get at the woman and marry her for the sake of her ear-rings. Would Bishop Potter in such case try to sustain amicable relations with his son, and encourage him to kill off the rest of the insurrectionary children so as to consummate the abhorrent marriage?

Would he regard the matter at this stage as an academic question? But that is about the stage the American nation has reached in its rape of the Philippines.

To get home news in its purity one must sometimes go away from home. For instance, while the administration is trying to carry out with the British ministry what Chamberlain called "an understanding between statesmen," doing it in the face of a presidential election, an American must go to the English papers to learn what the administration is really up to. His own papers are not in the confidence of the administration regarding this "understanding between statesmen." Thus the London Times was informed by its New York correspondent more than six weeks ago, what American papers are only now beginning to suspect, that the republican national convention will adopt a resolution of sympathy with the Boers. But it isn't to mean anything. We quote from the letter of this correspondent in the weekly London Times of April 20, his letter being dated April 15. After explaining that the German vote is becoming hostile to McKinley on account of his coldness toward the Boers, the correspondent goes on to say that this explains—

the present intention to allow the republican national convention to adopt a resolution of sympathy with the Boers. Said one of their chief managers: "The best friends of England should applaud us most heartily. We cannot afford to lose votes or risk states. . . . Our resolution will probably embody Mr. Hay's letter of mediation. We take our stand on that. We do not believe it gave offense to the English government. We believe they were grateful to us for offering them the opportunity to say 'hands off' to Europe. We believe German-Americans will finally understand we did all we could. Do you think it would benefit England if, by suppressing a platonic declaration of Boer sentiment which can have no practical effect on our relations with England, we lost the election and she had Mr. Bryan instead of Mr. McKinley, to deal with during the next four years?" That indicates fairly enough the prevailing tone among the foremost republicans in Washington. It is a tone of political cynicism, softened at the white house

into political opportunism. Such hostility to England as comes to the surface is political, and the expression of it has a purely political, purely domestic object. None will be heard from the president, and when it is heard from his supporters it is intended for home consumption. The more criticism it provokes in England the better for all concerned.

There you have the "understanding between statesmen" in one phase of it. The Hanna-McKinley combine is to make believe that it sympathizes with the Boers, and the British jingo combine is to make believe to criticize the Hanna-McKinley make-believe. In that way the German vote is to be fooled into voting for the British jingo candidate for American president.

And now it is the paper market that is suffering from "overproduction." A few weeks ago we were told that the high prices of paper were caused by a demand which defied supply. All the mills were working to their full capacity. And so on. This was the song of the expert, he who turned a deaf ear to the suggestion that prices were being arbitrarily raised by trusts. But the effect of these arbitrary proceedings is now disclosed. Diminished demand has succeeded exorbitant prices, and shut-downs come in turn.

But what remedy for such obviously remediable evils can be looked for when so few of the victims dare speak out plainly for what they know ought to be done. Here is a report of a delegation from 22,000 newspapers, which has presented a memorial to congress asking relief from high prices of paper. But it advocated no particular legislation. Then why did it memorialize? There might fairly be a suspicion that it was after a subsidy. Subsidies seem to be the universal refuge from financial ills. Bankers have them; ship owners and shipbuilders expect to get them; why should newspaper publishers be without them? A thousand to one this combination, too, will be found asking for subsidies before it boldly demands the repeal of the tariff on

paper and paper materials. That tariff is the real strength of the paper trust, and its repeal would at once put the manufacture of paper upon a competitive basis. But this remedy would be a slap in the face of that old fetish, protection. Therefore the American Publishers' association, while asking congress for relief from high prices of paper, suggests no method.

How the federal treasury is to be benefited by the process of refunding the national debt with two per cent. 30-year bonds is not quite obvious. With money piling up in the treasury under the stimulation of war taxes, it would be much more profitable to pay off the bonds as they fall due than to fund them at two per cent. It may be that the four per cent. bonds could not be paid off in 1907, as they amount to \$500,000,000. But consider the five per cents. due in 1904 and the three per cents. due in 1908. The former amount to only \$75,000,000 and the latter to \$200,000,000. To pay full interest on these until maturity and then pay them off altogether would have saved the treasury something like \$120,000,000, as compared with this two per cent. refunding law. Here is the calculation:

| | |
|---|--------------|
| 5 per cent. on \$75,000,000 due in '04... | \$15,000,000 |
| 3 per cent. on \$200,000,000 due in '08.. | 48,000,000 |
| Total interest | \$63,000,000 |

That is the amount, \$63,000,000, that it would be necessary to pay in interest if these bonds were to be redeemed as they fall due, which could be done with the amount of surplus now in the treasury. But under the new law the amount necessary to be paid in bonuses and interest runs up to \$183,926,525, thus:

| | |
|--|---------------|
| Bonus on bonds of 1904..... | \$7,556,325 |
| Interest for 30 years on substituted 2 per cent. bonds | 45,000,000 |
| Bonus on bonds of 1908..... | 11,370,200 |
| Interest for 30 years on substituted 2 per cent. bonds | 120,000,000 |
| Total bonuses and interest..... | \$183,926,525 |
| Deduct interest on old bonds as shown above | 63,000,000 |
| bonds as shown above..... | 63,000,000 |

Net amount in bonuses and interest donated to bondholders...\$120,926,525

So much for the bonds that might easily be redeemed with the treasury surplus as they fall due. They are to

be extended 30 years at a loss to the government of more than \$120,000,000.

Now consider the bonds that fall due in 1907, which, as they amount to \$500,000,000, might not be easily redeemed at maturity. The total bonus required to refund them would amount to \$58,382,500. Then the interest for 30 years at two per cent. on the bonds substituted for them would come to \$300,000,000. Interest and bonus together would consequently amount to \$358,382,500. But it was not necessary to refund for 30 years. The sale of our three per cent. ten-year war bonds, in 1898, showed that a three per cent. bond could be readily placed. If, then, the bonds that could not be redeemed by 1907 had been refunded at three per cent. for ten years, by which time they and all the others could well enough be cared for if present taxes are to be maintained, the whole debt could have been discharged in a decade at an interest cost of \$150,000,000, thus effecting a saving over the plan of the gold standard law of \$208,000,000. As it is, increased burdens have been created and the debt has been extended for 30 years. Is it unreasonable to suppose that such was the intention?

"I maintain," says Dr. Julia Holmes Smith, of Chicago, in a paper read before the Illinois Homeopathic Medical association, "that 999 out of every 1,000 mothers are not fit to bring up their children from the day the little ones are born." This is a sweeping assertion. But Dr. Smith explains that her figures "are based on observations made among only two classes of people—the two extremes of social life." By these extremes she means definitely "the society woman who dawdles from the time she rises until she goes to the ball, and the working woman who spends her days in the factory or shop; both exhaust their vitality, and although they may possess all the instincts of motherhood they are not able to do their duty to the child." Dr. Smith

here emphasizes a truth which is too easily overlooked. She shows in a startling way that in a disordered social life, one in which the overwork of one class goes to enervate with luxury the idle of another, both classes are degraded. Excessive work and excessive idleness, the complementary evils of social disorder, work together to produce social death. It is a tremendous object lesson for justice.

THE GORED OX.

Lord Salisbury's speech at the annual meeting of the Primrose league of British jingoism indicates that the British ministry is nervous. Either that, or Salisbury aims to intensify the martial spirit of England in the interest of further conquest. It is more likely that the ministry is nervous. A ministry that kicks up a little 30-day war, which has already extended itself out to seven months and drawn 200,000 men into the field to fight 50,000, cannot feel altogether comfortable in face of the traditional fear of a possible invasion of England.

At any rate, Lord Salisbury in his speech deplored this possibility with unusual earnestness. But for that matter the whole English-speaking world deplores it. An invasion of England would strike horror to the hearts of us all.

Yet what is the difference between an invasion of England by a stronger power, and the invasion of the Transvaal by England? It is only in the point of view.

The invaders would not be horrified. They would regard it as patriotic, and eloquently describe it as an obligation they owe their civilization. Their Kiplings might lift it even into the regions of the spiritual by singing, for example, the "Burden of the Slav." And who shall say that they would be wrong? The Anglo Saxon jingo himself is doing his best to destroy all moral tests. If the British may righteously invade the homes of other peoples to extend British civilization, why may not other peoples—the Latins, the Slavs, or the Turks—if they get the military power—righteously invade England to extend their civilization?

Of course we of English traditions

can feel that it would be disastrous and unrighteous. The man who gets hit can always realize his assailant's wickedness and bad judgment. But if the jingo is right in his theory that it is his duty to impose our superior civilization by force of arms upon reluctant weaker peoples, then by what standard shall the impartial judge decide that any people with adequate martial power, who think their civilization superior, may not rightfully impose it by force of arms upon us?

ANNEXATION OF CUBA.

In 1858 a proposition to buy Cuba for \$30,000,000 was discussed in the United States senate, but was withdrawn after debate. Referring to the same idea over 40 years later, ex-Gov. William J. Stone, of Missouri, prominent in the national councils of the democratic party, said in a speech at Peoria January 8, 1900:

As far back as 1897, nearly a year before the declaration of war against Spain, I declared in public speech that war between the countries, then imminent, was inevitable at an early day, and said I believed that when war did come we should take by force what we tried to buy with money 40 years before.

We are doubtless to infer from this that in 1897 Mr. Stone was in favor of taking Cuba by conquest, just as we have been trying for more than a year to take the Philippine islands. This is the logical and unavoidable inference. And there is no little danger that the democratic platform at Kansas City may be made to favor Cuban "annexation," which would mean nothing less than Cuban conquest.

