

The Public

First Year.

CHICAGO, SATURDAY, JUNE 4, 1898.

Number 9.

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.

Upon going to press last week we expressed an opinion, based upon the best information then obtainable, that the Spanish squadron under Cervera, which had dodged the American navy for ten days, was in the harbor of Santiago, and that unless Cervera surrendered his squadron would be compelled to remain there inactive during the rest of the war. The first part of this opinion was confirmed within the next three days by an official report from Commodore Schley. But at the present writing it appears unlikely that the Americans will be content with merely bottling up Cervera. It is altogether probable that a successful attack, preliminary to capturing or sinking his squadron, was made on the 31st, and that even as these lines go into type a continuation of that attack is in progress.

A story, for which, however, we cannot vouch, is told of Col. Watterson, of Louisville, Ky., to the effect that upon being asked by a friend to use his influence to obtain a commission in the army for the friend's civilian son, he declined with this explanation: "Two of my own sons are in the ranks, and I shan't use my influence to get commissions even for them." It is to be hoped that the story is true. And if it is true it ought to be given the widest circulation. Prominent examples of this kind are needed in times like these. They are needed in the first place to counteract the effect of military snobbery, by fostering a feeling among all classes that service in the ranks is as honorable as service in shoulder straps; in the second place, to discourage favoritism in military

appointments; and in the third to rebuke that form of selfishness which impels men to aspire to command their fellows who have offered up their lives for a cause, without having reason to believe in their own competency. The place in time of war for men who have not yet demonstrated their possession of military qualities, is in the ranks. If they there show fitness for promotion, it is the duty of those in authority—not for the sake of the men, but for the sake of the country—to see that the promotion is made. If that be not done, but "pulls" instead of merit control promotions, so much the worse for the country and its faithless upper servants. The attitude toward this matter with which Watterson is credited is calculated to create a sentiment against "pulls." Whether it does so or not, it at any rate has a tendency to raise the dignity of faithful service in the ranks, which is, after all, the most important consideration.

In these war days demands for a large standing army grow louder and more numerous. We are told that with 80,000,000 people we should have an army in proportion, fully equipped and always ready for the field. Had we maintained such an army heretofore, it is urged that the war with Spain would already have passed into history. This yearning for a large standing army comes from three sources. Young men in the veally stage are apt to want one because they are too thoughtless to realize the dangers to domestic liberties which are involved in the maintenance of large standing armies, and are ambitious to have their country recognized along with Russia and England and Germany as a "power." Men of great schemes looking to "expansion," who hope to enrich themselves if they

are civilians and to gain more rapid promotion if they are army or navy officers, are also to be counted among the advocates of a large standing army. But the most urgent appeals come from men who want to substitute a standing army for policemen and constables. Whatever the motive, however, or the pretense for establishing a large standing army, it is an innovation to be strenuously opposed. The latest argument for it is as flimsy as all the rest. We could have made but little quicker work in the war had we controlled a large standing army than we have done with hardly any standing army at all. Such delay as there has been was not caused by lack of troops but by lack of equipment. And, even as it is, we shall have an effective army in the field quite as soon as it can be advantageously used. It is not for any general good that a large standing army is being urged upon us.

If the militia of the several states had been properly organized and equipped, as a force of citizen soldiery instead of a collection of social clubs in military uniform, we should have been able to mobilize a well drilled, well equipped and unconquerable army within ten days after the first call for troops. What do we mean by a force of citizen soldiery? We refer in principle to that kind of militia system which was early adopted by the states, but was never properly organized or maintained. Every able-bodied man should be required during a certain period of his life to serve as a militiaman with the same regularity and in much the same manner that members of well disciplined national guard regiments now serve. If that were done, and this militia were properly equipped, we should have a military force at command in any emergency.

which would have cost us but a trifle in comparison with the amount necessary to maintain a large standing army, which could be brought into the field upon a day's notice, which would quickly make a better fighting force than any standing army that had not been furnished with frequent wars for practice, and which meanwhile would neither be an influence for war nor an instrument of tyranny. Such a system, held up to a high standard, is the solution of the military question for a democratic people. It is only autocratic governments, or governments that are ambitious to become autocratic, that need large standing armies.

When William J. Bryan offered his services to President McKinley in any military capacity in which the president might think him useful, he indicated the disinterestedness of his patriotism; and he proved it when, his offer to the president having been ignored, he enlisted as a private among the volunteers from his state. The president's action in the matter, however, is not to be condemned. He could not have offered Mr. Bryan a position of low grade, or suggested that he enlist as a private, without seeming, however unintentionally, to intend an insult to a political adversary with a following of only 600,000 less voters than his own in a total of 14,000,000. Neither could Mr. McKinley properly have offered him a position of military responsibility in anywise corresponding to his political standing without jeopardizing the interests of the service; for Mr. Bryan was deficient in military education and experience. But the president in ignoring Mr. Bryan's offer, would have appeared less ungracious had he not at the same time appointed to military positions of importance so many civilians whose military education and experience were no better than Mr. Bryan's.

The action of the Universal Peace Union in sending a letter of sympathy to the queen regent of Spain cannot

but grieve every member and friend of that society who is not a mere apologist for tyrannical government. The American authorities were right in refusing to allow the letter to go through the mails; and the president of the society exposed his personal partisanship in behalf of the Spanish government when he boasted of having sent it through other channels. It is one thing to stand up for peace under all circumstances and at any cost, and those who do so in sincerity and without partisanship are worthy of all possible consideration. Loyalty to unpopular principles is not such a drug in the American market that we can afford even to sneer at those who genuinely possess it. But sympathy with the Spanish government in connection with the Cuban question is quite a different thing from loyalty to peace principles. A peace man may condemn the United States for making war upon Spain in behalf of Cuba, without thereby in any wise approving Spanish government in Cuba or in the slightest degree withholding generous sympathy from the outraged Cubans; but he cannot communicate to the Spanish government such sentiments as those which were embodied in the Peace Union's letter to the queen without approving Spanish government in Cuba and in effect condemning the Cubans for resisting it. That letter was not a peace letter. It was a war letter—a letter which appears to have been intended, and certainly could only have had the effect of encouraging Spain to maintain her tyrannical grasp upon Cuba, and to resist the offers of the United States to establish freedom there. From the point of view of a sincere peace advocate—a peace advocate as distinguished from a Spanish sympathizer—it should be as much the duty of Spain to prefer withdrawal from Cuba to war, as of the United States to prefer Spanish tyranny in Cuba to war. This was not the point of view of the Peace Union's letter. Its point of view was distinctly that of unadulterated sympathy with Spain. The Philadelphia councils, therefore,

acted wisely in cancelling the privileges of the authors of the letter to occupy Independence Hall. And unless the Peace Union repudiates this letter which its president says he has smuggled into the palace at Madrid, it will deserve that withdrawal, which it will assuredly experience, of public confidence in its sincerity as an instrument for promoting peace.

From a source commanding our respect we are in receipt of a letter the burden of which is that this country ought to retain any territory which the fortunes of war may bring into its possession. In support of its position the letter argues that in that way the area of real free commerce would be extended, which would more than counterbalance any evils growing out of race questions; and it urges that by bringing the natives of the conquered territory into our Union and giving them all the rights which we ourselves enjoy, we should be doing them no wrong. Then, as to Cuba, the letter recalls that we have made no contract to establish there a separate government, our obligation being only to establish a "stable" government. And it insists that as all Cubans would have a right to a voice in the settlement of the affairs of the island, and a large proportion are too illiterate to be trusted with that right, a full generation under the advantages of schools must pass before our forces should be withdrawn. This is described as a condition which would be equivalent to full possession on our part. While admitting that there is much to be said on both sides, the letter finally asks if it is not best to take possession of Cuba, Puerto Rico, Hawaii, and the Philippines, and as soon as possible to admit them as states into the American Union; and it takes positive ground in favor of doing so, as a means of more certainly bringing on the Parliament of Man.

For ourselves, we feel constrained strenuously to oppose any such policy. Let it be remembered, in the first place, that the admission of con-

quered territory into the federal Union is not contemplated by those who advocate its retention. We shall not have the choice of making conquered islands states in the Union or of withdrawing from them. Our choice will be either to withdraw, or to enter upon a career like that of Great Britain in India. Precedents to justify such a policy are not lacking; but from the conquest of Peru to the spoliation of India, and on down even to the partition of Africa, they are precedents which put our so-called Christian civilization to shame. Give this policy any pretty name you please—"expansion," or what not—it is nevertheless a policy of outrage and plunder.

But even if this country were to have the choice of admitting into the Union, Cuba and the other islands mentioned in the letter to which we have referred, it would have no right to retain possession unless the people whose liberties were involved gave reasonable indications of their desire that we should do so. The theory that we have a right to force even so good a thing as American intra-territorial free trade upon people who don't want it, is unsound. Every people must decide for themselves upon the kind of liberty and the measure of liberty that they will have. That is their right. Any attempt to force conditions upon them, though better conditions than their own, injures not only them but those who engage in the coercion. The British occupation of India, for example, and the British conquest of Ireland, have operated to the injury of the British as well as of the Hindoos and the Irish. This is a law of human progress.

So much for what "practical" people may regard as the sentimental end of the question. As to the practical end, we cannot bring Cuba, Puerto Rico, the Hawaiian and the Philippine Islands into the American Union, either as states or dependencies or conquered provinces, without, like England, so gorging our nation with

outlying territory as to make it a prey to warlike nations, unless we also put on full armor and become a warlike nation ourselves. Expansion, even with the consent of the people over whom we expand, would involve the establishment of a great navy, a large standing army, an aggressive foreign policy, frequent wars, and the erosion of the liberties of our own people. Expansion and Jingoism are fellow adventurers whom it behooves America to shun.

Aside from all other considerations, so far as Cuba is concerned in the matter, we are under the most solemn obligations, upon expelling Spain, to leave the Cubans free to establish their own government in their own way. Two years ago, both houses of our congress by overwhelming majorities recognized the independence of the Republic of Cuba, that republic of which Maso is now the president and Gomez the commander in the field; and before entering upon the war with Spain we made the independence of Cuba our ultimatum. To retain possession of it, then, after having driven Spain out, would be a lasting disgrace. When we shall have relieved the Cubans of their brutal tyrants from across the Atlantic, we shall have nothing to do, in good morals and good sense, but to leave the island to its own people. If after that they should petition for admission to the Union, the question of receiving them would be properly before us for decision. Until then we shall have no more right to take Cuba to ourselves than we should have to take Mexico.

