

The Nation.

NEW YORK, THURSDAY, JUNE 3, 1886.

The Week.

THE President sent in five more vetoes of private pension bills on Friday, and nobody can read the messages without feeling convinced that his objections in each case are well-founded. Mr. Cleveland lays down the rule which ought to govern in these matters, but which has come to be entirely disregarded, when he says: "It is not a pleasant thing to interfere in such a case, but we are dealing with pensions and not with gratuities."

The Boston *Advertiser*, last week, saw fit to speak of "the absurd secrecy which is being practised at the White House concerning the President's marriage." To our minds, so far from being absurd, it was most natural. We presume there are very few properly-constituted human beings who do not crave some privacy touching their tastes, habits, doings, sayings, social and domestic relations; or, in other words, do not desire that some portion of their life, be it never so small, shall be private. We think, too, that there is no man with a spark of gentlemanly feeling who, when about to be married, would not wish to regulate the amount of news about the match and the wedding which should be communicated to the public. His rights in this matter, too, are paramount. The public appetite for gossip does not annul or override them. It is only in savage communities that the claim of individuals to have secrets about themselves is totally denied. An Eastern traveller who had put up at a "hotel" in a mining town in Colorado, finding no shades in his window, which looked out on a piazza filled with loafers, pinned a shirt across it to screen him while he was dressing. In a few minutes it was rudely torn down by a hand from the outside, and on his asking angrily what that meant, the intruder exclaimed: "I want to see what there is so d--d private going on here." The loafer's surprise and curiosity were, perhaps, not unnatural, but the traveller was none the less entitled to his screen. Nobody has a right to know everything about anybody on any occasion in life, except the police about a man convicted of a crime. An honest man has a right, on any lawful occasion, to say to what extent he is willing to take the public into his confidence, whether the occasion be his own marriage or his mother's funeral.

President Cleveland doubtless feels all this strongly. He shrinks from having more of his private and personal affairs laid before the public than he chooses. He knows that it is impossible, as the newspaper business is now conducted, to get the simple facts of either his engagement or his marriage given to the people. He knows on what trifles columns of silly, flippant, ruffianly fiction are built up by some of our esteemed contemporaries, and with what disregard of the decencies of civilized life, with what contempt for the feelings of the living or for the memory of the dead, the work is

done, if it is at all likely to be marketable. Moreover, his domestic affairs have no sort of resemblance to those of a European sovereign, though the reporters work them up as if they had. His place is not an hereditary one. He and his wife will in all probability be, a few years hence, plain citizens of Buffalo. But none the less his marriage is a matter of some interest to the people of the United States. It does concern them to know what manner of woman the mistress of the White House is, or is to be, but they ought to get their knowledge about her in a sober, respectable, and self-respecting way, like civilized men, and not like savages. The President would doubtless have been glad to gratify their legitimate curiosity about his marriage; but, knowing the agents by whom all knowledge on such subjects reaches the public, he probably endeavored to protect himself by precautions which looked like secrecy, whereas he was simply trying to keep something back, be it never so little, and felt that he should never accomplish even this except by trying to keep everything back.

The grievances of the trades-unions against the Knights of Labor have been reduced to writing, in the form of six demands, and presented to the Cleveland Assembly. These are, in brief, that the Knights shall not initiate any person or persons whose trade has a national or international organization without the consent of such organization; that no person shall be initiated as a Knight who works for less than the union scale of wages, or who has ever been convicted of "scabbing," "ratting," or embezzlement of the funds of a trade-union; that all charters granted to assemblies having a national or international union shall be revoked; that any organizer of the Knights of Labor who endeavors to induce trades-unions to disband, or tampers with their growth and privileges, shall be expelled from the order; that when any strike of trades-unionists is in progress, no assembly of the Knights of Labor shall interfere; and that the Knights of Labor shall not grant any label in competition with any label issued by any national or international trade-union. To grant these demands will be equivalent to disbanding the Knights of Labor altogether, or reducing the order to very contemptible dimensions. The idea at the foundation of the order is, that it is possible to bring "labor" of all kinds into one society, and direct its united power against capital in such a way as to squeeze profits down to nothing, or next to nothing. In practice it is an attempt to enable all trades to get the better of each other—as futile as the proverbial endeavor to lift one's self over a fence by the boot-straps. The trade-union idea is to enable each particular trade to do the best it can for itself, not intending any harm to other trades, but leaving them to look out for themselves. The Knights of Labor would seek to enable the workers in a coal mine and those in an iron furnace and those on a railway connecting the two to jointly get the better of the mine owners, the railway, and the

