

them all anyway? Private monopoly must be extinguished.

Well, in all these respects the Democratic party must make up its judgments. Where it judges truly it will in the end see its motions prevail; and where it judges amiss it must expect the same course of rejection that has visited it aforesaid; sometimes deservedly, and sometimes because the people were too slow of comprehension.

Possibly the Republicans, having immediate power, may anticipate the Democrats in carrying out righteous and necessary policies. If they do, so much the better. Righteous motions should not be unwelcome to any Democrat, simply because they proceed from some other source. Possibly, while Republicans remain obdurately attached to present policies, the Democrats may equally fail to take up the vital changes necessary to salvation. In that case some new movement must inherit the vitality that lies in the right purposes thus put forward.

That is none of Bryan's business nor ours. It is the part of every man who perceives these things to be good, to urge them however he can upon whomsoever he can reach. Bryan enjoys a peculiar opportunity of setting forth his views before a large number.

In this much he is right, eternally right. Private monopoly must be extinguished. And he is doing a good work in laying before the people his views, and aiding in getting to a conclusion the means to be employed.—Goodhue County News of Nov. 19, 1904.

MAYOR JOHNSON'S WAY.

REFORMATION OR PUNISHMENT.

It will be remembered by the people of Cleveland what a fierce howl was sent up from various quarters when the humane treatment of workhouse prisoners was started by Director Cooley, backed by Mayor Johnson. The idea was new and it was thought that there was not enough punishment and vengeance being visited upon the poor unfortunates who are sent to our local penitentiary.

But the course went right on. All who were thought worthy, or who seemed likely to make an attempt at reformation were let go and the results have been more than could have been anticipated.

Now come forward the state board of charities and commend what has

been done by Johnson and Cooley. They say the system ought to be still further extended, that the parole system at the Mansfield reformatory has been found very beneficial and that it is the only way to bring about any desirable results with prisoners. They ought always to be paroled when they show indications of reformation and as soon as the reformation seems to be confirmed they ought to be pardoned.

Thus are we gradually emerging from darkness of the old sort of prison life into the better light and Cleveland has been one of the first to adopt the new way of doing, thanks to Mayor Johnson and Director Cooley.

The time ought to be near at hand when the jails shall not be nearly so crowded as at present. It will not be so profitable perhaps for sheriffs in Ohio towns who board the prisoners, but it will be much better for society.—Editorial in Cleveland Recorder of Nov. 16.

THE CITY SOLICITOR'S REFORMATION OF THE "SUNRISE" COURTS.

City Solicitor Baker yesterday afternoon expressed himself as generally satisfied, in discussing the workings of the municipal code in its dealings with his office, but more particularly that section which placed the police prosecutor's office under his jurisdiction. The question had been asked as to the operation of the plan, which has now been in force for a year and a half.

"In my judgment the consolidation of my office and that of the police prosecutor has proved an effective arrangement. Perhaps no part of the city's complicated and extensive business is more important or more delicate than the prosecution of the delinquent and unfortunate classes before its police magistrates.

"Two police courts are in daily session, dealing with arrests averaging perhaps 200 a day. The offenses charged vary from simple cases of intoxication, for which the offenders are arrested either to prevent disturbance or as a protection to the defendant against his own inability to take care of himself, to the preliminary hearings of persons charged with the gravest infractions of the laws of the State.

"The persons with whom the police prosecutor has to deal, aggregating in all perhaps 30,000 persons annually arrested, and at least an equal number of persons for whose arrest no warrant is ever issued, include the young and old, the corrigible and incorrigible, the fortunate and the vicious. The exercise of sound discrimination against the indiscriminate arrest and imprison-

ment of all violators of more or less petty, though necessary legal restrictions, is daily required, while vigilance is always necessary to secure the enforcement of the law and to bring about that respect for the rights and property of other people without which no organized society can exist in peace and safety.

"Through the co-operation of the judges of the police court, and the officers of the police department, my assistants in the prosecutor's office have been able, I believe, to install several substantial and beneficial reforms in its administration, the most notable of these being the so-called 'sunrise' court, by which the persons arrested for intoxication, and having no previous criminal record, are permitted to sign waivers of their right to be present when tried, coupled with the pleas of guilty, and, upon being sufficiently restored to be able to take care of themselves, to be released by the officers in charge of the several precinct stations, thus enabling the defendants to return to their places of employment without the humiliation of arraignment in the police court and association with the more or less hardened offenders.

"These waivers and pleas are presented regularly each morning in the police court, and, in the absence of any charge by the police officers of aggravating circumstances, the defendants are uniformly discharged.

"By this plan the self-respect of first offenders is so far saved that it affords a stimulus for better conduct, and the actual number of persons to be dealt with in police court is so reduced that more time is afforded for the examination of cases requiring more attention and care."—Cleveland Plain Dealer of Nov. 20.

PROBATIONARY MARRIAGE.

An extract from a private letter.

Those radical thinkers who advocate a temporary union before permanent marriage because of existing social prejudices, usually suggest a clandestine arrangement. A clandestine arrangement is not a true test of compatibility. Permanent living together means two people living under normal conditions, with the different interests of life more or less properly proportioned. These normal conditions involve social life, for man's highest function is to fill his place as a member of the social whole. The vital necessity of any partnership where comradeship is the aim, is the sharing of mutual sympathies and interests.