Preliminary to the discussion of the justifiableness of the war, in the 4th issue of *The Public* we classified all honest views of the subject as follows: Those of the peace man absolute; those of the ideal anarchist; those of the "patriot" who is for his country right or wrong; and those of men who, believing in government and that the war-making power is a function of government, have a greater horror of some things which cannot be put aside without war than they have of war it-

self, though their horror of war is as great as anyone's. To this classification it has been objected that it omits one point of view which deserves mention: "There are some folks in this neighborhood," says a Philadelphia objector, "who . . . hold that in order to preserve self-existence, wars for defense may be at times necessary, but that government being supported by those having a common interest goes outside of its true function when it uses the public funds to carry on a humanitarian or any other movement outside of the sphere of its taxing power, even though such a movement is concurred in by a majority of its citizens." Our Philadelphia critic concludes: "According to this view, no matter how great the provocation of the Cubans to resist the tyranny of the Spaniards, our government commits a virtual aggression upon its citizens when it uses the common treasury for the benefit of any outside people." The criticism, though acute, does not impress us deeply. According to the principle our critic lays down, all expenditures of common funds for extra-territorial purposes, without unanimous consent, are aggressions. Nothing is gained in the argument by his limitation of the objection to humanitarian matters. A humanitarian expenditure of common funds abroad, no less than any other foreign expenditure of such funds, may be for the common good at home; and whether it is or not, is a question not of fundamental rights but of administration, the decision of which can be denied to majorities only upon the basis of the anarchistic theory. If every public expenditure requires the individual consent of all who are interested in the common fund, anarchists are right in holding that no common action at all can rightly be taken without the individual consent of all who engage in it. For these reasons we regard the Philadelphia view to which our correspondent calls attention as having been included in our original classification, among the views of the ideal anarchist.

If, however, it be granted that our original classification was properly open to the criticism summarized above, the expenditure of common funds for the prosecution of the present war may be justified upon the additional principle which our Philadelphia friend interposes. He agrees that war for defense may at times be necessary. Ideal anarchists would agree to the same thing. But where he may properly claim to part company with the ideal anarchist is as to the use of common funds. He admits that for the maintenance of a war for defense, common funds may be used against the will of the minority. He does this upon the ground that the minority have a common interest with the majority in being defended. But what constitutes defense? Are invasions of foreign territory always incompatible with it? Must we wait until the enemy gives us a death blow before we strike in self-defense? Suppose continental Europe, led on by autocratic Russia, should deliberately set out to subjugate comparatively democratic England, and a majority of the American people believed that if England were thus subjugated our own country would be the next victim, would not a majority of our citizens then have a right to spend our common funds in defense of England? Would not such a war on our part be a war for defense as truly as if the subjugating armies of Europe were already landing troops upon our shores? The illustration is pertinent. Whoever reads the story of our neighbors in Cuba during the past three years must feel that the continuance of Spanish government there is hostile to the democratic governments of this hemisphere, our own included, and that our expulsion of Spain is legitimately within the limits of self-defense. This feeling may be a mistaken one, yet if it has impelled a majority of the people of this country to make war for Spain's expulsion, they have a right, upon the self-defense principle which our critic concedes, to expend common funds in prosecuting that war.

In a speech delivered two weeks ago before the Merchants' association of Fitchburg, Mass., C. B. Fillebrown, a prominent merchant of Boston, spoke hopefully of the early adoption by the state of Massachusetts of the principle of local option in taxation—that is, of allowing counties and municipalities to select their own methods. This principle is evidently meeting with great favor throughout the country, as it should do, for it is both just and sensible, and is in conformity with the American idea of home rule. Under local option in taxation each county and municipality might levy all its taxes upon personal property if the voters preferred that method, or upon real estate, or upon land values according to the Henry George plan, exempting personal property and improvements, or upon all three kinds of property—personalty, landed improvements, and land. It would be a question of local choice, as such matters ought to be. How the choice would be exercised in country places it is not difficult to infer when some of the figures which Mr. Fillebrown presented to his audience are considered. He showed that under the land value tax of Henry George, cities would pay higher taxes and country places lower ones than now. The figures on this point are interesting as well as instructive. It appears from them that 32 Massachusetts cities which now pay less than 67 per cent. of the state taxation, would, under the land value tax, pay almost 78 per cent.; while 50 country towns or townships now paying over 13 per cent. would pay less than 8, and 253 other country towns or townships now paying over 16 per cent. would pay less than 10. These figures should be studied by those befooled farmers who imagine that a tax on land values would make tax burdens lighter on cities and heavier on country places.

President McKinley's proclamation of reciprocity between the United States and France, which went into operation on the 1st, gives to these two countries a small measure of mu-

tual free trade. More accurately, perhaps, it is a small measure of freer trade. Yet reciprocity is a protection decree! It proceeds upon the upside-down theory that the impulse to trade comes from the seller instead of the buyer. This theory is upside down because no man really buys in order to sell; he sells in order to buy. The desire to buy lies beneath and supports all trade. Yet reciprocityites, like territorial expansionists, assume that what lies beneath trade is the desire to sell. Accordingly, if we use our relations with France for illustration, American reciprocityites first make a tariff to prevent Frenchmen from selling in this country, while Frenchmen of the same ilk make a tariff to prevent our selling in France; and then each side, relying upon the false notion that the primary impulse of mankind is not to buy but to sell, hopes by these restrictions to force the other to lessen the obstacles that he has erected against selling. Neither gives any consideration whatever to the desire to buy. France agrees, for instance, that if we will allow her manufacturers of brandy to sell it a little more freely here, she will allow our manufacturers of canned meats to sell them a little more freely there. That is reciprocity. It is an upside-down, hind side before, inside out sort of system.

Since mankind's desire to sell takes its rise in their desire to buy, without which it would not exist at all, the true way of stimulating trade is for each country to make it easier for its own people to buy, instead of trying to induce the other country to make it easier for them to sell. If they could buy easily they could sell easily. Of course, reciprocity with France, for example, does make it easier for our people to buy from France. But that is only an incidental result of reciprocity, the object of which is not to help our people to buy, but to help them to sell. It aims at freer trade, but does so as some variety performers aim at a mark—with their backs toward it and by means of a looking

glass. Reciprocity suggests the noodle story of the men who, having built a temple without windows, tried to carry light into it in their hats. Had they made windows, the light would have carried itself in. Thus it is that our reciprocityites build a trade wall around their own country, and then try to bring trade into it in reciprocity hatfuls.

The report of the special committee of the Massachusetts legislature on the relations between cities and towns and street railway companies, is as timid as such reports usually, and perhaps wisely, are; but it does give the sanction of its approval to a principle of street railroad control which has in it the germs of a sound system. This principle contemplates the ownership by the municipality of the whole surface of its streets, whether paved with iron rails or other material, and the leasing to private companies of exclusive rights to run vehicles over prescribed routes. Essentially the principle discriminates between public and private functions, by placing the management of highways in the hands of the government—or, rather, keeping it there, for no one acquires highway rights without a grant—and leaving their use to private companies and individuals to the fullest possible extent.

What the limitations upon that use might be may not be determined now. Common pavements may be used freely. They do not necessitate a monopoly of use. And it may be that a system is possible under which rail tracks could be used in the same way—different transporters using the same track under time table provisions. If that could be done, the ideal system would be one under which the municipality would provide the tracks, and cars would be run competitively by transporters as trucks are run now on common pavements. But if that cannot be done, the lessees of street tracks would acquire highway monopolies which must be held in check by the terms of leasing.

Either this, or the municipalities themselves must operate street cars as well as control street car tracks. The one great desideratum is to eliminate the element of monopoly from street car transportation. A long stride toward doing this will have been taken when the recommendations of the Massachusetts committee—of which, by the way, Charles Francis Adams was chairman—shall have been put into practical operation. The resumption of public ownership of public highways is the first important step in the reform of street monopolies.

On the subject of the distribution of wealth, the Financial Reform Almanack for 1899 will contain some valuable information from British statistics. The "total net capital value of all real and personal property in the United Kingdom for the year ending March 31st, 1897," as shown by the fortieth report of the British inland revenue department and the British statistical abstract for 1897, has been compared with the population, by J. W. S. Callie, editor of the Almanack, with astonishing results. In the light of this comparison, Edward Atkinson's assertion that "the laborer is getting an increasing share of an increasing product," requires revision. In one of his tables, Mr. Callie divides the population of the kingdom into three classes, distinguished as A, B, C, and D, and specifies the number of persons in each class, together with the net value of the real and personal property they own. In class A he puts 14,751 persons; in class B, 185,364; in class C, 2,800,950, and in class D, 36,463,517. Classes A and B, the smallest in number, are the richest in property. And what a vast proportion of the wealth of the United Kingdom this small proportion of its population owns! Though numbering only 200,115 persons and constituting only 51-100ths of one per cent. of the population, these two classes own £8,879,169,527 worth of real estate and personal property, or more than 70 per cent. of the total

value. Over against this superabundance, Mr. Callie sets the figures as to the wealth of Class D, which numbers 36,463,517 persons and constitutes more than 92 per cent. of the population. It owns only £39,039,478 worth of real and personal property, or but 31-100ths of one per cent. of the total value.