Now, if Philippine conquest is wrong, Cuban conquest cannot be right. But if Cuban conquest was right in 1897, it cannot be wrong in 1900. Why, then, does not Mr. Stone favor Cuban conquest to-day? No doubt, because of the resolution of congress. But it may occur to many, that one whose resistless eloquence can sweep away the declaration of independence should not stand abashed before a pitiful little resolution of congress. There is some question, moreover, as to whether the Cubans derive their natural rights from the resolution of congress. Who gave

to mankind the right of self-government, anyway? Did it come from the American congress? Where did the Americans obtain this right? Mr. Stone, being a popular and forceful orator, should be able to give sense to jargon, demonstration to absurdity, and consistency to nonsense; but can he tell us where any nation gets the right to arbitrarily force its laws upon another?

Even conceding for the moment that all our former acquisitions of territory were expressly based upon conquest, or the right of purchase of human beings with or without their own consent, that fact could not justify similar wrong-doing to-day. If there is such a thing as the right of self-government, it is a natural right. Such rights exist irrespective of treaty. Treaties may recognize or ignore them, but they cannot create them. God alone can do that. The fact that precedents are established for or against these rights, does not affect their validity in the least. A right to commit injustice cannot be acquired by prescription, nor fortified by precedent. The statutes of limitation do not run against human liberty.

Some democrats favor the annexation of Cuba because they say it is democratic doctrine. And what, pray, is democratic doctrine? Do we get it solely from party platforms? If so, where was democratic doctrine before platforms were written? Jefferson managed to find some of this doctrine before he had the platform to draw from. Where did he get it? There was but one source from which he could have obtained it, and that is still the source of democratic doctrine—the immortal principles of human right as written by the finger of God in the heart of humanity itself. Jefferson quaffed at the fountain of eternal truth, which flowed not less copiously for him than it flows for us to-day, and will flow on to the end of time. The truth is older than Jefferson. He did not create it, nor was all of it known to him. A Jefferson may grasp the truth with a giant's grasp and hurl it with a giant's power against the enemies of the rights of man, but the imperishable principles which throw light into his brain and give strength to his arm

are not more potent than the instrument that wields them. There are few safer guides to democracy than Thomas Jefferson, but even he was neither infallible nor impeccable. The man who would comprehend in his soul the true democracy in all the amplitude and scope of that great concept, must seek it where Jefferson found it—in the living well of truth.

It is said that Jefferson favored the annexation of Cuba. He also favored lotteries. But lotteries are gambling devices, and if Cuban annexation is Jeffersonian democracy, gambling also is Jeffersonian democracy. The fact is that Jefferson, like the bible, is sometimes susceptible of different interpretations.

The democratic platform of 1860, it is true, contained Cuban annexation planks. This was the case with both the Douglas and the Breckenridge platforms. By reaffirming the Cincinnati platform of 1856 they also recognized the institution of domestic slavery. Both planks were inserted by pro-slavery men. They knew that Cuba, if admitted to the union, would be a slave-holding state. That this fact was well known by the statesmen of that day cannot be doubted, for it was openly charged in the political speeches of the time. In 1856 the democratic Cuban policy was well understood, although it had not yet been voiced in the platform. In a speech at Philadelphia, November 1, 1856, Kenneth Raynor, of North Carolina, said: "If he [Buchanan] be elected now, and the difficulties in Kansas be healed, at the end of four years they will spring upon you another question of slavery agitation. It will be the taking of Cuba from Spain, * * * for the purpose of embroiling the north against the south, and if I shall resist that agitation, I shall be called an abolitionist again." Thus it appears that Cuban annexation is not a whit more democratic than domestic slavery, if you take the platform as your authority; and such an annexation plank in a democratic platform of the present day would have about as much business there as a pro-slavery plank.

But suppose our platform of 1900 should overrule the Cuban policy of

1860. Would not the platform of 1900 control? I think so, at least; especially in view of the fact that the annexation of the island would result in throwing it into the hands of the money barons of New York, who, owning the plantations, transportation facilities and finances of the country, would enthrall the people thereof in as galling slavery as was ever witnessed south of Mason and Dixon's line. This the democratic party is not willing to permit. It has come back to the other side of the slavery question since 1860.

SPEED MOSBY.

Jefferson City, Mo.

NEWS

The latest authentic information from the seat of war in South Africa which we were able to give last week was contained in reports from Lord Roberts bearing date the 30th and the 1st. This was vague, though the London correspondents inferred from it that heavy fighting was in progress somewhat to the north of Thaba N'Chu and that the Boers were putting the British on the defensive. Those reports from Roberts were followed by one from him dated the 2d, in which he said that the Boers had been driven by the right of his line at Thaba N'Chu from their position at Houtnek, which is north of Thaba N'Chu and that they were retreating in several directions, mainly to the north and east. Two days later Lord Roberts had evidently begun his advance to Pretoria. With 50,000 men he then had a front 40 miles long, extending eastward from the railroad, and was pushing slowly forward. On the 3d he had captured Brandfort, which lies to the north of Bloemfontein. It had been the right of the Boer line which recently extended southeastwardly to Wepener; but no serious efforts were made by the Boers to prevent its capture. Pushing on to the north from Brandfort, the British, after sharp fighting on the 6th, crossed the Vet river about 20 miles northeast of Brandfort, and took possession of Smaldeel, the junction station where the railroad from Winburg connects with the main line. They subsequently took Winburg without resistance, the Boers withdrawing to the Zand river, 25 miles north of Smaldeel, where they are expected to make another stand, and where an engagement has since been

fought, in which 8,000 British were driven back. On the 9th Lord Roberts was still at Smaldeel, with the greater part of the forces, engaged in repairing the line of railroad to Bloemfontein and the bridge across the Vet river. According to an Associated Press dispatch of the 6th from Smaldeel, his advance to that point was secured by maneuvers which placed the Boers at a disadvantage at all points of contact. "Lord Robert's admirable strategy," says this dispatch, "resulted in placing everywhere five British to one Boer.

The general movement of which the advance to Smaldeel and Winburg described above is part, extends from the eastern border of the Orange Free State near Thaba N'Chu to the southwestern corner of the Transvaal near Fourteen Streams. The far western division is under command of Gen. Hunter, Methuen having apparently been subordinated. Gen. Hunter, having crossed to the west bank of the Vaal river at Windsorton and proceeded toward Fourteen Streams, had on the 4th fought his way to Warrenton, and on the 8th taken possession of Fourteen Streams without opposition.

Gen. Buller's command in Natal, which has been for some weeks awaiting orders, was reported on the 9th as having been ordered to move on Biggarsberg with a view of cooperating with Lord Roberts.

American peace in the Philippines is as warlike as ever. In a fight on the island of Panay, reported from Iloilo on the 3d, 4 Americans were killed and 16 severely wounded. Reinforcements came in the nick of time to save their comrades from destruction. In another fight on the same island the Americans lost on the 2d 3 killed and 7 wounded. Two Americans were killed and five wounded in a fight in Luzon on the 13th, and more fighting has occurred near Catubig, in northern Samar. On the island of Leyte the dispatches report an engagement in which the Americans had two men wounded but killed 125 Filipinos. Two important captures of prisoners are reported from Manila—Gen. Pantelon Garcia, the highest Filipino military officer next to Aguinaldo, and Pedro Paterno, formerly president of Aguinaldo's cabinet. This report is accompanied by news of the reappearance

of Aguinaldo. He is said to be in the north of Luzon, where he has assembled a considerable force and is planning to resume fighting in the rainy season now at hand.

Gen. Otis has begun his voyage home from Manila, having at his own urgent request been relieved by Gen. MacArthur.

American casualties in the Philippines since August 6, 1898, inclusive of all current official reports given out at Washington to May 9, 1900, are as follows:

| | |
|---|-------|
| Killed | 475 |
| Died of wounds, disease and accidents | 1,244 |
| Total deaths | 1,719 |
| Wounded | 2,103 |

| | |
|-----------------------------------|-------|
| Total loss | 3,822 |
| Total loss reported last week.... | 3,822 |
| Total deaths reported last week.. | 1,719 |

The foregoing figures represent only those casualties that are reported in detail from time to time and given to the daily press. The list is as yet incomplete, owing to lack of detailed reports for the past three weeks.

Preparations for the presidential campaign are fast vitalizing American politics. At the populist national convention, held at Sioux Falls, South Dakota, on the 9th, P. M. Ringdell, of Minnesota, was elected temporary chairman. The middle-of-the-road populists, who met at Cincinnati on the 9th, had ex-Congressman Howard, of Alabama, for temporary chairman. No further business had been done at the hour of this writing by either convention.

The democrats of Iowa, meeting on the 3d, named delegates at large to the national convention, with Cato Sells at the head and John S. Murphy of the Dubuque Telegraph next. They denounced imperialism, held the protective tariff responsible for trusts, expressed sympathy for the Boers, indorsed the Chicago platform, and demanded the nomination of Bryan. The republicans of West Virginia, meeting on the 8th, indorsed the gold standard, imperialism and the McKinley administration. On the 9th the convention of the republicans of Maryland was held, and elected delegates to the Philadelphia convention. It indorsed the McKinley administration. Connecticut republicans met on the same day and took

similar action, reaffirming the St. Louis platform and asserting that all its promises had been fulfilled.

In Illinois the republicans held a gubernatorial convention at Peoria on the 8th. The leading candidates for governor were Judge Hanecy and Judge Carter, both of Chicago. Hanecy represented the regular republican machine, while Carter was making a fight for independence within the party. On the first ballot Hanecy had 573½ votes, Carter 359½, and two others, Reeves and Yates, 331½ and 272½ respectively. Yates is a son of ex-Gov. Yates, the war governor. Carter, Hanecy and Yates all fell off on the second ballot, and only Reeves gained; and when the fourth ballot was reached Yates and Reeves were alone in the field. Hanecy's strength was thrown to Yates, who was consequently nominated, the vote being: Yates, 971, and Reeves, 566. The platform indorsed the McKinley administration and instructed the delegates to the national convention to support his renomination. A resolution of sympathy with the Boers was laid upon the table.