furnace. In case of a "grievance" in the furnace, the workingmen in all three of the trades might be "ordered out." Two entirely innocent and disinterested trades, together with many others which depend upon the mine and the railway, would be prostrated or injured in order to give a victory to the furnace men. The trade-union method of dealing with the same grievance would be to order a strike of the furnace men, and, by means of their national organization, to prevent the furnace from getting other workmen to take their places. In an extreme case they would order strikes in all furnaces, but would not molest any other trade. The boycott would never be introduced as an auxiliary weapon by a single trade-union, but would be the natural and almost necessary weapon of the Knights of Labor.

The trade-union idea is not only the correct one, but is the only one which has any chance of lasting influence in the social and industrial life of the nation. Every trade pays out the great bulk of its receipts in wages, directly or indirectly. Our friend John Roach, in one of his tariff speeches, said that 90 per cent. of the cost of an iron ship in the United States was paid for labor—labor in the ship-yard, in the rolling-mill, in the iron mine, the coal mine, the forest, the saw-mill, etc. The statement was undoubtedly true as to Mr. Roach's yard, and is probably true as to all yards, both here and abroad. It is not necessary to make a parade of statistics in order to show that what is true of the ship-building trade is true of industry in general, namely, that all but a very small part of the price that anything sells for is paid for the labor of producing it. It follows that when the Knights of Labor seek to bring all trades into one organization in order to get the better of capital, they are fighting capital only to the extent of 10 per cent., while they are fighting labor to the extent of 90 per cent. Mr. Arthur understands this thing better than Mr. Powderly. He says in substance: "Our business is to see that locomotive engineers get their rights. The cigarmakers, the silk dyers, the jute weavers, etc., have our sympathy, but we have no mission to take care of them and ourselves too. They will get on better without us, and we shall get on better without them." This is the American idea, and it will carry the day.

A bricklayers' union in Washington has fixed upon \$4 a day as the rate which should be paid to all workmen, whether good or poor, and, a number of men having found employers who are ready to pay them \$6 a day, it is authoritatively announced that these men must refuse to earn over \$4, and that "the Union will punish any member, by imposing a heavy fine, who shall accept anything in excess of \$4." Hitherto in the history of the human race it has been held that the ambition to rise in the world, to make one's labor more valuable to one's employer, and thus to earn higher wages than the lazy and the shiftless, was a very proper and laudable ambition. But the union changes all this. The fundamental principle

of the union is that all workmen shall fare alike; that the same wages shall be paid to the slow-going and inefficient laborer as to the active and capable one. The union holds that it is as great an offence for a member to earn more than the union rate as for him to take less, and the severest penalties are ready to be visited upon any man who makes the slightest effort to better his condition in the world and rise a little above the mass of his fellows.