The foregoing figures are too important to be buried in text: Let us tabulate them, so that the eye may take in their awful significance at a glance. For greater simplicity and emphasis we give in the table only the percentages. Here they are:

	Population.	Wealth.
Classes A and B..	0.51	70.06
Class D.....	92.40	0.31

Does anyone believe in his heart that the two hundred thousand persons who are thus shown to own over 70 per cent. of the wealth of England, have earned that wealth in the sweat of their faces—or of their brains, if you please? and that the thirty-six millions who own only 31-100ths of one per cent., have received all their earnings? Yet that is the crucial question. It makes little difference how rich a man is or how poor, provided if he be rich he has earned his wealth or if he be poor he nevertheless has received all he has earned. The question suggested by Mr. Callie's figures is fundamentally not one of relative wealth and poverty, but of social honesty. It is simply unbelievable that 200,115 people should own 70 per cent. of the wealth of the United Kingdom, while 36,463,517 people in the same kingdom own only 0.31 per cent.—unless the 200,115 have a large share of the wealth that the 36,463,517 have earned. Either Mr. Callie's figures are grossly wrong, or the distribution of wealth in the United Kingdom is grossly wrong. But Mr. Callie's figures are official.

The Albany Law Journal takes sensible ground on the question of dissenting opinions in law suits. It has been contended that a court decision should be the decision of the court and not of the judges as individuals,

and that when a question is settled by the highest tribunal it should remain settled for all time, a desideratum with the realization of which impressive dissenting opinions tend to interfere. To this contention the Albany Law Journal replies that whether a question settled by the highest tribunal should remain settled for all time depends upon whether it is settled right. That is good lay doctrine; and we are glad to find it good law doctrine also.

Appellate courts have two functions. One is to decide each case with the nearest approximation to justice. The other is to discover true principles of law. In the exercise of the first function, the opinion of a minority of a court is of no importance. When the majority have finally decided the particular case their decision must constitute the decision of the court, and the publication of a dissenting opinion can, in connection with that function, have little other use than to satisfy the defeated party that his lawyers were not altogether fools. But in the exercise of the second function of appellate courts, the opinion of the minority of the judges may, in the long run, be more important than that of the majority.

In a search for true principles of law, the judges of appellate courts have peculiar advantages. The facts in the cases they hear are presented calmly. As a rule, the verdict of the jury as to those facts is conclusive, so that for all the purposes of the appellate court the facts are not open to dispute. The question is: What, upon these conceded facts, is the law? There is, therefore, no confusion in formulating the legal proposition. Moreover, appellate judges enjoy the benefit not only of their own education and experience, but also of that of advocates having the strongest motives for presenting the best conceivable arguments for each side. After that an argument must be written by at least one of the judges, giving the reasons for taking one view or another of the case under consideration

—an exercise calculated to test the correctness of his view. This argument—the opinion of the majority of the judges—though of no real importance to the parties to the law suit, is of great importance in assisting lawyers, judges, text book writers and the public in the future to see whether or not an advance has been made by the courts in unfolding true legal principles. And for that purpose a dissenting opinion may be quite as valuable—it may be even more valuable. A dissenting judge has all the opportunities for discovering what is sound that his associates have, and if he gives better reasons for holding that they are wrong than they give for their decision, his opinion will contribute more than theirs to the ultimate discovery of good law. In the interest, therefore, of sound principles of jurisprudence, dissenting opinions should be encouraged. As the Albany Law Journal says, a law question once settled should not remain settled for all time unless it is settled right. But there is a reasonable presumption that no law question is settled right so long as impressive dissenting opinions are possible.

PLUTOCRATIC PATRIOTISM.

Inasmuch as we expected from the first to have more or less to say in *The Public* about plutocrats and plutocracy, we were at the pains in the first number to explain the meaning of those terms. This seemed to be necessary, because there are people who, imagining that plutocrat means a rich man, resent reflections upon plutocracy as indiscriminate libels upon the rich. In making our explanation we said:

Rich men are not necessarily plutocrats. Very often they are on the contrary genuine democrats. Very often, too, the most pronounced plutocrats are poor. He is a plutocrat who, be he rich or poor, sets up wealth as the test of respectability and the insignia of industrial or political authority—that is to say, who favors government by or for the rich. Goldsmith hit off plutocracy when he wrote:

Laws grind the poor, and rich men rule the law.

What we mean, therefore, by plutocratic influences, is influences which make for the elevation of the rich to industrial or political mastership.

In other words, plutocracy is not a financial condition; it is a mental state. The same idea is expressed by John E. Ellam, an English writer, in these verses:

What is a plutocrat? One who hath sold
His body and soul to the devil for gold;
Who, called by his conscience to choose
in the matter
Of Man or of Mammon, hath chosen the
latter.

With this understanding of what plutocracy means, it is easy to see that not a little of the American patriotism of the time is plutocratic patriotism. Of that order is much of the patriotic talk about America's entering upon a career of expansion, but the phase of plutocratic patriotism to which we wish at this moment especially to draw attention is that which relates to the raising of funds for carrying on the war.

Though there was no necessity for immediate action, the lower house of congress rushed through a war revenue bill which had been prepared in secret by the majority of the committee. No opportunity was given the minority to advise in its preparation, and when the bill came into the house scant time was allowed for debate and every attempt to alter the secret work of the majority of the committee in any important particular was voted down without consideration. The bill was put through its paces under the cry of patriotism. Whoever criticised it was denounced as unpatriotic, and those republicans and populists who with most of the democrats finally voted against it have ever since been held up to public scorn as if they were traitors. The senate has not been so easily influenced as was the house. In that body the bill has been deliberately considered, in spite of the outcry against senators for lack of patriotism; but the outcry of the self-styled "patriots" is so persistent that he must be a man of great courage who can wholly withstand its influence.

Now what kind of patriotism is it that thus intimidates the law-making power of the nation? An examina-

tion of the bill in behalf of which this patriotic outburst is made will answer the question. It is plutocratic patriotism.

The bill has two principal features: the tax feature and the bond feature. It proposes to raise the war fund by taxes which are expected to yield \$100,000,000 a year, and from the sale of interest bearing bonds to the amount of \$600,000,000. In both aspects, the bill is plutocratic. It is a scheme for placing the financial burdens of the war upon the masses of the people. It is drawn according to the ideals of those who favor government by and for the rich.

The taxation features of the bill are contrived upon the principles of indirect taxation, principles which contemplate the taking of money from the masses of the people without letting them know that pay it. When the masses were voiceless and powerless, the aristocracy unblushingly fleeced them by direct taxation. No pains were taken then to make them believe that the rich paid the taxes while they went free. They were bluntly told that it was their duty to pay the taxes while the rich went free. When the people got voice and put an end to this bold plundering, indirect taxation was adopted. By that means the poor were made to pay the taxes much as before, but they were fooled into the belief that they paid no taxes at all. A French statesman highly commended this system as a grand method of picking geese so as to get the most feathers with the least squawking. Could anything be more infamous? Yet it is the system of the war revenue bill, every objection to which is denounced as unpatriotic.

By taxing beer, this bill appears to tax brewers; but the brewers have already raised the price of beer, and the tax will be paid by beer consumers. By taxing cigars, it appears to tax cigar manufacturers, but every sane man who stops to think knows that the tax will be paid by smokers; and as there is but little difference between the tax on cheap cigars and that on expensive cigars, rich smokers will pay the least proportion of the tax. It is precisely so with pretty much all the taxes of this extremely patriotic bill.

That the burdens of war taxation

are thus to be cast chiefly upon the poor is well understood by plutocratic patriots. For example, the Chicago Tribune, a leading light in plutocratic patriotism, was recently discussing the proposed tonnage tax, and by way of defending it said:

But other ship owners are of the more sensible opinion that the extra dues will be added in good part to the freight rates, so that the customers of the carriers and not the carriers themselves will pay the tax ultimately.

Here is a distinct admission that taxes of this class are shifted from the persons who are ostensibly taxed, to the consumers of their goods. Yet the bill under which that is to be done is so sacred that it is treason to oppose it!

The extent to which that extraordinarily patriotic bill would favor the rich is summed up by Thomas G. Shearman in The Outlook for May 7th, on page 19. Mr. Shearman says:

Upon the whole, the burden of the new taxes will probably be divided in the proportion of ten per cent. upon the principal owners of invested wealth, 30 per cent. upon the middle class, who have some wealth but still mainly depend upon their earnings, and 60 per cent. upon those who depend exclusively upon their daily earnings.

Thus 90 per cent. of the war tax is to be put upon the middle and working classes, and only 10 per cent. upon the idle owners of invested wealth; and that by a bill which must not be opposed, under penalty of denunciation for treason. What kind of patriotism is it that defends such a measure, if it be not plutocratic?

But the bill in question does not stop with unjust indirect taxation. Its other feature, that with respect to the proposed bond issue, is even more plutocratic if possible than the tax feature. The interest on the bonds would be paid by means of indirect taxation—that is to say, in greatest proportion by the middle and the working classes, and in least proportion by the rich—and the principal, if paid at all, would be paid in the same way. But it is not intended that the principal shall be paid. What is aimed at is to perpetuate the public debt as a means of investment for the idle or worse than idle rich. The bond feature, then, would not only create a large and perpetual interest

burden to be paid in greatest proportion by the middle and working classes, but would create it for the benefit of the rich. Yet this bill we are told is patriotic! Yet the men who oppose it we are told are unpatriotic! In other words, antagonism to the unjust interests of the rich is treason to the country. What is that but plutocratic patriotism?

Is it said that there is no other way of raising a war fund than by taxing the middle and working classes for 90 per cent. of the amount, and stacking up a public debt as a basis for investment? That there is no other way without burdening unearned wealth, we freely concede. But why should unearned wealth be virtually exempt from war burdens? Why should it not pay them all? If Mammoth does the fighting, surely Mammoth might be made to foot the bill. And it could and would be made to do so if plutocratic patriotism were supplanted by patriotism of the right sort.

SPIRITUAL AND ECONOMIC LAW.

No one patiently disentangles the threads of social problems for long without discovering that the web of which they are a part does not end upon the earth where we find its beginning. Sooner or later the seeker finds that he is led to spiritual relationships and eternal laws. But because so much of our traditional teaching of religious things has been sentimental and pietistic, and because of the inherent difficulty of finding words in our natural language to give adequate impression of spiritual perceptions, he who has found that a new religious world within and back of the economic world has opened to his vision, must nevertheless oftenest content himself with vague perceptions, rather than with manifest reasons, and with visions rather than with the eternal realities.