From political preparations in America to the municipal elections in France. They were held on the 6th, when more than 400,000 municipal councilors were to be chosen, who in turn are to choose more than 36,000 mayors and 38,000 assistant mayors. As a majority vote is required to elect, some of the elections were left unsettled. They will be determined on the 13th by a second ballot. Parisian interest (and to the outside world that is French interest) centered as usual upon the contest in Paris, where 80 councilors were to be chosen. Seventy seats were contested. The principal contests were between the supporters of the present cabinet and the nationalists, who oppose not only the present cabinet but the present form of government. The army is their fetich. The nationalists were not expected to accomplish much, but they carried eight seats and are in the lead for 11 out of 30 for which second balloting must be held. Five of the seats they gain they take from republicans, and three from radicals. Their success is expected to have a disturbing effect upon national politics; and acting with the royalists and the conservatives they can control the city council. The republican press dis-

covers that Paris is now in the hands of the reactionaries. In the south of France there were general socialist gains.

A short-lived peasant's rebellion is reported from northern Bulgaria, caused by grinding taxation. Pressed by financial difficulties, the ministry brought in a tithing law bearing with special severity upon the agricultural population. For months past peasant meetings have been held, threatening to resist this law if it were not repealed. One conflict occurred a month or more ago at Varna, on the Black sea. The disturbance then spread until, in the neighborhood of Rustchuk, on the Roumanian border, it began last week to assume alarming proportions. Three thousand strong, and armed with scythes, hatchets, pitchforks and logs of wood, the peasants marched on the 3d upon Rustchuk, where there were but two battalions of troops. They disarmed one and used the captured arms against the other. The prefect of the town they cornered and killed by beating out his brains. Fresh troops arrived, however, and on the 4th the peasants were dispersed. The dispatches say that the leaders are being sought out and punished with unexampled severity.

Something akin to this peasant outbreak in Bulgaria are the street car riots in St. Louis. The street railway employes' union presented on the 4th to the president of the corporation that owns all the streets of St. Louis for street car purposes, a demand that the union be recognized and only union members be thereafter employed. The corporation having ignored the demand, a general strike began on the 8th. From the beginning of the day every street car line in the city was tied up. The men were on hand in full force, but not one would handle a car. Every department had struck. Some cars were started by means of non-union help, but mobs stopped them. Women and children who sympathized with the strikers hurled stones at those who tried to handle the cars. Some shooting was done, but only by non-unionists, who fired from cars into crowds. A large number of men were arrested for rioting. At three o'clock all effort to run the cars was abandoned, and the same condition has continued to the hour of writing. Over 4,000 men are involved in the strike. The mayor issued a letter

urging arbitration, and the strikers agreed to submit, but the corporation declined.

NEWS NOTES.

—The American Social Science association began the sessions of its annual congress in Washington on the 7th.

—Mount Vesuvius is again in a state of eruption and is emitting great quantities of lava. The rumbling and roar of the explosions can be heard plainly for miles around.

—Sir Francis Hodgson, English governor of Ashanti, is besieged in Koomassie by the rebellious Ashantis who are in great force. He has called on his government for aid.

—President Kruger opened the Volksraad of the South African republic on the 7th, on the occasion of its first session for 1900. Representatives of several foreign countries were present.

—The Illinois Steel company's plant at Joliet, Ill., part of the Federal steel trust, was closed down, for an indefinite period, on the 7th, by which action more than 2,500 men were thrown out of employment.

—A convention of Irish nationalists is to be held in Dublin June 19th, under the auspices of the United Irish league, at which delegates representative of the whole country will endeavor to determine the nationalist policy.

—The Ohio Single Tax league is to hold its fourth annual conference in Columbus, May 19th and 20th, at the Great Southern hotel. John S. Crosby, of New York, the distinguished single tax orator, will address the conference on the 20th.

—Germany's crown prince, Frederick Wilhelm, the eldest son of the kaiser, became of age (18) on the 6th, and the event was celebrated with elaborate ceremonies in the royal chapel at Berlin. The entire diplomatic corps was in attendance.

—For the ten months ending April 30 the United States treasury report of receipts and expenditures is as follows:

| | |
|--------------------|------------------|
| Receipts | \$472,387,062 72 |
| Expenditures | 413,866,973 21 |

Surplus

Surplus\$ 58,521,089 51

—The official report of the cash in the United States treasury for April is as follows:

| | |
|------------------------------|------------------|
| Gold Reserve | \$150,000,000 00 |
| Available cash balance | 146,117,548 26 |

Total cash balance

On hand June 30\$296,117,548 26

Increase since June 30.....\$ 14,737,079 53

—Emperor Franz Joseph of Austria-Hungary paid a visit to the kaiser in Berlin on the 4th. He was received with the greatest honors and during his visit conferred on Emperor Wil-

liam the honorary rank of field marshal in the Austrian army.

—William C. Endicott, secretary of war during President Cleveland's first administration, died at his home in Boston, from an attack of pneumonia, on the 6th, aged 74 years. He was the father-in-law of Joseph Chamberlain, colonial secretary in the British ministry.

IN CONGRESS.

This report is an abstract of the Congressional Record, and closes with the last issue of that publication at hand upon going to press.

May 1-7, 1900.

Senate.

On the 1st the Alaska civil government bill was passed; and Senator Berry, of Arkansas, offered to the army appropriation bill under consideration, an amendment, printed on page 5295, intended to give a preference in purchasing army supplies (all other things, including price and quality, being equal) to articles of domestic production, and as between domestic producers and dealers, to such as are not members of or in any way connected with a trust. After an extended debate the amendment was rejected by a vote of 29 to 18. The army appropriation bill being again under consideration on the 2d, Pettigrew spoke at length regarding volunteers in the Philippines and produced important letters from some of them, which are printed in this number of the Record, beginning at page 5293. Mason spoke on the food adulteration bill. The army appropriation bill was passed on the 3d, and the army reorganization bill on the 4th. The latter provides for the conferring of the rank of lieutenant general on the ranking major general. The fortifications appropriation bill was also passed this day. The senate was not in session on the 5th. On the 7th Senator Teller spoke at length on his resolution of sympathy for the South African republics, which was introduced on the 2d and is printed on page 5375; and Senator Mason introduced a joint resolution authorizing the government surveyors to make and report an estimate of the cost of a channel of a depth of from ten to 14 feet in the upper Illinois and lower Des Plaines rivers. Mason's resolution was passed without debate, and consideration of the naval appropriation bill was begun.

House.

Consideration of the Nicaragua canal bill, printed on page 5308, was begun on the 1st. A message from the senate was read asking for the appointment of house conferees on the amendments to the joint resolution regarding the administration of civil affairs in Puerto Rico. Consideration of the Nicaragua bill was resumed on the 2d, and an amendment, changing the phrase "fortification for defense," to "provisions for defense," was adopted by a vote of 151 to 103. A substitute bill offered by Burton, of Ohio, printed on page 5366, was rejected, and the original bill as amended passed by a vote of 224 to 35. A bill known as the free homestead bill, providing for free homesteads on the public lands for actual and bona fide set-

tlers and reserving the public lands for that purpose, was passed on the 3d. Consideration of the sundry civil appropriation bill was begun on this day and considered on the 4th. On the 5th the sundry civil appropriation bill was passed. A bill to appropriate annually the sum of \$2,000,000 for the purpose of providing arms, ordnance stores, quartermaster stores and camp equipage for issue to the state militia organizations, was passed on the 7th. The rules were then suspended and an important amendment to the pension law, known as senate bill 1477, and printed on page 5616, was passed.

MISCELLANY

MAN'S ELEMENT.

For The Public.

Oh, give us space, my Father,
That gave it once before!
The network lines of bondage
Are drawn from shore to shore.

No fish may own the water;
No bird may own the air;
But men have seized the heritage
Of man, and left him—where?

Then give us fins, my Father;
Or give us wings to fly!
Else—while the few may own the earth—
The many can but die!

VIRGINIA M. BUTTERFIELD.

SAVAGERY IN WEST VIRGINIA.

A liberally attended entertainment in West Virginia the other day was a fight between a wildcat and a bulldog. The animals were confined in a wire cage 15 feet square. At the end of 30 minutes the dog was dead, but the cat was uninjured. It is pleasant to know that cockfighting has been stopped in the Philippines in the interests of civilization. — Boston Evening Transcript.

CHRISTIAN POLITICS.

Fourteen years ago Rev. Dr. R. W. Dale, of Birmingham, received an anonymous note of rebuke to this effect:

'There is no politics in heaven; there is where your life should be; sad, sad, that it is otherwise.

The doctor publicly replied in an able pulpit address in the course of which he said:

No politics in heaven? Well, I suppose not; but there are no agricultural laborers there living on 12s. a week, whose condition political action may, perhaps, ameliorate. . . . In heaven there are no unjust wars to be prevented, no cruel, reckless ambition to be curbed by the will and power of a free people. Politics unchristian!

—London Morning Leader.

BOER AND BRITISH NATURALIZATION.

It is inaccurate to aver that the Boer government ever "deprived" the English or other aliens of "republican

rights." They required that in theirs, as in every other civilized country in the world, including, of course, our own, all aliens—British and non-British—when admitted to the rights of citizenship, should foreswear their native allegiance, and, along with the privileges of their naturalization, should accept its full obligations—to obey the laws of the land, pay its taxes, and even bear arms against their own race in any war with the people of their new home. If the alien did not like the terms he could remain an alien. Every foreigner residing amongst us has to submit at our hands to exactly the same "insulting contempt."—Thomas M. Watt, in London Morning Leader.