The Oleomargarine Bill afforded the House as much merriment on Thursday as any circus clown or band of burnt-cork minstrels could supply. All "bogus" articles of food and drink were sought to be added to the list of things to be taxed, such as artificial eggs, motherless chickens, watered milk, sanded sugar, glucose syrup and honey, mixed liquors, and wooden nutmegs. The several amendments were voted down amid roars of laughter, and the bill was "progressed" toward final passage with an evident concurrence of opinion that while members must vote for it, they nevertheless held it to be a supremely foolish measure. The performance was not edifying, but it serves to fix in the public mind the true character of the bill. There is one aspect of the measure and its consequences which may not prove to be so funny. If the price of butter be raised about ten cents a pound after the bill becomes a law—and if this effect be not produced, the only purpose of the bill will have been defeated—there will probably be a general inquiry as to the reasons for the sudden scarcity of an article of such prime necessity. It will then be discerned that although Congress has pretended to give us a free breakfast-table by removing the duties from tea and coffee, it has turned and put a tax on butter, not for revenue, but avowedly in order to make the article bring a higher price in the market. As an experiment upon the forbearance of the American people, the Oleomargarine Bill may have some value as showing how much "protection" the public will put up with. The passage the other day of a bill to prevent mackerel-fishing south of Cape Cod was an experiment in the same line. There is evident need of a bill to stop the manufacture of cotton-seed oil. This article has superseded lard and tallow to a considerable extent. If allowed to run wild in the markets of the country, there is no knowing how many people may find their profits curtailed. Why not pass a bill authorizing the Commissioner of Internal Revenue to collect taxes in his discretion on any new trade which seems to be getting the advantage of any old trade?

The Chicago *Tribune* reads a severe lecture to its New York namesake on the subject of South American trade, steamship subsidies, and the tariff. If American goods could be laid down in South American markets without any charge for transportation, says the Chicago paper, we should still be unable to compete with British manufacturers who get their raw materials free, while our manufacturers are taxed 40 to 50 per cent. on corresponding articles. "This country," it continues, "will never be able to secure the

South American markets for her manufacturers until she pulls down the commercial non-intercourse, high-tariff wall which, by a back-action operation in shutting foreign goods out of our market, excludes our wares from foreign markets. This adamant fact the New York *Tribune* must first learn to comprehend before it can intelligently discuss the subsidy question, or comprehend the reason that American goods are not exported and sold abroad." Which signifies, apparently, that the Chicago *Tribune* is not in the Blaine boom this year.

Just as the public has concluded, after a thorough study of the question of Federal aid to Southern schools, that the subsidy scheme would do more harm than good, Mr. Rutherford B. Hayes appears in an obscure magazine with a plea for such a scheme as the Blair bill, based upon the same old vague assertions of which the fallacy has been so thoroughly exposed. "Four millions of people in the South," Mr. Hayes says, "are unable to read and write," but he apparently does not understand that three-fourths of these people are too old to get any benefit from the most liberal system of schools. "Almost three millions of the young people of the South are growing up without the means of education," says Mr. Hayes. This is the same as saying that half the children of the South have no chance to go to school, whereas the reports of Southern school superintendents show that even in States like South Carolina and Mississippi, where the negroes are most numerous, the proportion of children of the school age who attend school is as large as in New Hampshire. The only bit of evidence which Mr. Hayes cites in support of his theory, is a statement made in a speech "a few years ago" by Dr. Ruffner, then School Superintendent of Virginia, that in his State they were not able to educate the people "in any tolerable sense," as he (Ruffner) had shown by statistics "a few years" before this speech. Regarding this, it is sufficient to say that Virginia has increased the amount of her school expenditures from \$946,109 in 1880 to \$1,428,678 in 1885, and now keeps her schools open 118 days in the year, against only 104 in Maine, and but 100 in New Hampshire. There might, perhaps, be an excuse for somebody else who should write an article upon so important a question without making the most elementary examination of the facts; but we do not quite see how an ex-President of the United States, leading a life of leisure, can reconcile such carelessness with his conscience.