So far as we know, no one has more perfectly bridged the gulf between economics and spiritual law than James E. Mills, whose paper on "The Two Great Commandments in Economics" has been published as a supplement to that excellent little periodical, The New Earth, and may be had of the editors of The New Earth, 540 Pearl street, New York.

Step by step, in the most logical fashion, Mr. Mills carries us from spiritual law to natural law, and then back to spiritual law.

To the following all will agree who believe in the two great commandments—love of God and love of man; but we warn them that Mr. Mills means actual law of life, and not sentimental devotion to persons.

The law of love, both love to God and love to man, finds its chief ultimate expression, and the basis on which it rests, and the means by which it comes into real existence, in service of man to man.

The law of service is the very organic law of society.

The industrial system, by far the grandest of all organizations of groups of men, embracing all peoples, except perhaps some of the most degraded savages, in an inconceivably vast and complete system of service and exchange of service, absorbing the greater part of the mental and physical activity of the race, is organized by the law of service. Whatever motive of worldliness or selfishness may impel the actors in this world-wide drama, its movements, from the very necessities of existence, fall into the rhythm of the law of service:

This law of service is therefore a basis upon which can be built up the life of the second great commandment.

So far as the vast system of service is true to the intrinsic law of its being, it is a training for love to the neighbor. It would make the school of life on earth the school of love. Its welcome to the youth would be the welcome of God to share with him the love of serving which is the motive power of creation, and the welcome of the world's best manhood to happy comradeship in doing the world's work. From the enthusiasm of boyhood through love of sweetheart and wife and children, and desire for fellowship and good standing with men, it would lead him to delight in doing his share of the world's work, and this is birth from above. Alone it could not indeed accomplish such changes. Environment alone cannot reach so far into the depths of character; but it would act in entire harmony with revealed truth, for it is meant to be itself the law of love in ultimate effect. It is the outer world where the new-born love of service first draws breath, and where it waxes strong and grows to the stature of spiritual manhood.

To him who has caught glimpses of the spiritual meaning and intent of

this law, what can be more astounding than its failure of its purpose? Yet

the world is resounding with the story of the wrongs and the miseries which the failure entails upon the workers, of human minds dwarfed and distorted, and human hearts hardened, of manhood robbed of honesty and womanhood of purity, of a mad scramble for wealth to escape the perils of poverty which no honest industry can confront with reasonable confidence of success.

The economist knows that the cause of the failure is "in the distribution of the products of labor, or the distribution of service among men;" and it seems easy to formulate the law that "service, and service only, entitles a man in normal conditions to share in the service of other men."

Then we come by straight and hard logic to the evil that is the antithesis of the good of service: "The wrong is privilege, or the ability conferred by law or custom upon some men or classes of men to secure the service of other men without rendering adequate service in return."

Through just as logical a sequence does Mr. Mills lead us from the spiritual relation of man to God—which lies back of and within the relation to the neighbor—to its natural expression in natural human rights, and to the especial wrong which thwarts those rights, which he thus states:

The principal privilege which so perverts the industrial system of the world, and robs it of its power to confer its highest blessings, and sickens it with injustice and misery, must lie near to the heart of the system. It must be some breach, not only of the law of service, or the second great commandment, but also of the law of relations of God to man, or the first great commandment. It is one that disturbs the relations of man to God and to the earth on which God has placed him and to his fellow-man. This privilege is the private and exclusive ownership of land, the monopoly by some men of the earth, which is the gift of God to all men.

Then in closing the author clearly and reasonably sets forth the only means for overcoming these disorderly conditions which he has shown us are more harmful to the development of the social, and consequently the individual spiritual life, than they are even injurious to our economic life.

To all who are seeking for the

higher laws which they feel must be in correspondence with fundamental natural law, we recommend this remarkable essay.

NEWS

Though the forts at the entrance to Santiago harbor were bombarded on the 31st by Com. Schley, no sufficient and trustworthy news has been received as we go to press upon which to base a definite report of the war situation in the West Indies.

On the 25th, when The Public went to press, though rumors were abundant, there was no trustworthy news as to the location of the American squadron nor as to that of the Spanish fleet under Cervera. The latter was supposed to be in the harbor of Santiago de Cuba, but it was uncertain. This indefiniteness continued for nearly a week. On the 26th it was reported from Madrid through censored channels that the general impression there was that Cervera had left Santiago. There was a definite report on the same day to the effect that the American squadrons operating in Cuban waters had been heard from at Key West; but as the report had it that Schley was "believed to be" off Santiago and Sampson in a position to proceed quickly to his assistance while remaining within striking distance of Havana—which is on the other side and at the farther end of Cuba—and as it gave no certain indications of Cervera's position, it was classed with "unconfirmed" rumors. Especially so, inasmuch as on that day no word had yet been received from Schley by the government. Neither had the government learned from any official source that Cervera was really in Santiago harbor. Aside from unofficial advices and confirmatory publications in Madrid and London, there was nothing to show that he had not escaped. For this reason and particularly as it should have been easy for Schley to ascertain through insurgents whether or not Cervera was really in Santiago, matters still remained in doubt, in the midst of which rumors of an intention to invade Cuba and Puerto Rico by land became oppressive until they were met by rumors to the effect that this movement would be postponed, lest Cervera might be at large and able to attack troop ships. So the puzzling question continued to be whether Cer-

vera's fleet was or was not at Santiago, and for several days rumors were thick that it had escaped. Among these rumors was one from London of the 29th, which originated in Jamaica on the 28th. It was insisted that Cervera had left Santiago and was in Central American waters. The same irritating uncertainty continued through the day of the 29th, when it was aggravated by reports from Cape Haitien that although the cable between that point and Santiago was in working order no news from Santiago could be obtained. But at midnight on the 29th the navy department received a dispatch from Com. Schley which stated definitely that he had located Cervera's squadron in Santiago harbor. But as the report in detail accounted for only a few of Cervera's vessels new doubts arose as to whether the Spanish squadron was there in its entirety. But these doubts also were put at rest on the 1st by a dispatch of the 31st directly from Schley to the department, showing that all the vessels of Cervera's fleet, with the exception of the torpedo boat destroyer *Terror* and the supply ship *Alicante*, which were last heard of at Martinique, were actually in Santiago harbor. This news was received on the same day with an account of two Spanish torpedo boat destroyers having slipped out of Santiago harbor on the morning of the 30th and made for the Texas, which, however, discovered them in good time and shelled them back into the harbor. And hardly had that episode been reported, when advices from Havana, by way of Cape Haitien, Haiti, told vaguely of a bombardment of the fortifications of Santiago de Cuba by Schley's squadron. The fight was said to have been severe, and the reports—considering that they were from Spanish sources, and remembering the character of the early reports from those sources regarding the battle of Manila bay—indicated a victory for Schley. The circumstances as reported even pointed to the possibility of his having entered the harbor and successfully attacked Cervera's fleet. But on the 1st it became evident that Schley had not yet entered the harbor. He had, however, attacked the forts at the entrance on the 31st, and, according to the best accounts, demolished them. Still, the news was very conflicting. From Cape Haitien it was said that he had ground the principal fort to dust, while in Madrid the senate was formally expressing its satisfaction with "the bril-

liant victories of the Spanish fleet." This was upon the assurance of the minister of marine that the Americans had been repulsed.

An incident of the Santiago maneuvering was the bringing into Key West on the 30th, as a prize, of the British steamer *Restormel* which had been captured on the 25th by the auxiliary cruiser *St. Paul*, while trying to put into Santiago with coal. She carried 2,400 tons of the best Welsh coal, but not a paper relative to destination or consignee. It was believed that she was one of Cervera's coal ships which had followed him to Santiago. Her log confirmed this belief. It showed that she had sailed for San Juan, Puerto Rico, where Cervera expected coal, and when San Juan was found to be unsafe had been directed to Curacoa, whence, failing to connect, she was ordered to Santiago.

The *St. Paul*, under command of Capt. Sigsbee, who commanded the *Maine* at the time of her destruction, captured the Spanish troop ship *Alfonso XIII.*, on the 1st, off Cape Maysi, Cuba. She was loaded with coal and troops.

Early on the 30th, immediately after being informed of the location definitely of Cervera in Santiago harbor, Gen. Miles telegraphed orders putting the troops at various rendezvous in motion for a military movement; and on the same day he, with his family and staff, left Washington for Tampa. He was accompanied also by Gen. Collazo and Col. Hernandez, of the Cuban army, who are to act as guides after the American army is landed in Cuba. Gen. Miles made no secret of his intention to have the army depart immediately from Tampa, though he declined to say anything as to its destination. These facts were the basis of numberless rumors relative to an invasion of Cuba by the American army. The general arrived at Tampa on the first. He submitted to a newspaper interview there, but the censor stopped its publication.

The rumors of an invasion remained unverified except in one particular. A large company of Cubans did leave Key West on the 26th, under American escort, to join Gomez. They numbered 400, and they were accompanied with 100 horses and an abundance of stores and ammuni-

tion. The expedition was under the command of Capt. Jose Lacret, formerly insurgent commander at Matanzas, and was safely landed on the coast of Cuba on the 26th. It was met by 1,500 armed insurgents, and encountered no hostile demonstration. This was the largest anti-Spanish expedition that has been landed in Cuba. The name of the place at which it landed was kept a strict secret by the war department.

It was learned in this country on the 30th that overtures to the Cuban republic had been made by Gen. Blanco, through the autonomist government at Havana, for a peace, with the view of having Cubans unite with Spain in fighting the United States. Unable, as they professed, to communicate personally with the civil officers of the republic, the autonomist commissioners distributed the following address:

To the President, Vice-President and Secretaries of the Revolutionary Government of Cuba: We address you wishing to have an interview with the revolutionary government of Cuba, that we may place in your hands the general order and a communication from the commander in chief of the Spanish army, hoping to secure an arrangement whereby peace can be established by a suspension of hostilities, and to interest the revolutionary government in the adoption of equitable measures. We hope that by a consultation we may arrive at an understanding which will insure an amnesty which will ultimately lead to the establishment of peace. We are Cubans, who have the interests of our country at heart, we have suffered much and sustained great loss as a result of the war, and our aim and hope is that peace may come from a consultation with you.