AND THERE IS A PHILIPPINE BEAM IN THE AMERICAN EYE.

An editorial paragraph from the London Morning Leader of April 21.

The Times shows its traditional lack of humor in printing a leading article that opens with the following sentence:

An important and interesting collection of documents has just been published in this country which is in the nature of an appeal to the judgment of the civilized world against the overthrow by sheer force of the constitutional rights of a small, but self-respecting nationality.

The reference is not, of course, to any publication of the South African conciliation committee. It is the opening of a vigorous denunciation of Russia's centralizing tendencies and a plea for Finland. It is written with complete unconsciousness of any incongruity. And that is the weak feature of international public opinion. In the case of Finland it convinces everyone but the czar and his ministers. In the matter of Capt. Dreyfus it influenced every people but the French. In this affair of the Transvaal it stirs every people but ourselves.

LIFE SAVING INSTEAD OF LIFE DESTROYING.

For boys' brigades trained in the tactics of life-destruction I would substitute boys' brigades trained in tactics of life-preservation. The careful discipline in the world's great cities of the wonderful fire brigades, and on our seaboard the work of shipwreck rescue—these should serve as suggestions of the tactics to be observed, of training and discipline, of obedience and order, of alert attention, of willing sacrifice, of noble consecration, of an exalted strenuous life. "Life Saving" would be the motto. And would not this draw out all that is most virile and true and lasting and worthy of main-

tenance and perpetuation and transmission to posterity?

What better strain of blood could heredity have to pass on and down to succeeding generations than a generation of youth trained in life-saving service rather than in life-destroying militarism? And how far-reaching is this method! Training to preserve life soon sweeps in methods of rescuing life from moral perils is well as physical, from perils of ignorance, perils of poverty, perils of hopeless degradation.—Rev. Samuel Richard Fuller, in *The Coming Age*.

MONEY NOT CAPITAL.

Money is never capital. It simply commands capital. If every dollar in money should be destroyed the world would have just as much capital as before, but those who now have the money would lose their power to command capital through that medium. If this conception be correct, then capital is always good, and never a menace to the people, although its improper use may become so. We cannot have too much capital, and it would make but little difference who owned, if only the results of its use were fairly divided between those who owned and those who performed the labor. It is the use of capital that is of vital importance, and not its ownership.

There must be public capital, such as parks, public buildings, streets, etc. And with this kind of capital I class railroads. I maintain that they are public capital, simply held in trust for the people, and the time is coming when they will be public capital in the fullest sense. Private ownership of land has been undoubtedly best under the civilization we have had, but advancement in civilization is teaching us more and more that even the land is simply held in trust by the owners for all the people, and it is theirs as soon as they demand it. No man's land is exempt from condemnation for public use now.—Gov. John Lind, in *St. Paul*, Apr. 22.

THE TENDENCY OF COMMERCIALISM.

It is the essential vice of aggregated wealth to oppose every movement which makes for the betterment of humanity in the mass. It was so in the evil days of slave-driving in our country; it has been so always; it will be so ever.

In 1850, when Mr. Seward was pleading with his fellow senators not to vote for the slavery compromise of that year, he used these prophetic words:

Slavery has, moreover, a more natural alliance with the aristocracy of the north,

and with the aristocracy of Europe. So long as slavery shall possess the cotton fields, the sugar fields and the rice fields of the world, so long will commerce and capital yield it toleration and sympathy. Emancipation is a democratic revolution. It is capital that arrests all democratic revolutions.

It does not wholly nullify this charge of crucifying the "enthusiasm of humanity" to say that the commercialism which I condemn rears splendid charities and opulent endowments for the cultivation of letters, and builds libraries and equips schools. Too often the process is but a disgorging of a small part of that which has been acquired by some of our various robberies under the forms of law for the benefit of a small portion of those from whom it was in the first instance abstracted, and too generally from the low and unworthy motive of quieting the public pulse and stifling the public conscience while the legalized spoliation is still going on. This constitutes what, in the estimation of the donors, the late Mr. Fernando Wood used to call "pandering to the moral element."—Judge Charles R. Grant, in *Akron (O.) Daily Democrat*.

WHY DO WE NEED A GREAT ARMY IN THE PHILIPPINES?

I hardly could trust my eyes when I read in the president's annual message this amazing statement:

I had every reason to believe, and I still believe, that this transfer of sovereignty was in accordance with the wishes and aspirations of the great mass of the Filipino people.

And this, in the face of the fact that we need there for the enforcement of that sovereignty the largest army this republic has ever had in active field service, except during our civil war—an army twice or three times as large as any we had in the revolutionary war, or in the war of 1812, or in the Mexican war, or in Cuba in the late war—an army ten times as large as that which is thought necessary to keep order in Cuba now.

Why do we need so tremendous a force? To beat the Filipino army which, as our secretary of war told us, in a speech at Chicago, represented almost too infinitesimally small a portion of the Filipino people to be mathematically expressed by way of percentage? Or did we need it, as others tell us, to protect the "good Americans" among the Filipino people against the so-called "rebels?" But if, as the president says, "this transfer of sovereignty was in accordance with the wishes and aspirations of the great mass of the Filipino people," why do we not put arms into the hands of the

great mass to enable it to tackle that small rebellious minority and hand it over to the police? Why not? The reason is simple: Because, as everybody knows, there is too much reason to fear that this great mass of "good Americans" would, upon occasion, turn out to be good Filipinos and eventually use those arms against us.—Hon. Carl Schurz, at Anti-Imperialist Conference in Philadelphia.

OUR OWN SELF-GOVERNMENT IS NOT ABOVE REPROACH.

Neither have we a right to say that the Philippine people must be held to be incapable of independent government if they cannot form an ideal republic, in which liberty, and peace, and order, and honesty will reign in unclouded sunshine. They may easily be as orderly as Kentucky and as honestly governed as the city of New York. What if they have their troubles and turmoils? They may be like some South American republics, or develop into something like the orderly dictatorship in Mexico. Do we question the title of those countries to their independence? Let us not indeed "scuttle away" from the Philippines, like baffled thieves, but assist and protect them until they stand upon their own feet; and if this is done in perfect good faith, difficulties now deemed ever so formidable will vanish like morning mist.

Besides, it is not the most important question how perfect their government will be. More important is it that their government should be their own, and more important still that the American people should not become unfaithful to the fundamental principles of their democracy; that they should not lose high ideals of liberty, right and justice, and that they should wash from the escutcheon of the republic the foul blot with which the great perfidy to our late allies has defiled it.—Hon. Carl Schurz, at Anti-Imperialist Conference in Philadelphia.

THE POWERS OF PRESIDING OFFICERS.

The power of a presiding officer of a parliamentary body to thwart the will of the majority is considered in the somewhat novel case of state, ex rel Southy, v. Lashar (Conn.) 44 L. R. A. 197. Here the mayor of a city presiding in a meeting of the board of public works declined to entertain a certain motion, whereupon one of the members of the board took it upon himself to put the motion, and, upon its receiving a majority of the votes, declared it carried. The contention was made that the presiding officer of any deliberative board or assembly

is the servant of the body over which he presides, and not its master, and, if he attempts to dominate the assembly or to thwart its will, any member may act in his place. But the court, without denying the correctness of this as an abstract proposition, did not consider that it was raised in the case, and said that, if it was, it was analogous to the right of revolution. It was held that in declining to entertain the motion and sustaining a point of order against it, the mayor was acting within the lines of his duty and powers as a presiding officer, and that, if he was in error, the remedy was not for another member to put the motion, but to appeal to the house from the decision, which, if a majority were against it, would be thereby overruled. The question which the court declined to decide would have been substantially presented if, on taking an appeal from the decision, the presiding officer had refused to put the question of sustaining his decision to vote. Whether such a refusal, which would cut off the last remedy of the aggrieved members, would justify one of them in putting the motion or not, remains undecided.—Case and Comment.

COAL AT \$2 A TON BUT FOR COAL TRUST.

Thomas P. Fowler, president of the New York, Ontario & Western railroad, made some startling revelations about coal prices before the state railroad commissioners in the Fifth Avenue hotel, New York, on March 14.

President Fowler stoutly declared that there was no such thing as a coal trust, but, in almost the same breath said that if the independent owners of coal mines were allowed to build a railroad of their own to market the product of the mines, stove coal would be selling in this city for two dollars a ton.

The independents want to build a railroad along the route of the abandoned Delaware and Hudson canal from Lackawaxen, Pa., to Kingston on the Hudson. The coal trust has been bitterly fighting the project of the independents.

John A. Garver, counsel for the independents, examined Mr. Fowler.

"What would be the effect on the New York market of an increased outlet for coal to tidewater?" asked Mr. Garver.

"It would, of course, reduce the price of coal, just as if you dumped potatoes on the market without a demand. Without some restriction there

would be coal on the market not needed and stove coal would be a drug at two dollars a ton. I suppose that would satisfy the individual operators."

"Then the output is restricted now?"

"We bring to the market all that is needed; all that can be sold to give a fair profit to the coal man."

"That is, the coal trust or combination?"

"There is no combination," retorted the witness.

Frank H. Platt, son of Senator Platt, as counsel for the coal trust, in opening for his side, denied all the claims of the independents.—N. Y. World.

ONE OF THE TESTS OF CIVILIZATION.