The time has at last come when the task of answering the people who want to run future Republican campaigns upon a bloody-shirt platform can be left to Republican papers. Frederick Douglass made a speech to a Boston club the other day, in which he declared his belief that Mr. Blaine's ill-natured sectional speech at Augusta, after his defeat for the Presidency in 1884, would be "the keynote in the next campaign," and "carry the Republican party triumphantly to victory." A Republican paper in Mr. Blaine's State, the Portland *Advertiser*, discusses this proposition with great good sense. It says that under the reconstruction policy the ne-

groes became the prey of demagogues, and "misgoverned the Southern States beyond all endurance," and it declares that "no New England State would submit for a month to such rapine as was perpetrated by the carpet-bag governments." The revolution which followed was inevitable, and it cannot be reversed, since "no act of Congress can organize and establish permanent anarchy and injustice." The *Advertiser* considers Mr. Douglass a man whose public utterances always deserve attention, but it assures him that "when he advocates the re-establishment of the color line and the carpet-bag governments, he talks of wild impossibilities." When a Maine Republican paper talks in such a strain as this, even Mr. Blaine must begin to perceive how far the country has got beyond his Bourbon ideas.

There are in this city at the present time 8,557 licensed liquor-saloons, or 1 for every 23 voters. This is the proportion for the whole city. If it were possible to get the number of saloons in each ward, we should find that the proportion varied in different localities. In Philadelphia, according to an interesting calculation published by the *Public Ledger* of that city, there are about 6,000 saloons, an average of 1 saloon for every 29 voters, the proportion ranging from 1 saloon to every 8 voters in the worst ward to 1 for every 50 voters in the most respectable ward. There are wards in this city in which the casual observer would say that there must be a liquor saloon for at most every half-dozen voters, for more than half the stores appear to be devoted to that business. But taking the general average of 1 saloon for every 23 voters, what an alarming condition of affairs that discloses! It is no wonder that the liquor-saloon and the liquor-dealer have come to be the controlling forces in municipal politics. Under the present system of mixing politics with liquor, there can be no other result than to multiply constantly the number of saloons. With an Excise Board composed of three men who represent as many different "halls" or factions, and who are all unscrupulous politicians, put there for the express purpose of making the position "pay" all that it possibly can for the benefit of the party, there can be no other outcome. Each Commissioner vies with his fellows to get the largest possible number of saloons which will yield a revenue to him.

The Rhode Island Republicans have carried out their plan, and have completed their alliance with the liquor interest by electing to the office of Chief of the State Police a defaulter, of whom the *Providence Journal*, the Republican organ of the State, speaks as follows:

"Who and what kind of a man Charles R. Brayton is and has been, is known to every citizen of Rhode Island, and to the members of the General Assembly who cast their ballots for him. There can be no plea of ignorance. Every one knows that when Postmaster of the city of Providence he was a defaulter in a sum exceeding \$30,000, that he resigned to avoid dismissal, and that this defalcation had to be made good from the pockets of those who, in friendship and trust, gave bonds for his honesty and good behavior. For years before and after the discovery of his crime he has been notorious as the agent of corruption in politics. He has received the money and he has paid the money for 'Machine' politics. He has manipulated caucuses and conventions, and

been the acknowledged head and chief captain of the Swiss mercenaries of Rhode Island politics, with his fingers upon the keys of intrigue in both political parties, and with instruments in every town and ward in the State."

The *Journal* adds that this performance has excited great public indignation, and predicts that the men who have carried it through will be driven from the public service; if they are not, it says, "then the days of the Republican party in Rhode Island are over, and will deserve to be over." A letter from Newport to *The Evening Post* throws interesting light upon the way in which the scheme was carried through the Legislature. It is no secret that among the prime movers of this plan to strengthen the party by connecting it, through a defaulter, with the rumsellers of the State, are a United States Senator and other Republicans high in the ranks of the party. These are the same men who recently took General Logan to Providence, to arouse the party of moral ideas to a sense of its duties and responsibilities.