The address was signed by Eleiseo Gibergo, Eudardo Dolz, Leopoldo Sola and Francisco J. Rabell. It was ignored by the civil officers of the republic.

Though the civil authorities of the Cuban republic took no notice of the address reprinted above, the commander in chief gave it sharp attention. It seems that Gibergo, whose name leads the signers of the address, had made his way to Gomez with the proposition it alluded to. For having made similar overtures, before the war with the United States, other representatives of Spain were shot by the Cuban insurgents. This was done under Cuban laws which were passed to prevent Spain's attempting to bribe leaders. But as Gen. Gomez now re-

gards himself as the commander of a recognized army, instead of the leader of a band of insurgents, he received Gibergo under a flag of truce, but immediately ordered him outside of his posts. Following is Gen. Gomez's proclamation, in which the circumstances are told and a warning for the future given. It was published in the second issue of *Las Villas*, the Cuban official newspaper, copies of which reached this country on the 30th, and bore date May 17:

To the Army and People of Free Cuba: I have to inform you that a few days ago there arrived at our camp under a flag of truce Senator Gibergo, an autonomist, sent here by the traitor Blanco. Had we been insurgents and such a treaty been submitted to me, such a bribe being offered to me to become a traitor and sell out my country, I would have shot him without even the form of a military trial. But we are no longer insurgents, we are the regular army of the free republic of Cuba, and I, as your commander in chief, have rather followed the rules of civilized warfare. I gave this messenger of Gen. Blanco free passports through our lines and four hours' time in which to get outside of our posts and out of sight of our guns, and at the same time advised him to communicate to his superior, Gen. Blanco, that a repetition of such a proposition would result in the trial of the messenger by court-martial and his immediate execution.

Should Blanco desire to communicate with us in an honorable manner he must do so through our foreign office, but it must be with the consideration and understanding that the army of the Cuban republic is in alliance with the United States army, and his communications must have no other object than the surrender of the Spanish army and the evacuation of our shores. A treaty of peace acknowledging the independence of Cuba forever from Spanish rule and the complete evacuation by the Spanish army is all that will be accepted.

No Cuban is a traitor, and I do not believe that it is possible even with the spy system maintained by Gen. Blanco for him to induce the Cuban people to ask me to accept a treaty such as he proposes, and I do solemnly swear that anyone forgetting that he is a Cuban, and so far losing his honor as to take the liberty of speaking to me with a view to induce me to accept such a treaty, will be shot within one hour as a traitor. The army of Cuba is henceforth and hereafter to be considered as in an alliance with the army of the United States of America, and any treaties made with us must be made subject to such conditions.

M. GOMEZ.

The first exchange of prisoners in the war took place on the 27th. C. H.

Thrall and Hayden Jones, American newspaper men who had been captured by the Spanish in Cuba, were exchanged for Col. Cortijo and Gen. Julio, with their soldier servants, who were passengers on the Spanish steamer *Argonauta* when it was captured in April. Cortijo is a brother-in-law of Gen. Weyler.

On the 26th, 29 Spanish merchantmen seized by the Americans and in Key West harbor, were condemned as prize of war. At least four of these are to be sent to New York for sale, to insure a fair price.

Fears of the Cadiz squadron have not been felt during the past week as they were the week before. Three strange vessels, apparently warships, were seen maneuvering off the coast of Newfoundland on the 28th, and suspicious vessels were reported on the 30th off the coast of Virginia; while it was officially announced from Madrid on the 28th that the Cadiz squadron, to which these ships would belong if they were really Spanish warships, had actually gone to sea. But the better opinion seems to have been that this squadron is still in Spanish waters. Dispatches to that effect were given out from Madrid by way of London on the 1st. These spoke of the Cadiz ships as undergoing speed trials and gun trials off Madrid. So much anxiety has been shown by the Spanish to put out these reports that it is suspected the Cadiz squadron may be on its way to join Cervera.

Among the subjects with which the Spanish Cortes is struggling in connection with the war is a proposition to levy taxes upon the public debt. The minister of finance, backed by the conservatives, is opposed to this proposition, while the Carlists, the republicans and the Romeroists—the advocates of a military dictatorship—advocate it. Gamazo, the liberal leader, gave notice on the 26th that he would resign if the impost were not granted; and it is known that Puigcerver, the minister of finance, will resign if it be granted. Puigcerver's following, however, is of less importance than Gamazo's. Another difficult question before the Cortes relates to a "run" on the Bank of Spain, the notes of which are being presented in large amounts for redemption in coin. At the time of the report of the bank a year ago—July

10, 1897—the note circulation amounted to \$226,071,745, and the gold and silver on hand to \$98,394,459. To stop the "run" the ministry have decided to treat as criminal disturbers of the peace all persons who change notes of the bank for speculative purposes or to create difficulties for the bank. And for the purpose of securing the kingdom against a coin famine the lower house of the Cortes passed a bill on the 31st prohibiting the exportation from Spain of silver coin. One member criticised this bill as useless, and urged the government to increase silver coinage and thus avert the impending monetary crisis; to which the minister of finance replied that the Madrid mint is already coining 1,000,000 pesetas daily—\$200,000—an amount which is to be increased if necessary by an arrangement with the Paris mint. He advocated the bill as a measure to prevent the export of the large quantities of silver money which are stored in the frontier provinces; and he said that if this prohibition were to prove insufficient stronger measures would be proposed. The condition of the bank is regarded in Madrid as more serious to Spain than any reverse of the war, since the inability of the bank to aid the government would force a discontinuance of the war.

Dispatches of the 25th were received from Admiral Dewey on the 27th. They reported no change in the situation. On the same date newspaper reports told that Aguinaldo, the popular native chief, was in command of the insurgents, with headquarters at Cavite, and also that the Spaniards at Manila had offered \$25,000 for his head. Later newspaper dispatches confirmed the report as to the price that had been put upon Aguinaldo's head. They told, besides, of the interposition of Admiral Dewey in behalf of the captain of the Spanish gunboat *Callao*, which came into the harbor with colors flying, utterly ignorant of the existence of war, and was forced to surrender. The account was given in *The Public* of May 21st on page 10. Because the Spanish captain had surrendered, the Spanish in Manila threatened to shoot him, and therefore Admiral Dewey notified the Spanish authorities that he would hold them responsible for the captain's life.

Other reports from Manila tell of the firing recently of one shot by Ad-

miral Dewey toward the city. Dewey had promised the Spaniards that he would not bombard the city provided they made no attempt to strengthen the defenses, and this condition was agreed to by the Spanish captain general. But on the 22d, Dewey discovered that the condition was being violated, and he fired the shot as a warning. Work upon the defenses immediately ceased.

Dispatches given out at Madrid on the 26th, purporting to have come from Manila, reported the evacuation by the Spanish of Corregidor Island, at the mouth of Manila Bay, for want of ammunition. The same dispatch told of a rebellion of grave dimensions in the province of Panagasnam, and complained that the insurgents were pillaging houses and massacring Spaniards. Another event reported through the same channel was the alleged submission to the Spanish governor general of the insurgent chief in the province of Zambale—to-wit, Matabelo. In the same dispatches it was stated that all the Caroline Islands had revolted and the natives were engaged in violence and depredations.

Maj. Gen. Merritt, the American governor general of the Philippine Islands, arrived at San Francisco on the 26th, on his way to his post; and Brig. Gen. Francis V. Greene, late colonel of the Seventy-first New York volunteers, who has been ordered to join Gen. Merritt at the Philippines, is on his way to San Francisco.

On the 26th it was learned that upon the examination of mails to Spain in April, a letter to the queen, dated April 21st, had been discovered, emanating from the Universal Peace Union, which has an office in Independence Hall, Philadelphia. It was as follows:

It is in our hearts to say, as the Universal Peace Union, representing many thousands of friends of peace in all parts of the world and from the United States, that we have appreciated your many concessions in this Cuban trouble in behalf of peace, and we want you to hear from the people, the real representatives of the American heart, that we believe all that is desired could be obtained by peaceful means.

Our hearts are full of sympathy for you in your present embarrassed position, but the right will sustain you. Our country would receive you if your people rebel in your efforts to avail of any opening to still avert war and meet

the demands of humanity, freedom and peace.

The postal authorities withheld this letter, and upon application to the department of state Secretary Day refused to permit its transmission. But President Love, of the Peace Union, was reported from Philadelphia on the 26th as having told a reporter that he had outwitted the government and forwarded the letter in a roundabout way. The city councils have since withdrawn the office in Independence Hall from the use of the Peace Union.

On the 30th President McKinley issued a proclamation announcing that the governments of the United States and of the French republic have entered into a commercial agreement "in which reciprocal concessions have been made according to the provisions" of the 3d section of the Dingley law, whereby certain specified products of the United States are, after June 1st, 1898, to be admitted into France at the minimum rate of duty; and, in consideration thereof, products of France are, after the same date, to be admitted into the United States at the reduced duties enumerated in the 3d section of the Dingley law.

As the result of a conference at Washington between Sir Julian Pauncefote, the British ambassador; Sir Louis Davies, the Canadian minister of marine; Gen. John W. Foster, American special commissioner in charge of Canadian affairs, and Reciprocity Commissioner Kasson, with reference to questions in dispute between Canada and the United States, a definite agreement was reached on the 30th for the creation of a commission to consider all such controversies, and to frame a treaty between the United States and Great Britain for their complete adjustment.

San Francisco has adopted a new charter. Some of its features were regarded as objectionable, and it was carried through by a majority of only about 2,000. The provision which makes its adoption of general interest is that for a form of the initiative and referendum—a provision, that is to say, for enabling the people to legislate directly at the ballot box. On the petition of 15 per cent. of the voters of the city, any proposition which they advocate must be referred to popular vote, and if approved by a

majority must be made part of the city law.

On the 29th the east pier of the Northern Pacific railroad bridge at Bismarck, N. D., was transferred bodily from its old foundation to a new one, four feet away. The pier is 60 feet high, 25 feet wide, 12 feet in diameter, is built of solid granite and weighs over 4,500 tons. It was moved by means of rollers. The work of preparation occupied more than eight months, but the time required to move the pier was less than a minute, and from first to last there was no interruption of traffic. The removal was made because the sliding of earth beneath the foundation had displaced the pier, and an entire new foundation became necessary.