A clandestine partnership does not ad-

mit of a rational proportion between the life of personal affections and passions, and the active life of the two individuals functioning as members of society, with the broader relations this would make possible. Because of the necessity of hiding their relations, and the consequent exciting effect upon the passions, of the mystery thus involved, and because of lack of opportunity for mutual work together in their social world,—this secret relation assumes undue proportions and is not normal in its effects.

So it is not a fair test of married life, and any little reaction of one against the other easily results in an estrangement. The unduly close, or abnormally distant relations of the couple, of necessity, lead to magnification of annoying incidents, so that too great a demand is made on human self-control, just because there lack the thousand little daily bonds to weigh in the balance. It is impossible for two people to live together without some moments of estrangement, and mutual giving up and self-control is required, even in an ordinary friendship.

Then again, we are all inheritors of our past; no matter how much we may think we are emancipated from old traditions and beliefs, we are unconsciously influenced by them, and under certain circumstances easily revert to them as an excuse for our weak inability to live up to our advanced ideas. A man may think he believes in a "free woman," and yet, after the first enthusiasm of his affection has passed, he easily leaves her because his traditions do not sanction her actions and his inherited social conscience exonerates him from blame, as does his social world. It is easy for him to think that "legally" he owes her nothing, since he has been accustomed to measure right and wrong by civil law.

Moreover, the union of a man and woman only becomes absolutely complete and perfect when their oneness becomes incarnate in a child of their love. Then, too, the mutual self-sacrifice for the child gives a strong common interest, and creates sympathy between them in spite of some slight personal incompatibility. In our present society the reason for secrecy in probationary arrangements is to save the couple, or particularly the woman, from almost absolute social isolation, and in case marriage does not follow, to protect the woman from the future of a social outcast. The above facts demand that the couple forego this culminating and most chastening experience of life together, and so the probationary period is not a fair test. If we had a "free society," these objections would be removed, and a couple might work to-

gether openly and lead a normally balanced life. But granting this, if separation should take place after a child is born, what a wrong to the child, for no state, no impersonal protection (which of necessity becomes perfunctory in its duties), could make up to the human soul for the love and tenderness of father and mother. No one who loves, and who knows the needs of a little child, could for one moment bear the thought of a state rearing of children. If that means simply that the state bears the expense, while the mother nurtures and trains the child, the injustice would not be so great, but even then it would lose much from the lack of the father's influence, too. The parents ought to share the great responsibility of educating the human life which is a part of them both.

But, be society what it may, there is a deeper and unanswerable reason why temporary marriages are not best. Every true woman feels physically and spiritually bound to her first love (and there is natural law back of this); he is always enshrined in the holy of holies of her heart. She may pull the veil tight and almost forget the presence there; she may even love another honestly and live happily and usefully with him, but more often her whole life is bound up and limited by the first all-absorbing passion of her life.

We have only to interpret the evidence of great fictions and of history, to realize the truth of this. Certainly it has a meaning for the advocates of great freedom in love, if they will but see it. Though the fundamental objections to experimental marriages come from the point of view of the woman, since man is so often lacking in paternal instinct, and one might say, always lacking in the instinct of fidelity; yet a man can only reach a high development through consideration for the general good of individuals, and of society. If these are all militated against by probationary marriage, he should be willing to deny himself somewhat.

Men should remember that the ones to champion a cause are not those who lose nothing by it, and whose natural tendencies may even be indulged under its high-sounding mottoes. Any great movement for the general good must take its rise from those who have everything to lose personally, before we can feel that the cause is for the world's advancement. The saviors of society have ever found that they must lose their lives to save their souls. We are all our "brothers' keepers."

The young lawyer is a necessity but frequently, like necessity, he knows no law.—Philadelphia Record.

THE MIRSKY REGIME IN RUSSIA.

An editorial published in the Springfield Republican of November 25, 1904.

It would be by far too daring a parallel if one were to compare the first national assembling of the representatives of the zemstvos, or provincial assemblies, in Russia with the convening of the states-general of France in 1789, which was the initial step in the French revolution. The conditions in the two countries are not the same, and the Russian national assemblage of the representatives of the zemstvos will be by no means a body having the political and traditional status of the states-general of France. Yet, allowing for all important differences, it is impressive to note certain points of similarity in the two cases.

France had been ruled by a despotic monarch for generations when Louis XVI. found his government beset with grave difficulties, especially financial ones, and confronted by an increasing discontent and poverty of the people. All schemes for removing the embarrassments of the government and alleviating the burdens of the masses having failed, the king, as a last resort, convened the states-general, consisting of the representatives of the three estates, or orders of citizens, which had not been in session since 1618. The essential point for one to grasp is that after generations of absolutist rule, a break-down of autocratic government had taken place, and in that emergency the autocrat turned back to the representative idea of government, or to the people, for help in carrying on the state. When the states-general was convened, no one realized what the consequences would be; no one dreamed that within five years the autocratic monarch would have been displaced by a republic of a democratic type. The convening of the states-general came too late for an orderly period of change and reform; but that fact need not obscure the point that in its distress, under the unbearable burden of government, the autocracy was finally forced to stretch out its hands toward the people.

The political parallel between the France of Louis XVI. and Necker and the Russia of Nicholas II. and Prince Mirsky must be found, if at all, therefore, in the fact that in the later emergency and distress, if not the actual breakdown, of an autocratic government the despot again shows a tendency to turn toward the people. It is not necessary to exaggerate the difficulties of the present government of Russia: in view of its financial credit in inter-