A panic is said to have been produced among the Ministerialists in England by the unexpected strength of the "dissidents" displayed at the meeting called by Chamberlain on Monday, which, according to Chamberlain's "arithmetic man," promises a majority of fifty-one against the Home-Rule Bill on the second reading. Their theory is, that if they can muster a majority as large as this, the Queen will see in it evidence that the Opposition can form a cabinet, and will ask Lord Hartington to undertake it, instead of allowing Mr. Gladstone to dissolve Parliament. Should the majority against the bill be but small, however, that is to say, not over thirty, a dissolution is certain. But it is very clear from the wide difference between the estimates of the arithmetic men on each side, made doubtless after most careful canvassing, that there is a large number of members who have not made up and cannot fully make up their minds, and whose course at the final moment nobody, not even they themselves, can accurately foretell. The chances would seem to be at this moment that the bill will be beaten by a small majority, and that Mr. Gladstone will then at once dissolve and appeal to the constituencies; but as the division will take place in all probability before the end of the week, prophecy is of no great value.

Mr. Dicey's letters on English politics are always interesting and instructive, and we make it a rule to let him, as indeed all our correspondents, say his say without note or comment. The letter we print to-day seems, however, to suggest one or two brief observations, which he will not think out of place. The first is, that the absence of "genuine enthusiasm" for Irish home rule in England seems an odd thing for Mr. Dicey to deem worthy of serious consideration. The absence of all genuine interest in Irish questions on the part of Englishmen constitutes the strongest of the arguments for home rule. Now, without interest of some kind to begin with, enthusiasm there cannot be. There was no "genuine enthusiasm" in England for Catholic emancipation, for the abolition of the Protestant tithes, or for any of the land acts, or for the disestablishment of the Irish Church. We

have read, we believe, every speech of importance on both sides, and have, on analyzing those of the anti-Gladstonians, found invariably that the whole argument rested on the assumption that the Irish would in some manner fail to keep faith or fulfil the obligations imposed by the bill, not through want of ability, but through want of will. If this assumption were taken away, the whole superstructure went to pieces. That is to say, the bill has been opposed mainly by means of appeals to prejudice, partly religious and partly racial, or, in other words, on purely sentimental grounds. Secondly, we take leave to dispute Mr. Dicey's first "consequence." The first Reform Bill was undoubtedly the triumph of numbers over wealth, vested interests, and "thoughtfulness," even although the numbers did not vote. At the same time we agree with Mr. Dicey in thinking this a great danger and misfortune. But it is the inevitable consequence of refusing too long the redress of a grievance not felt by the "educated class." That class in England found it easy to bear with the woes of the Irish peasants until that complete social and political separation of the tillers of the soil from the owners of it which we now witness in Ireland, took place. This state of things cannot be cured by further resistance on the part of the educated class, and yet it must be dealt with in some new way.

Of Mr. Dicey's fourth "consequence," we would say that the propositions that "the Gladstonian idolatry is degrading the tone of public life," and that the bona-fide supporters of home rule in the Liberal party do not constitute a "respectable minority"—that is, that the bulk of its supporters are hypocrites or cowards—are too serious to rest on such assumptions as "it is the universal belief"; "every one out of Parliament thinks"; "all over the country Liberal managers" are doing so and so; "men who always opposed home rule" "are being informed" of something very absurd; "rumors are current," etc., etc. We should say that these expressions rather indicate a state of panic and disgust among the "educated class," than describe a whole political situation. Finally, touching Mr. Dicey's fifth consequence, we would remind him that all concessions made by an established government to a revolutionary movement, whether it take the form of simple disorder or of organized armed resistance, involve at the outset "the condonation and, indeed, the reward of lawlessness and injustice" in some degree. This was true of the American Revolution. It began in "lawlessness," and was marked by "injustice toward thousands of men," who "trusted to the protection of the English Parliament," and were "ill-treated because they respected the law," and "attempted to exercise their legal rights." It was true, also, of the Canadian rebellion, and of the concessions to the Dutch Boers. In fact, it is a form of misfortune, or evil, with which Englishmen ought by this time to be very familiar.