Definite information of the result of the French secondary elections, held on the 22d, have not been reported in this country; but enough is known to make it certain that the Meline ministry, which is moderate republican, has but a scant majority—so small that any one of the factions can turn it out at will. The secondary elections were held in the districts in which no candidates received a majority of votes at the general election on the 8th, a brief account of the results of which appeared in *The Public* of May 14 on page 13.

On the 28th the minister of foreign affairs of the Italian cabinet resigned and the other ministers followed his example. King Humbert at once instructed the Marquis di Rudini, late president of the council and minister of the interior, to organize a new cabinet. Accordingly on the 31st a new cabinet was formed.

The schooner *Jane Grey*, carrying 61 gold seekers from Seattle to the north, foundered on the 22d, about 90 miles west of Cape Flattery. Thirty-four of her passengers went down with her. The remainder reached Seattle in a launch on the 1st, bringing the news.

Capt. H. C. Pande, of the Norwegian ship *Prince Edward*, reports the discovery of an island in the South Atlantic, not far north of the Falkland Islands, at a point where the latest admiralty charts claim a depth of 2,000 fathoms. The water about the new island was hot for several hours after the discovery, and Capt. Pande

attributes the island to an earthquake upheaval. His crew have named it Prince Edward's Island.

IN CONGRESS.

Senate.

Week Ending June 1, 1898.

The debate on the war revenue bill is still under way, and but little other business of general interest has been done.

On the 27th, to force a vote on the Hawaiian annexation, Senator Lodge offered, as an amendment to the war revenue bill, the resolutions for annexation reported to the house by the house committee on foreign affairs; and which have not yet been taken up by the house. This amendment was the principal topic of debate in the senate on the 31st.

The first test of strength on the war revenue measure came on the 28th. It was upon a motion to lay upon the table the corporation tax amendment proposed by the majority of the senate committee. This motion was carried by a vote of 41 to 27. Gorman, democrat, of Maryland, voted with the republicans for the motion.

But on the 1st Gorman brought forward an amendment of his own, to levy a tax of one quarter of one per cent. upon the gross receipts of all corporations doing a business exceeding \$250,000 a year. It was lost by a vote of 27 to 34. An amendment offered by Pettigrew, populist, of South Dakota, to impose the same tax on all corporations was lost by 25 to 37. Finally one by White, democrat, of California, to levy it upon the sugar trust and the Standard Oil company was carried by 33 to 26.

On the 27th a bill was passed providing for a second assistant secretary of war with a salary of \$4,000; and Morgan, democrat, of Alabama, offered as an amendment to the war revenue measure a clause providing for the government of any of the islands of the Atlantic or Pacific when owned or occupied by the United States as a result of the war with Spain. On the 28th the vice president laid before the senate a communication from the Ohio legislature announcing the report of the Ohio senate committee on charges of bribery against Senator Hanna, republican, of that state.

House.

Business in the house for the week has been of a routine character.

NEWS NOTES.

—Ex-Secretary of State John Sherman is making a health trip to Alaska.

—The general assembly of the United Presbyterian Church met at Omaha on the 26th.

—The annual meeting of the Brethren, commonly called the Dunkers, began at Burlington Park, Ill., on the 31st.

—About 1,000 employes of the Singer Sewing Machine works went on strike on the 31st for a return to the wages of 1892.

—On the 31st wheat for May delivery fell at Chicago to \$1.25. It was at \$1.75 on the 28th, and had been as high as \$1.85.

—The prohibitionists of Illinois met at Peoria in state convention on the 1st and adopted a platform and nominated a state ticket.

—A monument to the memory of the original John Jacob Astor was unveiled last week at his native place, Walkdorf in Baden, near Heidelberg.

—Herr Vogtherr, a socialist member of the German reichstag, has been sentenced to six months' imprisonment for criticising the emperor in an election speech.

—Dispatches from Madrid of the 26th said that Lieut. Sobral, who was reported last week on page 14 as in custody as a Spanish spy, could not be the person so accused, as he was then in Madrid.

—W. V. Sullivan, congressman from the Second Mississippi district, has been appointed by the Mississippi governor to the vacant seat in the United States senate of the late Senator Walthall.

—Thomas W. Keene, the Shakespearean actor, died at New York on the 1st from the effects of an operation for appendicitis. He was 58 years old and had been regularly on the stage nearly 30 years.

—The warship Columbia, which left New York harbor last week, came into collision on the 28th with a British steamer, sinking the steamer and so injuring herself as to be obliged to put back into New York harbor for repairs.

—Gov. Stephens, of Missouri, offered to William J. Bryan the colonelcy of the Missouri regiment now forming; but Mr. Bryan declined on the ground that his first duty is to the Nebraska regiment in which he has already enlisted as a private.

—A rumor was afloat on the 28th to the effect that the Austrian minister had been given his passports and that our minister at Vienna had been recalled. No reason was assigned, and later in the day the rumor was authoritatively denied.

—Roosevelt's rough riders received orders at San Antonio, Tex., on the 27th to proceed to Tampa at once and report to Gen. Shafter. They left the next

day. On the 31st they passed through New Orleans. They had been given an ovation all along the line.

—The Spanish torpedo boat Temarario, which threatened the Oregon on her passage up the Atlantic, is laid up at Asuncion, Paraguay, for the war. She was in unfit condition, and the Paraguayans have given her the benefit of their neutrality. This deprives the Spanish of the benefit of her service.

—Gladstone's body was viewed at Westminster on the 26th from six in the morning throughout the day. It was estimated that 75,000 persons had passed by the coffin by three o'clock. The body was entombed at Westminster on the 28th, in the northern transept of the abbey and by the side of Disraeli's tomb.

—In the United States court at Milwaukee, on the 31st, it was decided that the city ordinance requiring the Milwaukee Electric Railway and Light company to sell 25 street car tickets for one dollar is invalid. This decision is upon the ground that this rate of fare would not return a fair profit upon the cost of reproducing the plant.

—The American government demanded on the 31st the right to censorize dispatches by way of the French cable from Martinique, claiming that the line is being used by Spanish spies in Canada. Secretary of State Day notified the secretary of the French legation at Washington that if the United States were not given this right the cable would be cut.

—The British steamer Belvidere was stranded on the 31st at Cape Maysi, Cuba. One of her passengers was Vice President Capote, of the Cuban republic. Cubans attribute the disaster to treachery of some sort. Vice President Capote with 23 other passengers of the wrecked Belvidere was brought into Philadelphia on the 1st by the Norwegian steamer Kong Frode.

—By a vote of 24 to 12 the directors of the Trans-Mississippi exposition at Omaha decided on the 26th that "the exposition grounds and buildings be kept open on Sundays from one p. m. to ten p. m., and conducted in the same manner as on week days, except that the sale of liquors be not permitted." Concerts are to be given and religious services held in the auditorium on Sunday afternoons. The exposition was formally opened on the 1st.

—A detective named Kellert has been arrested at Montreal charged with stealing on the 29th eight cents worth of postage stamps attached to an unmailed letter. The importance of the matter lies in the fact that the charge is made by the Spanish diplomats whom Polo, late minister to the United States, left behind him in Montreal. The unmailed letter was purloined from the office of these diplomats and is supposed to contain secrets relative to Spanish spying across the Canadian bor-

der. At the hearing at Montreal on the 31st, the Spanish diplomat whose letter was stolen by the detective was not required by the magistrate to reveal its contents while a witness on the stand, but the Spaniard said that it was addressed to a relative and was of no public importance.

MISCELLANY

THE REFORMER.

Before the monstrous wrong he sits
him down—
One man against a stone-walled citadel
of sin.
For centuries those walls have been
a-building;
Smooth porphyry, they slope and cold-
ly glass
The flying storm and wheeling sun. No
chink,
No crevice, lets the thinnest arrow in.
He fights alone, and from the cloudy
ramparts
A thousand evil faces gibe and jeer him.
Let him lie down and die; what is the
right,
And where is justice in a world like this?
But by and by earth shakes herself, im-
patient,
And down, in one great roar of ruin,
crash
Watch-tower and citadel and battle-
ments.
When the red dust has cleared, the lone-
ly soldier
Stands with strange thoughts beneath
the friendly stars.

—E. R. Sill.

THE ORIGIN OF OUR NATURAL RIGHTS.

An extract from "The Two Great Commandments in Economics," by James E. Mills, a notice of which will be found on another page of this Public.

The rights of the individual man are founded upon his relation to God. He stands among his fellow men the equal of any or all of them in being the object of God's love. He receives, indeed, a part of the blessings of life through them; but far more, directly from the Giver by the inner door to his soul. He is in some measure responsible to them, but his first and highest responsibility, and, in his deeper life of motive and purpose, his entire responsibility, is to God. In the animal kingdom, the individual seems to be an incident, and the preservation of the species the main object of its existence. Individuals are born and perish that the species may endure. But among men the individual is as enduring as the species; he is himself an object and end of Divine love; and, being such, he can never perish. This is the foundation of the dignity and right to freedom, and to the highest development of his own character, in-

herent in every individual man. Without a sense of direct relation to God and responsibility to Him, manhood is in a state of arrested development, unconscious of its own greatness and worth, unconscious of its place in the universe. In default of this sense, men assume an arbitrary self-respect, or rest upon the respect of other men or upon pride or privilege of caste, and a thousand props and makeshifts; but no man knows the repose and dignity of manhood until he is conscious of its relation to Divinity. With this consciousness, he need never quail before other men, or be dismayed by any conditions; he can go forward with entire trust in the Divine love and care, following the light as God gives him to see the light, serving his fellow-men and working out his destiny.

HOW INTELLIGENT SPANIARDS VIEW THE WAR.