An interesting glimpse is given of national characteristics and ideals in the treatment accorded the aged poor in different lands. Beginning with America, the unprejudiced observer would probably conclude that to be old and poor in this country is nearly as bad as to be criminal. Those who have investigated the subject say that America treats its indigent aged worse than any other civilized country. Europeans generally form their opinions on this question from an observation of how New York treats her poor on Blackwell's island; but, after all, very few of the states do any better by this class of its population than New York. In France those of the aged poor who are lucky enough to gain admittance to the hospices fare better, perhaps, than similar persons fare anywhere this side of Japan, a country noted for the respect accorded to parents and the aged generally. Those who cannot obtain admission to the hospices of France are left to starve or beg outside. In Germany workmen over 70 who have contributed regularly to the pensions fund for 30 years are given a pension which amounts to less than \$50 a year. Other classes fare as they can. Both Denmark and Austria treat their aged poor with more kindness and consideration, the former sending the thriftless to the poorhouse, but providing liberally for the worthy poor, while Austria gives kindly and respectful treatment to all poor persons over 65. In Holland care for this class of the population is regarded as a religious duty. In Sweden, Norway and Switzerland the working people in general are so prudent and thrifty that few of them ever need help, while in Spain, Portugal and Italy the reverse is true, and no one of the working classes, as a rule,

acquires a competency for old age, but when strength fails resorts to begging.

As to Iceland, a writer in Temple Bar two years ago gave this description of the primitive but charming way in which the unfortunate aged are treated:

In every district a list is kept of the old people who are unable to provide for themselves, and at the beginning of the year the local authorities seek out homes for them. The custom is for each ratepayer to receive one or more of them, according to his means, into his house on a visit, the length of which depends, of course, upon the number of ratepayers there are in the commune. The old women are expected, provided they have the strength, to give a helping hand in the house where they are staying; and the old men, perhaps, in the garden; but if they be unwilling to work, no one would ever dream of using compulsion. For the most part these pauper visitors just saunter about in much the same way as old, worn-out family retainers might do, and have their meals with the rest of the household. It is an almost unheard-of thing, it seems, for them to be either neglected or ill-treated; for they are regarded as being under the special protection of the whole community; and if anyone were known to do them wrong he would speedily find every man's hand against him.

—Chicago Daily News.

THE FAMINE IN INDIA.

Faith in God is sometimes taxed by the sight of human misery. Many see a rift of light in the dense cloud of suffering hanging like a pall over "sad India," in that, through the efforts of Christian people to relieve the anguish, giving spiritual bread as they minister physical relief, many will find eternal life, and the suffering ones, going to these messengers of light because of their extremity, will gain relief that otherwise they would not only never have sought, but spurned when offered.

When God's children are deprived of their spiritual inheritance, we feel it to be a great calamity. We are ceaseless in our efforts and prayers that this priceless boon may be restored. If temporary relief from famine through the hands of God's people, may lead many into covenant relations with God, would not a permanent economic system, based on Christian ethics, be far more productive of wonderful results in this respect?

Is it as easy to lead people to see that God is their loving heavenly Father when they are cut off from the physical sustenance he undoubtedly planned for his creatures as it would be if a system prevailed by which they realized their temporal wants were supplied by him?

"The earth hath he given to the children of men" (Ps. cxv. 16). As the milk supply comes with the calf and baby, so come the land values with the community, and in proportion to the demand of the people is the supply of land values. If communities, instead of individuals, received these values, social conditions would be incomparably different. If the people of India could hoard the wealth of India, would they not have and to spare? Prof. Herron says, in "Between Caesar and Jesus:"

In the early part of 1897, when meetings for the relief of the famine in India were being held in English and American cities, when contributions were received from newsboys and washerwomen, scores of ships laden with wheat and carrying millions of money, arrived in English ports as rents from the people in India for the privilege of living on the lands the English had taken from them.

Dr. McGavran told us, at the jubilee convention, that it was not because there was not food in India that the people died by thousands of starvation, but because they were too poor to buy the food. Would they be as poor if labor had its just reward? Says Henry George:

If men lack bread, it is not that God has not done his part in providing it. If men willing to labor are cursed with poverty, it is not that the storehouse God owes men has failed, that the daily supply he has promised for the daily wants of his children is not here in abundance. Our trouble lies in that we have given into the exclusive ownership of the few the provision that a bountiful father has made for all.

May there not be deep lessons for us, in famine-free lands, in this daily death of thousands in India? Jesus never promised to care for the lilies and birds when separated from the land.

Is there not too little attention paid by Christians, ministers and missionaries to these matters of gospel economics? — Laura DeLany Garst, in Christian Standard, of Cincinnati.

WHAT IS ENGLISH?

Extract from an article with the above title, published in the London Speaker of April 21.

"English" means nothing, unless it has some reference to the traditions and the individuality of England. If an Englishman is proud of the aggression of his country, he is proud of something which is not peculiar to England. If he rejoices, as a good many of our London journalists are entitled to rejoice, that he did his part in inciting his countrymen to extinguish two independent communities of white men, he finds satisfaction in a policy which England

shares with Russia, Prussia, Turkey and the Saracens. If he has helped to extend the power of marauding financiers, he has certainly done something to draw England away from the beaten track and the traditional lines of her historical policy. Above all, if he has condoned the raid, made heroes of the chief actors, deprecated the payment of an indemnity to the Transvaal, and represented the whole transaction as a piece of romantic chivalry, he has taught his countrymen to admire qualities, such as forgery, lying, cowardice, bad faith, and financial greed, which nobody but the most ignorant and unscrupulous of Anglophobes has ever associated with the name of England.

The liberals who oppose the government, and who hate the spirit which during the last few years has been driving their countrymen into courses which they regard as dangerous and dishonoring, have no reason to fear the results of an appeal to the standards and the traditions of England. Let us take one aspect of the English history. For some generations our nation stood in the eyes of Europe for nationalism. The names of Canning, Byron, Palmerston, Lord John Russell—chief of all, that of Mr. Gladstone—were associated with that idealist movement which rescued the smaller states from despotism and gave a certain sacredness to the idea, the claims and the life of nationality. Nationalism has suffered a good deal at the hands of the jealousies, the ambitions, the new enthusiasms, which have given to the closing years of the century so dark and ominous a complexion for humanity. And if liberals wished to see in our policy in the near east something of the spirit which they were proud to identify with the actions of their greatest statesmen in the past, they might be open to rebuke on the grounds of a rash and inconsiderate judgment, but to say that their standpoint was not English would have been the silliest of slanders. Last year enough of that old tradition survived to make professors, politicians, men of letters and of science, in England as elsewhere, sad and indignant over the extinction of the autonomy of Finland. Is there anything anti-English or un-English in the feelings of liberals who are horrified and revolted by a course of action which has made their country no longer merely a helpless spectator in the eclipse of a national movement (as she was in the Greco-Turkish

war), no longer a sympathetic mourner over the destruction of a guaranteed autonomy (as she was last year), but the agent herself of the destruction of the principle for which, in other days, she had made so stout a stand in Europe? This may be cant, as it may be cant to believe in freedom of speech, but it is the kind of cant which made a great part of English history, and a part which we fancy a great many Englishmen have no wish to forget. . . .

There are not many Englishmen who remember with pride that we withdrew our ships from Port Arthur at the peremptory dictation of Russia; an indignity which was in no way redeemed after our retreat by our petulant assertions that our ships had the best of rights to be there. Let us recall that incident, the tone of the German dispatches a few months ago, the impotence of our fleet to act on the coast of Crete three years ago, except as the instrument of the German emperor's selfish ambition, and then recollect the exuberant enthusiasm with which some of our newspapers invited us to make war on two small republics with a united population that was comparable to that of a respectable English borough, and with a militia which, these newspapers assure us, would never take the field. An England which picks its quarrels with the weak and makes all its concessions to fear may be the England of Mr. Rudyard Kipling and of the Times, but it is not the England of history, and we don't think it will be the England of to-morrow.

THE PROFITS WILL GO TO THE FEW.

There is a point in regard to our national imperialism and expansionism that seems to be in danger of being overlooked by both sides in this controversy, and that is the point of who will receive the profits, if there shall be any, and who will pay the bills. Our new expansion is not to be an expansion of the race or nation in any such sense as our expansion on this continent has been. As Prof. Bernard Moses, one of the members of the new Philippine commission, has well said—and note his words, for it is a confession by an official engaged in the work, of the real inwardness of the whole scheme: "If our race moves forward upon these regions it will not be the race as a whole, but the race represented by its organizing and dominating classes. The migration beyond this shore will, therefore, be the movement of a class."

There can be no doubt as to what "class" is here referred to; the "class" which will go will be the agents of trusts and syndicates. These aggregations of capital expect to obtain control and ownership of franchises, land values, valuable mines and forests, and the profits, whatever they shall be, will go to them, but not to the nation as a whole, but the nation pays the expense.

What is this expense? Tens of thousands of our strongest lives, "the best ye breed," and untold millions of treasure. But statements of round bulks of millions seldom convey any adequate idea, and they need to be illustrated by comparative values. Let us examine a few of the items, on the margins, so to speak, of this bill. To the ordinary person, to whom it is a matter of much self-denial and effort to save \$1,000, it is rather startling to think that we are ordering hundreds of guns for many of which the ammunition alone will cost \$1,000 for each single discharge. The international complications made possible and probable by expansionism have seemed to make it necessary to fortify seacoast towns at an almost fabulous expense. A single mortar battery at Newport is expected to use ammunition costing \$16,000 for each discharge.

About one-half the population of this country are farmers, and they suffer an inordinate expense and labor from being compelled to haul produce and transact business over roads that are bad all the time, and at some portions of the year are almost impassable. They are compelled to this hardship because neither they nor the rest of the public think they can afford the necessary outlay for better highways. Yet to support imperialism we are building a whole naval fleet, when the cost of a single first-class battleship would build a macadam highway from the Atlantic to the Pacific. The government is now building 61 vessels.

Do you say that this is but a single outlay, and that the vessels once acquired are a permanent thing. The various expenses in connection with the support of an increased navy, such as the renewals of vessels, munitions, supplies, vast numbers of men needed in their handling, etc., are likely to reach a figure beyond belief, when it is compared with our necessary home outlays. The salaries of the naval officers alone are sufficient to build two macadam highways from New England to California every year. These scraps of the expense ac-

count of the navy are startling, and I have not mentioned the equally startling ones in connection with the army.