The Italian Parliament was dissolved more than a year before the end of its term, and the electoral agitation has begun. That Parliament was the first convoked under the new electoral law passed in the beginning of

1882, which, by considerably reducing the property qualification, as well as the educational tests, raised the number of electors in the kingdom from about six hundred thousand to upwards of two millions and a half. The law, which also included a narrow *scrutin de liste*, was initiated by the Depretis Government, under pressure of the more radical fractions of the Liberal party. The apprehension that the vast extension of the suffrage would bring the constituencies under clerical sway was not realized, the clergy, at the direction of the Vatican, continuing its policy of abstention. The Depretis Cabinet disposed of a good working majority, though continually harassed by attacks of the so-called Pentarchists—that is, the groups led by, or rather supporting, the political fortunes of Cairoli, Crispi, Nicotera, Baccarini, and Zanardelli. It leaned, to a large degree, on the Conservatives, from whom the Left, under Depretis, had wrested the long-held reins of administration in 1876. Both its external policy and domestic management were fiercely denounced, in spite of obviously favorable results, as illiberal, and thus faithless to the programme enunciated by the Left on assuming power. It was accused of tyrannically persecuting Irredentists, Republicans, and Socialists, of fawning upon Bismarck's royal coalition, of cringing before the Pope, of neglecting the interests of Italy in the Balkan Peninsula, in Africa, in Italia Irredenta, and of numberless other wrongs of commission and omission.

A vast improvement in the finances, the abrogation of a forced currency, the electoral reform, the final settlement of the railway problem, peace maintained with France under grievous provocations, a firm and most salutary understanding with Austria-Hungary and Germany—these are the main achievements of which Depretis and his supporters not unjustly boast. The Pentarchist opposition they declare to be devoid of principle and factious, and its protection of Anarchist tendencies, and especially of Irredentism, to be fraught with danger to peace within and abroad. They have not deserted their banner by yielding to necessities arising from changed conditions: it is the Pentarchists who have deserted the common camp. The greatest humiliation suffered by Italy—when France treacherously seized Tunis—was incurred under the Premiership of Cairoli. They cling to the Central-European coalition under honorable conditions, placing a powerful naval and military contingent at the disposal of the peace league. The alliance with the more advanced wing of the Conservatives is a natural consequence of a political evolution demanding a recasting of parties. The reproach of "transformism" they willingly accept. Mancini's foreign policy is a successful continuation of Minghetti's. The fact is, the moderate Liberalism of Depretis suits the ruling classes of Italy so well that even his exceptionally long stay in office—at the head of various cabinets—is not likely to speed the agitation for his downfall. There is no chance for a Radical, Clerical, Socialist, or Anti-Austrian majority, or even strong minority, yet, and coalitions of the advanced opposition with Conservative groups are but transient and partially effective. Depretis holds the same position in Italy which Tisza holds in Hungary by similar methods.

SUMMARY OF THE WEEK'S NEWS.

[WEDNESDAY, May 26, to TUESDAY, June 1, 1886, inclusive.]
DOMESTIC.

THE following official announcement was issued from the White House on Friday night: "President Cleveland will be married at the White House on Wednesday evening, June 2, to Miss Frances Folsom. The recent death of a relative of Miss Folsom has changed the original plans for the wedding, and the invitations will now be limited to a few of the near relatives and the members of the Cabinet and their wives. The Rev. Dr. Sunderland of the First Presbyterian Church of Washington will officiate. The ceremony will be followed by a collation, and the wedding in all of its details will be plain and unostentatious."

President Cleveland on Friday vetoed five more private pension bills. In closing one veto message he says: "It is not a pleasant thing to interfere in such a case, but we are dealing with pensions, not with gratuities."

President Cleveland spent Decoration Day in New York and Brooklyn, and reviewed the parades.

The conference report on the Shipping Bill was adopted by both houses of Congress on Thursday. The bill contains the Frye amendment authorizing the President to treat foreign vessels in American ports as American vessels are treated in foreign ports.

It is asserted on good authority that the Canadian fishermen are all anxious and ready to sell bait to American fishermen, as it is their main source of income.

The Canadian schooner *The Sisters*, Capt. Anderson, which had been detained by the United States Collector at Portland, Me., was on Saturday released by order of the Treasury Department. It is said the release was ordered on the ground that the Captain did not intend to evade the law.