At Vittoria I was so fortunate as to make the acquaintance of a Spanish gentleman of social and political note who was an officer in the cycling club of that town, and offered his services to us in the objects of our journey. * * * Our talk passed from the wars of Napoleon and Wellington to the present war in Cuba, and my host was offered abundant opportunity for a diatribe against the United States in harmony with the jingoism manifested by the Imparcial of Madrid and other organs of the war party. But he showed no taste whatever for war or swagger. His words, as I noted them down soon afterwards in my memorandum book, were substantially these:

"What a sad thing is this Cuban matter! We Spaniards cannot conduct such a war with satisfaction, for the Cubans, after all, are they not fighting for liberty? We are very much discouraged over the situation, but the government dares not confess its failure. I hear that already more than 200,000 troops have gone to Cuba, and more than 30,000 are in hospital. The men go cheerfully, or at least obediently, to their hopeless task, for so far I have not yet heard of any troops refusing to embark. But it is a bad business, and I wish we could close it honorably."

I asked him how he regarded the attitude of the United States. He answered, to my surprise, without anger:

"The Yankee government has not acted generously towards us, for they have undoubtedly done much to encourage the Cubans and prolong the war. And yet we cannot blame them altogether. Cuba is so close to them that this war must disturb their commerce very much."

This little bit of a most interesting conversation I repeat without mentioning names, because of the moderate spirit manifested, because this gentleman may be regarded as a typical Spaniard of property, and because it is the tone I have met with almost without exception when talking on this subject with men of consequence in different parts of the country.—Poultney Bigelow, in Harper's Weekly.

REVENGE, OR RIGHTEOUSNESS?

When the commissary of a great nation is ignorant enough to order revengeful mottoes to be stamped upon army biscuit, it is time for honest citizens to protest. Are we in the dark ages, or nearing the twentieth century? Are we fighting duels to receive "satisfaction" for personal insult, or are we pledged to the cause of freedom and of mankind's birthright? Let us beware lest we accept as an ally the cruelty we have armed ourselves to oppose. If we desire—as every patriot must—that the war into which we have plunged be a war for righteousness, then every movement makes our necessity imperative to strangle the unrighteous impulses that accompany it. For war has other horrors than shattered ships and ghastly battlefields. More dangerous, because more subtle, and more hideous by far in their results are the greed, the tribal animosities, the savage instincts, to which war opens the way. They affect not only the few who go to battle, but the nation itself. Committed as we are to war, we should prosecute it vigorously, not merely in the field against Spain, but at home against the moral forces which are akin to Spain. Our army and navy can attend to the one, but every journal not hopelessly given over to the yellows, every pulpit, every man and woman who loves honor and country has a stern and immediate duty in respect to the other.—Ellen Andrews, in Boston Transcript.

—We are glad to be able to append to the foregoing article this denial from the Chicago Evening Post of the shocking story which Miss Andrews has commented upon so justly. The article applies, however, to other cases than the one which served as its text.

Somebody started a report that the contractors who were to furnish the army and navy withhardtack were proposing to stamp each piece with the legend "Remember the Maine." The story reached the eye of the commissary general of subsistence, who at once, not knowing whether the report was well founded or not, issued a notice to the contractors that nothing of the sort must be done. For the sake of being very circumstantial, the inventor had located the contracting

firm for the navy at St. Louis. As the navy has had no hardtack contract in St. Louis the paymaster general paid no further attention to the matter.

GLADSTONE'S FAITH IN THE COMMON PEOPLE.

Unlike Peter the Great or Napoleon, Mr. Gladstone complied, throughout the whole of his life, with the moral law. Even in those episodes of his career wherein he has been most bitterly denounced, no one competent of forming a just judgment of his motives can deny that he possessed nobility of aim. I will give an example.

As events have turned out, the English surrender of the Transvaal was probably unwise. Certainly it produced in England the bitterest feeling of humiliation and national wounded pride—a feeling in which I have always shared.

After my first visit to South Africa, when the opportunity was afforded me of seeing much of those who had suffered for their loyalty to England, this feeling of shame and indignation was redoubled. Firmly believing that Mr. Gladstone had acted wrongly in the retrocession of the Transvaal, I returned to England with the conviction that his South African policy was governed by motives of political expediency. It was in that frame of mind that I met Mr. Gladstone, in a country house, on Easter Monday, 1886. I shall never forget the first serious conversation I had with him. He introduced the subject by referring to my recent visit to Africa. Believing that an opportunity had arisen not to be missed, I said to him, speaking in the interests of my countrymen and country women who had lost their all by reposing faith in England's promise that the British flag should never be hauled down so long as the sun was in the heavens, "Sir, I think, if you had been, as I have been, in the homes of those Englishmen and loyal Dutch Boers who have been ruined for no greater fault than a foolish confidence in Great Britain—I think your cabinet would not have surrendered the Transvaal."

Taking me by the arm, and with his marvelous onyx eyes blazing with indignation, he gazed out of the window at the sky and the budding trees, and spoke for nearly 20 minutes, in a low, rich voice. He raised his arm with the gesture with which a lion raises his paw, and I realized, for the first time, the greatness of the man.

What he said, in effect, was this: "We have given back the Transvaal to its owners because it was acquired from

them by fraud. A small country, a mean country, a country less sure of itself, could not have done this thing. Perhaps England alone, with her 800 years of history behind her, could have dared to do this act. To have done it shows the greatness, not the smallness, of England. The common people wished it. They hate injustice; they refuse to profit by fraud. The common people are always right. They were right in Macedonia; they were right in Judea;" and then he added, with a sweep of his arm so vehement that I thought he was about to crush me, "they are right now."—Arnold White, in *Harper's Weekly*.

AMERICAN ARMY TRANSPORT.

Though the United States have only engaged in one "foreign" war, that against Mexico, its army inherits the best traditions of transport service of any civilized nation. For nearly a century North American migration has been conducted not by sea, but by land; and the settlement and occupation of a vast continent has been effected by a civilized population, who never hesitated to move for thousands of miles, carrying their household goods and families in the "prairie schooners," the mule wagons or ox wagons of the states. At the same time, the pioneers of trade never shrank from penetrating with trains of hardy pack-mules into unknown deserts and among the hostile Indians of the plains. Traders and settlers alike spent their lives as transport officers; it was their normal occupation in time of peace; and though the railway has now superseded the pack-mule and the wagon, the old traditions and aptitude are still maintained by the regular army in the frontier posts of the west.

Though the train has generally superseded the "prairie schooner" and the pack-mule, the art of managing the latter has been purposely maintained by the United States war department. The services of one of the most noted "packers" were, by the suggestion of Gen. Sheridan retained to teach the art to the officers and men at several posts. He received a large salary, and, later, was sent to the large cavalry station at Fort Riley, in Kansas. To this gentleman the English war office were most glad to apply for instruction during the Zulu war. He came to Natal, and there instructed our troops in the methods of packing mules for army transport. It is believed that there are at the present time in the United States, mainly in Kansas, Missouri and Kentucky, enough mules to provide transport for 70,000

men. Horses are so cheap that it does not pay to feed them on the ranches; and should bullock trains be in favor the Texas steers will be available in tens of thousands. Cuba is in parts much intersected by light railways from the sugar plantations. But, failing railways, the United States possesses not only the finest material for army transport, but the most competent drivers and packers in the world.—*The London Spectator*.

THE NATIONAL INTEGRITY OF CANADA.

An extract from an article published in the *May Forum*, on "Canada's Relations with the United States, and Her Influence in Imperial Councils," by Dr. John G. Bourinot, C. M. G., clerk of the house of commons of Canada.

Despite all the powerful influences that have fought against Canada she has held her own in America. At present a population of 5,000,000 (against 1,000,000 in 1840), with a total trade of \$250,000,000 (against \$25,000,000 in 1840), and with a national revenue of nearly \$40,000,000 (against \$700,000 in 1840), inhabits a dominion of seven regularly organized provinces, and of an immense territory, now in course of development, stretching from Manitoba and Ontario to British Columbia, whose mountains are washed by the Pacific ocean. This dominion embraces an area of 3,519,000 square miles, including its water surface, or very little less than the area of the United States with Alaska, or a region measuring 3,500 miles from east to west, and 1,400 miles from north to south. The magnificent valley through which the St. Lawrence river flows from the lakes to the ocean is now the home of prosperous, energetic and intelligent communities, one of which was founded nearly three centuries ago. A remarkable system of waterways, consisting mainly of the Red, Assiniboine and Saskatchewan rivers, extends through the plains of the territories as far as the base of the Rocky mountains, and fertilizes a region whose capability for the production of foods is probably not surpassed on this continent. The mountainous country to the north of Lake Superior is rich in gold, copper, nickel and other valuable minerals, which are already attracting the attention of enterprise in Europe and America. The gold mines of British Columbia are most productive; and the great bulk of the precious metal still lies buried in the rocks of that immense province. The coal mines of Vancouver have no rivals on the Pacific coast; while those of Nova Scotia and the territories are capable of infinite development. The treasure of

gold now attracting capital and people to the dreary country through which the Yukon and its tributaries flow seems to be inexhaustible, and must add largely to the population and wealth of the dominion, which, year by year, sees its resources increasing in extent and value. The fisheries have long been the envy of the United States; and the agricultural production is as great as that of the most favored sections of that country. Its climate and resources—the best springs of a nation's energy and wealth—are those of the northern, middle and western states.

No dangerous question like slavery exists to complicate the political and social conditions of the union, and, although there is a large and increasing French-Canadian element in the dominion—the heritage of the old French regime in America—its history so far should not create fear as to the future, except perhaps in the minds of sectarian pessimists, who too often raise gloomy phantoms of their own imaginings. Whilst this element naturally clings to its national language and special institutions, yet, under the influence of a complete system of local self-government, it has taken as active and earnest a part as the English element in establishing and strengthening the confederation.

The expansion of the African race in the southern states is a question of the future for the federal republic, which its statesmen will find much more difficult than any that Canadian statesmen have to solve on account of the existence of a French nationality, who possess the lively intelligence of their race, exercise all the privileges of self-government, and, above all things, well comprehend that their true interests lie in a prosperous Canadian federation, and not in union with a country where they would eventually lose their national identity.

The whole history of Canada proves that there has been always among the people, not merely an attachment to England and her institutions, but a latent influence, which in times of peace, as in times of peril, has led them onward in a path of national development which with every decade has diverged more and more from the United States. The statesmen and people generally of that country have been always remarkably ignorant, not only of the history, but of the political institutions and of the political sentiments of the Canadians; and they have never appreciated the tendency of this political development, which is in the direction of a new nationality not inferior to the

United States in many of the elements of a people's greatness.