But what of commerce? Will not the nation benefit by the increased commerce which will flow to our shores? It is sufficient reply to this to say that the commerce of the world can be ours, and could have been at any time in the last 25 years, by simply removing the barriers which we ourselves have erected against it. The party now in power, which is shouting "commerce" so lustily, has for the last quarter of a century denounced commerce as an evil thing, calculated to destroy the prosperity of the nation, and especially of its laborers. If we want commerce we have only to remove the obstructions—not from our harbors, but from our statute books.

I am fully conscious that this viewing of the cold question of profits is not an ideal view, for it takes no account of the eternal verities of right and equity; those mills of the gods that grind so fine, yet when so many are being bewildered by the cry of immense wealth to be obtained—no matter how—it is well perhaps to meet the assertion on its own level and ascertain, if possible, who will obtain the wealth, and who will pay the expense of obtaining it.

It is becoming more and more evident every day that the nation has entered upon the project of looting a country at an enormous expense in blood and treasure, that expense to be the nation's, and the benefit to be for a few private corporations.—Charles E. Benton, of New Bedford, Mass., in Springfield Republican.

A PHASE OF THE ANTAGONISM BETWEEN LABOR AND CAPITAL.

An address delivered by W. J. Strong, Esq., at the annual banquet of the Life Insurance Underwriters' association at the Athletic club in Chicago, April 17.

There is nothing inherent in capital that should make it antagonistic to labor. Neither is there anything in labor that should make it antagonistic to capital. When I speak of capital I use the word distinctively. I do not mean wealth when I say capital, but I mean that part of wealth which is engaged in productive enterprises. There is something in wealth in its broad sense that is antagonistic to labor—the wealth that dissipates itself in riotous living; and my use of the word capital means only that part of wealth which is the brother of labor, that works with labor in the productive enterprises of this country.

We all know that every productive enterprise in this country to-day of any moment is organized into a corporation or a trust; and we, the party of the third part, are interested in knowing why these labor difficulties arise. What is the cause of the differences between that part of wealth called capital, and that part called labor? From my study of this question I am firmly convinced that the difficulty arises wholly from the refusal on the part of capital, which is organized, to recognize labor in its organized capacity.

The mistake the laboring men in this country make is that they do not call their unions associations, that they do not call their walking delegates and their business agents superintendents or general managers. If the labor unions were called associations, and their business agents superintendents or general managers, the public would appreciate the position they occupy. There is something about the word association that suggests velvet carpets, mahogany desks, Havana cigars, silk hats and patent leather shoes. But the word labor-union suggests to the mind greasy overalls, dirty hands, blackened faces, and brogans.

The main antagonism between labor and capital, in my judgment, comes from the failure on the part of capital to recognize the right of labor to act in its organized capacity. They say to the laboring men: "We will treat with you as individuals. If you have any difficulty with us come to us as individuals." Labor might as well say to the corporation: "We refuse to treat with your business agent or superintendent. We wish every stockholder to come here and listen to our complaints. Your business agents are arbitrary and unreasonable, and are working for nothing but to hold their own jobs." The business agents and the walking delegate of the labor union occupy the same position to their organization that the superintendent and general manager do to the corporation and the trust. And until organized capital recognizes labor in its organized capacity these antagonisms never will be settled.

Now the party of the third part, you and I, are interested in this question. We belong to neither element. Every labor union that was ever formed in the history of the world is but an organized protest against the greed of organized capital. The whole civilized world to-day is organized on the cooperative plan. We each of us give up many of our individual rights for the protection of organized society. And for the capitalist to stand back and say, "I

do not propose to allow any labor union to dictate to me what help I shall employ," is merely a question of pride, and must give way to the rights of the party of the third part, whose business is being interrupted by these labor difficulties. Capital must be forced if necessary to treat with labor in its organized capacity. I claim that inasmuch as capital is organized into corporations and trusts represented by business agents called superintendents and general managers that they must recognize the same right on the part of labor to organize, and to appoint its business agents or superintendents to treat with capital in the contests that arise between employer and employed. When capital recognizes this right, the antagonisms which now exist between labor and capital will be greatly reduced, if not entirely done away with.

A striking example has occurred in the late strike of the machinists of this country. The International Association of Machinists demanded that capital engaged in the production of machinery should organize itself into a national association. They insisted, on the other hand, that they should organize into a national association, and that one of these associations should treat with the other in its organized capacity. The machinery manufacturers of this country had sense enough to appreciate the force of this proposition. The laboring men did not demand a scale of wages that would make an equal amount of wages to every man regardless of his qualifications. But they did demand that a minimum rate of wages should be given to every man that worked as a machinist. They offered to the capitalists this, that every man who belonged to their association must be a man who had served four years at his trade, which is a guarantee to the employer that this man and every man that belonged to their union was capable at least of earning the minimum rate of wages. Nothing was provided in their demands regarding the rate that might be paid to the more skillful men. They demanded shorter hours, and their proposition was a guarantee to the manufacturer that any man who belonged to their union was capable at least of earning the minimum rate of wages. They did not demand and do not demand that every man shall receive the same pay regardless of his ability, but they say that a man who has served an apprenticeship of four years is capable of at least earning the minimum rate of wages. There is nothing in their contract which prevents a manufacturer from paying a skillful man more wages than an un-

skillful man. There is nothing which prevents him from recognizing genius; and on account of the strength of the proposition they made the manufacturers, the National Metal Trades association finally agreed to settle their difficulty by arbitration.

The walking delegate has been much abused by the manufacturers. Mr. W. J. Chalmers said before the industrial commission that the labor trust was worse than all other trusts. It is necessary for us, the party of the third part, in discussing these questions to consider, first, what a trust is. A trust means a combination in some industrial enterprise that absolutely prevents competition; that has the power to limit production and to fix the price. A trust in the labor world is impossible for this reason. Every moment a man is born into the world. He becomes a laborer. There is no power in labor organizations to compel him to join their unions, and there must necessarily be an element of competition all the while on the part of labor.

Another feature of the labor organization is that they do not attempt to limit production, but they try all the while to extend it. Hence the main element of a trust cannot exist in a labor union, and a labor union never can be a trust. A man is growing every minute to come in competition with his fellowmen. He has his desires, and a principle that every student of economics recognizes is that every man seeks to gratify his desires by the least possible effort. If he joins a labor union it is because he believes it is to his advantage. There is not a possibility of labor ever becoming a monopoly, owing to the fact that you cannot control the output; neither can you limit the price.

Capital says to labor: "The price of labor shall be regulated by demand and supply." This is a false economic theory. There is something in labor above supply and demand. Labor is not pig iron, wheat, corn, beef or any other inanimate object. It has an element in it that reaches down to the bottom of civilization. It has the human element in it. It is not a commodity. It never will become a commodity. But so long as human beings struggle for a higher and a better life, labor which has hewed this nation of freemen out of the wilderness will struggle for a better education, for more sunshine, for more music, for more opportunity to cultivate the arts and science. It is the aspiration of the human soul to do something besides drudge. Labor, the giant, does not know its power. And whenever it does realize its power and acts in concert it always succeeds.

Capitalists through the whole his-

tory of the world have been blind to this fact. George Eliot, the greatest writer of the century, said: "They say that knowledge is power; but who hath duly considered the power of ignorance? What it hath taken knowledge centuries to build up, ignorance has destroyed in a single night." Never in this contest between labor and capital has capital succeeded when brawn and muscle have been thoroughly aroused. Will not the capitalists of this country realize that they are fighting against a principle that is as certain as the law of gravitation in the realm of physics, that they must go down in the crush and devastation of riot if they do not recognize this human principle in labor? Until organized capital says to organized labor: "We will recognize you in your organized capacity; we will treat with your organizations as just and right; we admit that you give stability to the industrial world by furnishing us competent, skillful men," until capital recognizes this great fact that organized labor must be treated in its organized capacity, and that its business agents and walking delegates are merely prototypes of the superintendents and general managers, this contest between labor and capital for labor's just share of the wealth produced by it will never stop. Until that is done the contest now going on will not cease. Labor must be recognized in its organized capacity or the irrepressible conflict now existing in this world will go on until something more terrible occurs in this country of ours than was seen in the French revolution. There is enough virility and manhood left in American labor to insist upon this right of labor which is the source of all wealth, and that labor must be recognized in its organized capacity; and the sooner capitalists realize that the sooner will these antagonisms cease. They demand the right to be recognized themselves in their capacity of corporations and trusts. Labor, on the other hand, says: "We demand recognition of that kind. Our business agent is the superintendent of our concern. He is the general manager of our concern." Every laboring man that belongs to a union is a stockholder in that concern.

The individual is afraid of the black list, afraid to assert his rights, because he knows if he leads his fellow men he is barred forever from pursuing his trade. They use that as a silent coercive method to subjugate labor, and the determination of organized capital in this country is to subjugate labor to the condition of serfdom.

Mrs. Henrotin, one of the best known women of this city, in her testimony before the industrial commission, related the case of a mother and daughter working in one of the sweat shops in this city, and showed to the committee that the mother and daughter worked in finishing pants for the trade at ten cents per dozen, and that the combined earnings of the two for a day was 35 cents. She demonstrated to that committee that the sole cause of that condition among the laborers who make clothing for the wholesale clothiers was the lack of organization, and that wherever labor has been organized the unions have exercised the power and have brought about better wages, better sanitary conditions, better citizenship and more humanity than has been found in other cases.