The captain of a coaster which arrived at Halifax on Tuesday reported that the *L. Houlette* had seized an American mackerel fisherman off the Guysborough coast.

In the Canadian House of Commons on Thursday the Minister of Marine, in reply to a question, said that six steamers and six schooners are being fitted out to protect the Canadian fisheries. The instructions to the masters of these vessels are to cruise around the coasts to protect the in-shore fisheries from the encroachments of foreign fishing vessels, especially those of the United States. They are to do their work with as great caution, as much courtesy, and as much firmness as is possible.

The American revenue cutter *Dix* arrived at Cedar Keys, Fla., on Sunday, with the Spanish fishing smack *Chlotilde* of Havana, which she captured off Anclote Key, Fla., for violating the fishery laws by fishing within three leagues of the American shore, and for irregularities in her papers. The *Chlotilde* is a small schooner-rigged vessel and has six thousand salt fish on board. The crew consists of ten men and officers, none of whom speak English.

Senator Sherman moved in the Senate on Wednesday the bill defining some of the phrases in the law restricting the landing of Chinese in American ports. He said the bill simply defined phrases which had been interpreted in different ways by different courts. Mr. Hoar protested against existing and proposed Chinese legislation as among the great blots on the history of the human race. It was, he said, aimed at men simply because they were laborers, and belonged to a certain race. He intimated that American skill, talent, and industry were afraid they should be beaten. Mr. Ingalls denounced the Chinese restrictive laws as a disgrace to civilization.

Republican Senators held a caucus on Tuesday morning. Among the measures which it was decided to consider in the near future were the bill to repeal the preemption and timber-culture laws and the alien land bill.

At the meeting of the House Committee on Education on Friday, Representative Miller of Texas introduced a substitute for the Blair Educational Bill. It is in substance as follows: It appropriates \$8,000,000 annually for ten years, to be distributed among the States and Territories according to the ratio of illiteracy as established by the census of 1880. The money shall be paid to the States on the first of each July beginning with July 1, 1887, and shall be expended by the States in the maintenance of public schools under the State laws. The provisions of the Blair bill requiring reports from the States regarding the disbursement of the money, and to which objections have been made on the ground of interference with States' rights, are eliminated from the bill. In States in which separate schools are maintained for white and colored children, the bill provides that the money given the States shall be apportioned between white and colored schools in the proportion that the total number of children of each race of school age bears to the total number of children of school age in the State as shown by the scholastic census. Mr. Miller says that while he regards all bills of this class as unconstitutional, he prefers that a bill similar to the one proposed by him should be reported rather than one containing the objectionable features embodied in the Blair bill.

The Postal Savings Bank Bill is making little progress in the House Committee on Post-offices. It has been referred to a sub-committee, consisting of Jones of Texas, Chairman, Wood of Indiana, and Burrows of Michigan. They are holding no meetings to consider it.

The Special Committee appointed to investigate the strike in the Southwest has not yet made its report, and ex-Gov. Curtin, the Chairman, who was recently asked when the report might be expected, said that he did not think any would be made at this session. He said that there was something to be gained by holding the subject open, and that he thought it would be well to "enlarge the scope" of the inquiry, and to investigate the labor troubles in Pennsylvania, and that authority would be asked to do that. The Republican members of the Committee think that the delay, if finally decided upon, will be for a political purpose, and that one of its immediate objects will be to aid in the organization of a movement to secure the nomination and election of Mr. Curtin as Governor of Pennsylvania. That, beyond question, is his own object. He is in close relations with Mr. Powderly, and he has doubtless convinced his Democratic colleagues on the Committee that it will be possible for him to secure the cooperation of the Knights of Labor in the advancement of his political plans. The fact that Mr. Powderly is said to insist that the Knights of Labor are not to be used as a political organization, does not seem to have been considered by Curtin.

