

sentenced to imprisonment and fine. The imprisonment part of the sentences being served, one of them, having money or friends or confederates with money, pays his fine and is released. But the other, though no worse an offender than the first, yet having neither money nor friends or confederates with money, is for that reason alone compelled to serve further time in prison. In recommending pardons in cases of the latter class, Mr. Cooley is right. The sentence to pay a fine with imprisonment until paid is a relic of barbarism which no criminal judge should allow himself to perpetuate, and which the pardoning power everywhere should discourage. Criminal fines make a bald discrimination between poor convicts and those who are better off. Under this fining system the well-to-do thief lessens his imprisonment while the poor thief serves on; and the well-to-do drunkard pays his fine and escapes imprisonment, while the poor drunkard goes to the workhouse. Any crime for which imprisonment is imposed at all, should be punished regardless of the pecuniary ability of the culprit. And this wholesome rule ought no longer to be evaded by the prevalent system of imposing fines which offenders of the richer class can pay, while those of the poorer class, though they offend only in like manner, must work out in prison. It is encouraging to find a penal official in one of our large cities who, recognizing the true democratic principle in this matter, has the courage to put it in practice.

We do not pretend to pass critical judgment upon the merits of vaccination, though it is a practice which really does exhibit the usual earmarks of a medical superstition. But more than the merits of this dubious preventive of small pox are at stake, whenever and wherever vaccination is made compulsory by law. That invasion of private rights is something which cannot be defended. Few things could be more abhorrent than laws compelling healthy persons to

submit to surgical operations for the purpose of injecting foul and it may be dangerous animal matter into their blood. Voluntary vaccination is one thing; enforced vaccination is a very different thing. Yet cases are reported now and again which disclose the fact that this outrage upon individual rights is not infrequently committed. At this moment Sharon Hill, a suburb of Philadelphia, is excited over an attempt to compel universal vaccination on penalty of \$25 fine for each refusal.

It seems that in a codification of the borough laws of Pennsylvania a few years ago, the codifiers slipped in a clause authorizing borough boards of health "to enforce vaccination." Acting under this clause the board of health of Sharon Hill has made refusal to submit punishable by the heavy fine of \$25, and begun its crusade. One of the residents, Mr. A. C. Pleydell, with the assistance of several of his neighbors, and the aid of such contributions as sympathizers send him for legal expenses, is strenuously resisifying the board. He himself, according to the Philadelphia North American's report, suffered seriously for four years from the effects of poisonous vaccination. He consequently refuses to allow his healthy little girl to risk a like experience. So far Mr. Pleydell appears to have the best of the contest, but it is not yet at an end. One of its peculiarities is the fact that the autocratic and possibly dangerous power which the health board of this village of a thousand inhabitants asserts, cannot be exercised by the health board of the city of Philadelphia, only a mile away and in the same state.

We are glad to learn of one man whose antipathy to Negroes rests upon grounds which, however false in fact, are at least logical. In denying their human rights, he is not so illogical as to concede that they are human beings. We refer to Robert S. McCallen, St. Louis manager of the American Book and Bible house. Mr. McCallen was called as a juror

last week in a case in which a Negro woman was suing a St. Louis street car company for damages for injuries. Being examined as to his qualifications as a juror, Mr. McCallen was asked if he had any prejudices that might bias his judgment, and he replied that he had. He said he had a prejudice against the plaintiff, distinct and unalterable, not for any personal reasons, but solely because she was a Negro. This reply startled the judge, who propounded further questions and finally dismissed the Negro-hating juror; for in his replies Mr. McCallen said, we quote from the news report, that "he didn't believe the Negro was a human being any more than a dog or an ape."

Mr. McCallen is to be commended for his candor, and for the sturdiness with which he has made a logical foundation for what would otherwise be an utterly illogical race animosity. It is, perhaps, fairly due to Southerners to add that Mr. McCallen was formerly a Northern man. This may account for the rigidity of his logic. But his residence in St. Louis in pursuit of the book and bible business, must be held accountable for the luxuriance of his race prejudice. It was here he learned, as he explains in a book he is reported to have written, "The Negro a Beast," that the Negro cannot be human because he does not descend from Adam, who was the only representative of God. Mr. McCallen's logical processes appear to lose some of their rigidity at this point, for they assume that Adam was a white man; but his logical balance is completely recovered when he argues that—

if the negro and the human family both have souls the souls are all alike and the negro is your equal as far as souls are concerned; if he is your equal in spiritual things then he is your equal in everything.

To such a mind there was no alternative but to accord to the Negro the rights of manhood or else to deny his human nature. The generous Christian spirit and angular logical qualities of Mr. McCallen drove him to the latter conclusion. Nevertheless,