In Canada, as in other parts of the world where representative institutions exist, democracy, as a form of government, has made its influence felt in the enlargement of political rights and in the extension of the franchise; and unhappily sometimes in the dominion, as in the neighboring country, it partly obscures and misleads public opinion in moments of bitter political controversy. Fortunately the principles upon which Canadian government is based are sound; and political morality is, on the whole, higher than in the United States. The federal union gives expansion to the national energies of the whole dominion; at the same time it affords every security to the local interests of each member of the federal compact. In all matters of dominion concern, Canada is a free agent. While the queen is still the head of the executive authority, and can alone initiate treaties with foreign nations (that being an act of complete sovereignty), and while appeals are still open to her privy council from Canadian courts within certain limitations, it is an admitted principle that, so far as Canada has been granted legislative rights and privileges by the imperial parliament—rights and privileges set forth explicitly in the British North America act of 1867—the dominion is practically sovereign in the exercise of all these powers, so long as they do not conflict with the treaty obligations of the parent state or with imperial legislation directly applicable to Canada with her own consent.

It is true the queen in council can veto acts of the Canadian parliament; but that supreme power is exercised only under the conditions just stated; and can no more be constitutionally used in the case of ordinary Canadian statutes affecting the dominion solely than can the power of the sovereign to veto the acts of the imperial parliament—a crown prerogative still existent, but not exercised in England since the days of Queen Anne, and now considered inconsistent with modern rules of parliamentary government. England exercises a certain supervision over the affairs of the dominion through a governor-general, who communicates directly with an imperial secretary of state; but in every matter directly affecting Canada—as, for instance, in the negotiations respecting the fisheries and Behring sea—the British government acts in unison with the Canadian ministry, whose statements are carefully considered, since they represent the sentiments and interests of the Canadian people, who,

as subjects of the empire, are entitled to as much weight as if they lived in the British Isles.

In a limited sense there is already a loose system of federation between England and her dependencies. The central government of England, as the guardian of the welfare of the whole empire, cooperates with the several governments of her colonial dependencies, and, by common consultation and arrangement, endeavors to come to such a determination as will be to the advantage of all the interests at stake. In other words, the conditions of the relations between England and Canada are such as to insure unity of policy as long as each government considers the interests of England and the dependency as identical, and keeps in view the obligations, welfare and unity of the empire at large. Full consultation in all negotiations affecting Canada, representation in every arbitration and commission that may be the result of such negotiations, are the principles which of late years have been admitted by England in acknowledgment of the development of Canada and of her present position in the empire; and any departure from so sound a doctrine would be a serious injury to the imperial connection, and an insult to the ability of Canadians to take a part in the great councils of the world.

The latest assurance that Canadians have had of the desire of English statesmen to pay every possible respect to the wishes and feelings of Canada, where her interests are immediately affected, was given by the recent decision of the British government to "denounce" all commercial treaties which hamper the free action of the Canadian parliament with respect to trade, and to allow no such treaties to be made hereafter except with the consent of the dominion itself.

Under these conditions of self-government, which allow such full expansion to colonial action in all matters affecting the welfare of the country—conditions which give Canada a large measure of the sovereignty belonging to an independent nation—the connection between Great Britain and her dependency is necessarily strengthening as the years pass by, and may yet lead to a federation of the empire on a basis which will preserve all local rights and at the same time insure a strong and workable central organization. One thing is quite certain; a party favoring annexation to the United States has no *raison d'être*; and the man would be bold indeed who should step on a public platform in Canada and urge a scheme so repugnant to people now enjoying so

many advantages as an influential dominion of the British empire.

DON'T GRUMBLE PREMATURELY.

Our readers may have noticed that the Star has made no criticisms whatever on the conduct of the war. It has claimed that, so far as the army and navy officers and men are concerned, all has been well done, so far as known, and we have expressed our faith that such will continue. We have been reticent in ascribing unnecessary delays or bad plans to the Washington management, for the reason that both experience in the last war and common sense show that it is very possible for outsiders to be mistaken, in view of the necessary secrecy that responsible conductors must maintain and the fact that they are thereby, and by their positions, debarred from making explanations and replies. We know that the daily press assumes to be much wiser than this and to have access to "inside" information, from which others are excluded. But their contradictions, inaccuracies and baseless rumors negative this assumption. The administration is attacked by the daily press for its tardiness and failure to be prepared for emergencies. We advise our readers not to be too hasty in so believing. The situation is one of great difficulty, and while Washington may restrain commanders too much, it is obvious that in a war covering so much territory, there must be some central point to which information comes, and, only when based on all such information received, can an intelligent plan of campaign be devised, so that the commanders in one locality can advantageously work in connection with those in another.—San Francisco Star.

HUMOR FROM THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Did any of you ever hear anyone pronounce a more beautiful eulogy on himself than that just pronounced by Josiah Patterson?

In listening to it I could not help but be reminded of what my friend, Jake Cummings, once said about me. It was in the great campaign of 1884. The Cleveland, Hendricks and Allen club at Tupelo had a meeting, and Mr. Taylor and Mr. Anderson spoke to the club that night. As I chanced to be at home from my campaign, I attended the club meeting. After the regular speakers I was called for and submitted some remarks about myself and my campaign.

After I had spoken, the crowd called for Jake Cummings, a long, black, sleek, old negro carpenter, who lives in Tupelo, and Jake's speech ran about this

way: "Well, gentlemen, it's gittin' kinder late, and I don't know as its necessary for me to say anything. You's heerd Mr. Taylor and Mr. Anderson on the gen'l politics of the day. They's tol' you what sort of a man Blaine is and what sort a man Cleveland is. It don't look to me like no honest man ought to have any trouble in picking out de fittest man of them two; and then you's heerd Mr. Allen on hisself, and he has ricommended hisself so much higher than any the rest of us kin ricommend him, it ain't worth while for me to say nothing about him."—Hon. John M. Allen, in the House, April 22.

SOME BOSTON BABIES.

A few years ago, accompanied by Rev. Mr. Swaffield, then of the Baptist Bethel mission, I spent considerable time in the slums of the North end. I thoroughly explored this region, and the memory of what I saw and heard will never leave me. It was a frightful nightmare. I there beheld children three and five years old sewing all day long on clothes for the sweaters. Some of them were living in attics, some in cellars. They were old to look upon, although spring had scarcely kissed their brows. One of these little ones heard my friend say he was 40 years old that day, and she exclaimed: "Oh, dear, I should think you would get so tired of living so many years!"—B. O. Flower, in The Arena.

During a discussion at a meeting of the Trinity College Historical society upon the slight consideration attached to life by uncivilized nations, a speaker mentioned the extraordinary circumstance that in China if a man were condemned to death he could easily hire a substitute to die for him; "and," the debater went on, "I believe many poor fellows get their living by acting as substitutes in that way!"—The London Spectator.

"Now, Thomas," said a certain bishop, after taking his servant to task one morning, "who is it that sees all we do, and hears all we say, and knows all we think, and who regards even me in my bishop's robes as but a vile worm of the dust?" And Thomas replied: "The missus, sir."

"You've never seen a teetotaler drunk, Tom," said the priest. "Ah, your riverence," replied Tom, "I've seen many a man drunk, but I couldn't tell for the life o' me, whether they wor teetotalers or not!"—London Spectator.

"Why is it," they asked, "that you no longer read the Yellow Journal?" "The fact is," he replied, "that I am

more interested in knowing what the news is than I am in how it is secured."—Chicago Post.

"It is better," said President Tucker, "to really believe a half truth than only to half believe a real truth."—The Outlook.

DISCRETION THE BETTER PART.

Let others fight the hordes from Spain;
To dye with blood the raging main
Is little to my mind;
Upon the broad and heaving sea
One looks in vain for rock or tree
A man might hide behind.

When sounds the angry, booming gun
The scared man has no chance to run
Or crawl into a hole;
He's got to stand while pigs of lead
And kegs of nails whiz past his head
And paralyze his soul.

Although the heat would kill a cow
He has no chance to fan his brow
Or drink some lemonade;
He has to feed a patent gun
That calls for powder by the ton—
He feeds it with a spade.

And now and then there comes a thud
And he is painted thick with blood,
If not wiped off the map;
No parson near to close his eyes,
No inquest on him when he dies—
Who'd envy such a chap?

I would not mind exchanging whacks
In olden style, with battle ax,
If single foe were mine,
But when machines distribute death
And don't ring off to give one breath
I have to draw the line.
—Kansas City Star.

THE PUBLIC

is a weekly paper which prints in concise and plain terms, with lucid explanations and without editorial bias, all the really valuable news of the world. It is also an editorial paper. Though it abstains from mingling editorial opinions with its news accounts, it has opinions of a pronounced character, which, in the columns reserved for editorial comment, it expresses fully and freely, without favor or prejudice, without fear of consequences, and without hope of discreditable reward. Yet it makes no pretensions to infallibility, either in opinions or in statements of fact; it simply aspires to a deserved reputation for intelligence and honesty in both. Besides its editorial and news features, the paper contains a department of original and selected miscellany, in which appear articles and extracts upon various subjects, verse as well as prose, chosen alike for their literary merit and their wholesome human interest. Familiarity with THE PUBLIC will commend it as a paper that is not only worth reading, but also worth filing.

Subscription, One Dollar a Year.

Free of postage in United States, Canada and Mexico; elsewhere, postage extra, at the rate of one cent per week. Payment of subscription is acknowledged up to the date in the address label on the wrapper.

Single copies, five cents each.

Published weekly by
**THE PUBLIC PUBLISHING COMPANY, Room 622,
Schiller Building, Chicago, Ill.**

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

SUBSCRIPTION AGENTS:

Western Reserve, Ohio, OTTO PRISTER, 314
American Trust Building (Telephone, Main 1069),
Cleveland, Ohio.

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

READERS who find this paper interesting or useful, are requested to bring it to the attention of their acquaintances, and also to forward the names and addresses of such persons as they think might become subscribers after seeing sample copies.