The Committee on Legislation of the Knights of Labor presented to the General Assembly on Monday a report on the land question, which was unanimously adopted. They demand that all public land shall be held for settlers only; that all land which is held by individual proprietors in excess of 160 acres, and which is not under cultivation, shall be taxed on the full value of cultivated land in the same neighborhood; that all land which is now held by railroads or other corporations when the conditions under which it was granted have not been complied with, shall be declared forfeited and revert to the Government; that patents shall at once be issued for all non-forfeitable lands, and that the taxation of them on the basis of the value of cultivated land shall at once begin; that all fences on the public domain shall at once be removed at the expense of those who have put them up; that after 1890 all lands in the United States the titles to, which are vested in aliens shall be taken possession of by the Government under the right of eminent domain, by purchase at a fair valuation, which shall be fixed by appraisement; that after 1886 no alien shall be permitted to acquire the title

to land either by purchase or in any other way. In addition to this they demand that Congress shall pass a law abolishing all property qualifications for the exercise of the elective franchise. In all the States they demand the passage of an act providing for a graduated income tax. They protest against the reduction of the appropriation for the Labor Bureau. The passage of a bill is urged prohibiting the employment of minors for more than eight hours.

The Grand Lodge of the Brotherhood of Railway Brakemen recently in Illinois expelled twenty-six of its members for originating the strike on the Union Pacific Railroad, and has suspended thirty more for ninety days for participating. As the Brotherhood is one of the most powerful labor organizations in the country, and now embraces Canada, the above action has created a profound impression in railroad circles.

The Chicago Grand Jury is making inquiries which may lead to the indictment of Most for connection with the riot there. There is evidence that the bombs seized at Lingg's lodgings and distributed by that person were manufactured in accordance with the instructions of Most—that Most was in correspondence with Spies and had a conference with him shortly before the bomb throwing; and it is believed that it can be established that packages of dynamite were sent from New York by Most to Spies for work in Chicago. Twenty-two Anarchists were indicted by the Chicago Grand Jury on Thursday, a number of them for murder.

The Anarchists John Most, Adolph Schenck, and Richard Braunschweig, charged with unlawful assembly, etc., were found guilty in the Court of General Sessions late Friday afternoon, and were remanded for sentence. Schenck was recommended by the jury to the mercy of the Court. Under the conviction, Recorder Smyth can sentence the prisoners to the penitentiary for one year, and fine them \$500 each.

Judges Pardee and Billings, in the United States Circuit Court, sitting in New Orleans, on Monday rendered a decision in the notable case of the American Bell Telephone Company against the International Improved Telephone Company. In concluding their opinion, which is in Bell's favor, the judges say: "From the evidence submitted in this case it seems clear that now, in the present state of the art, neither the Reiss instruments nor any reproduction of them can be made to transmit articulate speech except by changes of some form in the instruments themselves or by the employment of Bell's methods. We therefore conclude that neither Reiss nor his successors anticipated the invention of Bell as set forth in the fifth claim of his application and patent, and as illustrated by figure 7 described in his accompanying specification. The injunction against the defendant company is ordered to issue."

The New Jersey Prohibition State Convention on Friday nominated Gen. Clinton B. Fisk for Governor. They hope to poll about 22,000 votes in the campaign.

In the General Assembly of the Southern Presbyterian Church at Augusta, Ga., on Wednesday, a vote was taken on the case of Dr. Woodrow, charged with teaching evolution in a theological seminary. By a vote of 137 to 13, the majority report, which declares that "man was created by an immediate act of divine power, without animal parentage," was adopted.

Judge Marcus Lyon, as Surrogate of Tompkins County, N. Y., on Wednesday filed a decision in the famous McGraw-Fiske will case, decreeing the legacies of Jennie McGraw Fiske to Cornell University of \$1,500,000 for library purposes in all respects valid, ratifying the payments heretofore made, and directing Executor Boardman to pay the balance of Mrs. Fiske's estate to Cornell University as residuary legatee. This celebrated case has been pending before Judge Lyon since July 20, 1883. The alleged invalidity of the legacies to the Uni-