When capital recognizes right of labor to organize and treats with labor in its organized capacity, recognizing the business agent and the walking delegate as the legitimate representative of labor, that condition of affairs so eloquently described by Macauley will have come to pass:

When no man was for party,

But all were for the state;

And the rich man helped the poor,

And the poor man loved the great;

and all questions between union and non-union labor will be solved, as all laborers will join the unions in order that they may have the protection of the unions, and reap the benefits of the organization, as they will immediately see that as individuals they are helpless. Some capitalists see this already, and are doing all they can to prevent the consummation of so desirable a state, by using non-union labor as a foil to destroy the unions.

ERE CENTURY DAWN.

In this the waning light of rounded years,
We swing the portal of the Century near;
In ecstasy of hope—through blur of tears,
We wait the word prophetic, Be of Cheer.

The Holy of the Holies enter we,
The dream of ages and of seers foretold,
A day of kinder motive, bondless, free,
The Century-tide—where meet the New
and Old.

In clash of hungry steel and din of hate,
We hear the echo of a dying Past;
We pray it jangle not the new-born State,
Nor that its clang this pregnant year
outlast.

For Dispensation new, the world hath
need,

Of peace on earth and God's good will
to men!

Where Love shall make new war—on lust
of greed,

And old-war steel shall thirst for blood
in vain.

And what have ye to gain of arms ye
bear,

O Nations, army-mad, in fevered strife?
What measure will be mete for blood ye
spare,

For waste of treasure and for sunken
Life?

The fittest do ye drain, to mar and slay;
Survives the weakling, to beget your
young!

Decadence dogs your dead march all the
way,

From hall to hut, the haunting wall is
wrong.

Ye pile the burdens higher year by year,
For every ship ye build, are builded two;
In wild alarm, ye counsel take of Fear,
Nor see the end whereof—the ill ye brew!

Ho! Armistice! Ye Leaders, be ye wise!
Ere yet the Century-sands have all been
spilled,

A truce to let of blood! Ye Nations rise,
And call the measure of your hate o'er-
filled.

For halt shall come; nor may the ques-
tion cease:

"The turn, be it of choice, or led by
fate?"

To bid for rising joy of unarmed Peace;
Or War, to broadcast wild the seeds of
hate!

"Come, now, and let us reason," saith the
Lord,

If there be not for men an holler way;
For ye shall lay no lines of less reward
Than such have fallen ere this Epoch
Day.

We wait a newer school in things of State,
Of joy in brotherhood and weal of men,
To lift the Human Life—put Love for hate;
Look ye—the writing on the wall again!

If e'er an hour outrolled within our ken,
When it were due to pause, one cometh
now—

And on apace—when o'er this world of
men

There broodeth thought of Peace, o'er
aching brow.

So be ye swift to take your fill of blood,
Then haste to wipe your blades, ere set
of sun;

For men implore that in more human mood,
The wide world o'er, the Century be be-
gun.

Mark not with stain of blood that sacred
hour—

At turn of Century-tide. This threshold
cross

With lowered lance. Show ye a mightier
power

That counteth war and spoils of war all
loss.

O ye who are the hope of this our day,
Who dominate world-thought—ye of our
tongue,

Defy not, but ally that we may say:
On Century-morn no battle-hymn be
sung.

WILLIAM HENRY LYNCH.
Ottawa, Canada.

Man is a dual creature—he has two
natures in one. He has a sensual side
and a spiritual side. He is half animal
and half angel. You cannot separate
the two halves without undoing him.
Without the sensual side man is a

ghost; without the spiritual side he
is an animal; yes, worse than an ani-
mal, for an animal is ruled by instinct
always, and man without a spiritual
side is unruly. It is the sensual side
overcoming the spiritual side that
makes one man want to own another.
It is that which creates struggles in
business and fires party strife. It is
that which has thrown our sister state,
Kentucky, into such a fearful condi-
tion. Perfect harmony of the spiritual
and sensual sides and the contrbl of
the latter by the former are necessary
for a good man.—Dr. H. W. Thomas.

"Most emphatically I am against
imperialism!" said the temperance
woman. "Why, just think; we are
sending to the Philippines twenty
times as much beer as we sent to
them when they were controlled by
Spain. That means we have increased
the rate of making drunkards of the
poor Filipinos twentyfold!"

"But, madam," ventured the suave
supporter of the administration, "is it
not better to dispose of our beer in
that way, even if it causes the intoxi-
cation of the ignorant and uncivilized
natives, than it would be to keep it at
home, tempting with the fiery liquid
our beloved and innocent children?"

G. T. E.

Originality consists in doing the sim-
plest possible things in the easiest pos-
sible ways. Everybody is naturally
original, if he keeps his eyes open for
what is true instead of hunting for
things that are not true. Every child
shows originality until that divine gift
is scared or pounded or laughed out of
him. The most blighting form of
selfishness is the desire to suppress
originality in somebody else, and trim
everybody down to the same pattern.
The most heroic form of unselfishness
consists in trusting other people to be
themselves and to live out their partic-
ular forms of originality.—The
Straight Edge.

Whatever may be the doctrine of
depravity, man loves his family, his
neighbors and his country. This love
makes society possible. We should
love our friends and neighbors and
country, but we should love the peo-
ple of every other race as we love our-
selves. There are indications of a
tendency not to value men of other
races as we value those of our own.—
Rev. Dr. Edward G. Andrews, of New
York.

"Let us look syllogistically at the
Puerto Rican tariff measure," cried the
eloquent stump speaker. "We all are
conversant with the politico-econom-

ical truism that 'the foreigner pays the tax.' Every one of us is possessed with the knowledge that neither we, nor our dear half brothers, the Puerto Ricans, are foreigners. What, then, is the conclusion, my dear friends, to be deduced from these premises? Is it not obvious that the administration has been falsely accused of imposing that tariff on the people of Puerto Rico? Do the traitors of this nation want more proof of their perfidy?" G. T. E.

When the preacher from the east took the church at Devil Mound
The impression he created gave him pleasure,
And the worshipers all thought in their parson they had found
What the worldly ones would call a "corking" treasure;
But his popularity wasn't very long to stand,
And he left his angry charge beneath a shadow
Just because he preached about what he called a better land
Than their own beloved, peerless Colorado.
—Denver Post.

"Were there many great men in the world, just prior to the Renaissance?" asked the reflective student.

"There was hardly one," replied the professor of history.

"I suppose, then," observed the reflective student, "that a man of even mediocre abilities would have been very conspicuous in those days?"

"Without doubt," answered the professor, "but why do you ask?"

"I need the information," said the reflective student, "for my essay entitled: 'Would McKinley have been Conspicuous?'" G. T. E.

Charles Bradlaugh, the English free-thinker, once engaged in a discussion with a dissenting minister. He insisted that the minister should answer a question by a simple "Yes" or "No," without any circumlocution, asserting that every question could be replied to in that manner.

The reverend gentleman rose and said: "Mr. Bradlaugh, will you allow me to ask you a question on those terms?"

"Certainly," said Bradlaugh.

"Then may I ask, have you given up beating your wife?"

This was a poser, for if he answered by "Yes," it would imply that he had previously beaten her, and if by "No," that he continued to do so.—Woman's Journal.

As one of the Salvation Army lasses was, some time ago, going round a northern town begging with her tambourine in her hand, she was accosted by a policeman. "De ye knaa what

ye're dein'?" said the man in authority. "Yes, I am begging." Policeman—"De ye knaa aa can lock ye up for that?" "Yes, but I'm begging for the Lord." "Weel, divvent de it agyen, or aa'll lock ye baith up!"—Newcastle (England) Weekly Chronicle.

"The society blue book," said the conscientious one, thoughtfully. "I should think it would be an irksome task to attempt to decide who should go in and who remain out. I suppose that the blue book editors take into consideration people's family and social position and worth."

"Not at all! They have a much simpler way of deciding who belongs to society."

"May I ask what?"

"They simply ask if one is able and willing to pay the price of the book." —Puck.

"Is this Bible the latest revised edition?" asked the imperialist.

"Yes, sir," replied the book agent, "you will notice that it has an appendix containing the business cards of all the prominent manufacturers of ordnance and armor plates." G. T. E.

Foreman (Weekly Hustler)—Hello! Here's the weather report in this morning's daily; says that a cold wave's coming. I saw that just in time. We are all ready to go to press, but we can just run that little announcement.

Editor—No; we just won't. This paper doesn't do any official advertising for the government. It's an anti-administration organ from the word Go!—Puck.

Keverage—You are certainly mistaken in your belief that your friend is an anti-imperialist. I heard him refer to Aguinaldo as a "usurper."

Mettigrew—He often makes that remark. He means that Aguinaldo has usurped our spirit of '76. G. T. E.

BOOK NOTICES.

"Morals and Socialism," by Charles H. Kerr, and "The Odd Trick," by Ernest Belfort Bax (Chicago: Charles H. Kerr), are two socialist leaflets under one pamphlet cover.

"Eight Years Among the Malays," by Paul Daxsel (Milwaukee: Paul Daxsel), is a story of the adventures in the wilds of Sumatra, among Malay tribes, of a former member of the Dutch colonial army. The book was written in the summer of 1897, and purports to be history and not fiction.

"People and Property" (The Abbey Press, 114 Fifth avenue, New York), a most attractive little volume, by Edwin B. Jennings, discusses in easy style the subject of wealth, under three heads—gaining, sharing and using. The conclusion to

which the author leads is a demand for "public ownership of public property."

In "Vaccine Virus, a Story of To-day" (Terre Haute, Ind.: Anti Vaccination Society of America), the editor of "Vaccination" makes his readers feel, not by the use of fervid rhetoric but by a plain story verified with quotations from medical authority, that vaccination is about as disgusting if not dangerous and useless an experience as one could expose himself to.

"Superstition," by Thomas Todd, B. A. (published by M. Cook, 257 1/2 Herbert st., St. Louis) gives a brief account of certain forms of ancient superstition, followed by an explanation of what it describes as "some forms of modern superstition." In the latter category it names fortune telling, palmistry, spiritualism, Christian Science and divine healing. All are assailed by Mr. Todd as in conflict with orthodox interpretations of the bible.

"The Rights of War and Peace," the preface to the great work of Hugo Grotius, "De Jure Belli et Pacis," is republished as No. 101 of the "Old South Leaflets," by the directors of the Old South Work, Old South Meetinghouse, Boston, Mass. The virtue of these leaflets is well described by Edwin D. Mead, who says that "they bring students into first-hand instead of second-hand touch with history." The leaflet named above, from the pen of the father of international law, is especially interesting and valuable at this time, when brute force is being appealed to as higher than moral law. Grotius taught the civilizing doctrine of right as against the barbaric doctrine of might.

"The British and Dutch in South Africa" (published at the request of the Victorian club, by James H. Stark, 31 Milk street, Boston), an address delivered by James H. Stark, purports to be "a collection of facts obtained from the most authentic sources, giving a true account of what caused the present war in South Africa," etc. It is in truth a portrait of the Boers by a Briton of the jingo persuasion. While the facts he records may be true, and are certainly of importance as revealing what a man of that type regards as a justification of the war, the pamphlet is notable more for the relevant facts it omits than for the more or less irrelevant ones it includes. Its wholesale omission of all allusion to the aggressive attitude of the British ministry, beginning with their notification that Great Britain would propose terms of her own for final settlement, and ending with the calling out of the reserves, all of which preceded the Boer ultimatum, is more suggestive of ingenuity and a discreet disposition than of a judicial mind.

With its issue for May 1, the "Dial" celebrated the twentieth anniversary of its publication. This literary review is without an equal in its field, even if published at Chicago instead of the effete east. While inferior to none of its contemporaries in judgment, it excels them all in typographical attractiveness and in the quality of human interest which its matter possesses. In the anniversary number is a collection of specially interesting and valuable essays. Francis F. Browne, the editor, writes of American publishing and publishers, and William Morton Payne discusses the characteristics of transatlantic literature during the past 20 years, while William P.

Trent performs a like service for American literature. The subject of American bookselling and booksellers is handled by John N. Dingman, and that of American periodicals by Henry Loomis Nelson. William H. Brett's contribution is on American libraries. The other principal topic of the number is "American Education," by B. A. Hinsdale. The "Dial" does not confine itself to literature. Though holding aloof from mere party politics, it never hesitates upon occasion to be even political in the larger sense of politics—that is, to use its own language, "when questions arise which touch the very principles upon which our civilization is based." And when it does discuss these questions it is in a spirit of democracy and with a tone of sincerity that are unusual in literary periodicals. The false notes of the hired-man editor are conspicuously lacking. The "Dial" is indeed what some periodicals only claim to be—"a journal of civilization."

Public Libraries and Reading Rooms which receive THE PUBLIC weekly:

Mobile, Ala., Ettel's Restaurant, 72 Dauphin St.
Mobile, Ala., Reading Room, Y. M. C. A. Bldg.
New Westminster, B. C., Public Library.
Berkeley, Cal., Public Library.
Pasadena, Cal., Public Library.
Colorado Springs, Col., Free Reading Room.
Como, Col., Reading Rooms.
Denver, Col., Public Library.
Wilmington, Del., Institute Free Library, 5th and Market Sts.
Wilmington, Del., Young Men's Single Tax Club, 4th and Shipley Sts.
Orlando, Fla., Direct-Legislation Reading Rooms.
Chicago, Ill., Reading Room Atlantic Hotel, cor. Van Buren and Sherman Sts.
Chicago, Ill., Six Branch Reading Rooms of Public Library.
Chicago, Ill., Y. M. C. A. Reading Room, Hyde Park.
Elgin, Ill., Gall Borden Public Library.
Elgin, Ill., Y. M. C. A. Library.
Geneva, Ill., Public Library.
Maywood, Ill., Public Library.
Normal, Ill., Public Reading Room.
Peoria, Ill., Public Library.
Muncie, Ind., Trades' Council Library.
Terre Haute, Ind., Reading Room of Central Labor Union.
Cedar Rapids, Ia., Public Library.
Des Moines, Ia., Public Library.
Sioux City, Ia., Public Library.
Atchison, Kan., Public Library.
New Orleans, La., Fisk Free Library.
Boston, Mass., Public Library.
New Bedford, Mass., Free Public Library.
Stoneham, Mass., Public Library.
Stoughton, Mass., Public Library.
Wakefield, Mass., Public Reading Room.
Worcester, Mass., Free Public Library.
Kalamazoo, Mich., Library of Kalamazoo College.
Minneapolis, Minn., Public Library.
Meridian, Miss., Reading Room, R. R. Y. M. C. A.
St. Louis, Mo., Free Reading Room of St. Stephen's House, 520 Rutger St.
St. Louis, Mo., Public Library.
St. Louis, Mo., Reading Room of Aschenbroedel Club, 604 Market St.
Helena, Mont., Public Library.
Newark, N. J., Free Public Library.
Albuquerque, N. M., Public Library.
Brooklyn, N. Y., Brooklyn Library.
Montague St.
Buffalo, N. Y., Public Library.
New York, N. Y., Manhattan Single Tax Club, 119 E 23d St.
New York, N. Y., Social Reform Club, 45 University Pl.
Riverhead, N. Y., Free Reading Room.
Syracuse, N. Y., Central Library.
Wyoming, N. Y., Free Library.
Fargo, N. D., Equal Suffrage Library.
Cincinnati, Ohio, Public Library.
Cleveland, Ohio, Case Library.
Newark, Ohio, Y. M. C. A. Reading Room.
Troy, Ohio, Public Library.

Youngstown, Ohio, Haselton Public Library.
Youngstown, Ohio, Hotel Radcliffe.
Youngstown, Ohio, Public Library.
Youngstown, Ohio, Y. M. C. A. Reading Room.
Portland, Ore., Y. M. C. A. Reading Room.
Allegheny, Pa., Carnegie Library.
Braddock, Pa., Carnegie Library.
Conemaugh, Pa., P. R. Y. M. C. A. Reading Room.
Du Bois, Pa., Y. M. C. A. Reading Room.
Homestead, Pa., Carnegie Library.
McKees Rocks, Pa., R. R. Reading Room Y. M. C. A.
Philadelphia, Pa., Economic Library, 1315 Filbert St.
Philadelphia, Pa., Free Reading Room of Henry George Club, 27 No. Juniper St.
Pittsburgh, Pa., Carnegie Library—Lawrenceville Branch, West End Branch and Wylie Ave. Branch.
Pittsburgh, Pa., Central Library.
Pittsburgh, Pa., Y. M. C. A. Reading Room, East Liberty Branch; Y. M. C. A. Reading Room, 43d and Butler Sts.; and Y. M. C. A. Reading Room, Penn Ave. and 7th St.
Reading, Pa., Library, 5th and Franklin Sts.
Wilmerding, Pa., Public Library.
Peacedale, R. I., Narragansett Library.
Providence, R. I., Public Library.
El Paso, Tex., Public Library, City Hall.
Seattle, Wash., Public Library.
Milwaukee, Wis., South Side Branch of Public Library.
Seattle, Wash., Y. M. C. A. Reading Room.

ATTORNEYS.

Chicago.

CHARLES A. BUTLER,
ATTORNEY AT LAW,
Suite 616, Ashland Block, CHICAGO.
Telephone, Main 7711.

HARRIS F. WILLIAMS,
ATTORNEY AT LAW,
306 Chamber of Commerce Building,
CHICAGO.

JOHNSON, McGRATH & WAAGE,
ALFRED T. JOHNSON,
JOHAN WAAGE, JAMES E. McGRATH.
LAWYERS,
SUITE 906 TACOMA BLDG. Telephone Main 3644.

NELLIE CARLIN,
ATTORNEY AT LAW,
1202 Ashland Block, Chicago.
Telephone Central 925.

Houston.

EWING & RING,
ATTORNEYS AND COUNSELLORS,
HOUSTON, TEXAS.
Presley K. Ewing. Henry F. Ring.

WE DON'T SELL OUR

CIGARS

FOR LESS THAN THEY ARE
WORTH. WE DON'T HAVE
TO. THEY ARE FULL VALUE,
NO MORE, NO LESS.

J. & B. MOOS,
95 Randolph Street, 58-64 Dearborn
Street, - - - CHICAGO, ILL.

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,
1401 Schiller Bldg., Chicago, Ill.

Post-office address:
THE PUBLIC, Box 687, Chicago, Ill.

Volume 2 of the Public

Complete Volumes, including Index,
Unbound, sent postpaid at Regular
Subscription price, \$1.00.

Bound Volumes. Price, \$2.00.
Express charges to be paid by consignee.

Address,
PUBLIC PUBLISHING CO., Box 687, Chicago.

To be "fixed for life" is desirable. Much more so to be "fixed for death." There is no temporal way for the latter better than life insurance. Consult

HENRY C. LIPPINCOTT,
Life Insurance Expert,
921 Chestnut Street,
Philadelphia.

OLD BOOKS! Any obtainable BOOK, PAMPHLET, or PERIODICAL, supplied.
Libraries, or small lots of Books bought
Catalog free upon application.
H. H. TIMBY, (Book Hunter)
P. O. Box 927. 731 1/2 Conneaut, Ohio

CHICAGO SINGLE TAX CLUB

MEETS EVERY FRIDAY EVENING
HANDEL HALL,
40 East Randolph Street, Second Floor.
Program for Friday, May 11th,
REV. FR. THOMAS E. COX,
Pastor of St. Jarlath Church,
"The Ethics of the Single Tax."