

compilation made by the bureau of labor, fifteen show an advance and fifteen a decline but offset the fifteen articles that show an advance because those articles that have advanced in price more largely enter into consumption.

**I**N MAKING ITS statistics the bureau of labor has taken a basis of relative prices in order to make its comparison as follows:

	Price in 1894.	Price in 1904.
Beans .....	105.0	116.8
Beef roast and stew.....	98.6	112.8
Beef steaks .....	99.1	113.4
Salt beef .....	99.6	108.3
Wheat bread .....	99.7	103.9
Cheese .....	99.2	107.4
Chickens .....	97.1	120.7
Corn Meal .....	102.2	121.5
Eggs .....	96.3	130.9
Fresh Fish .....	100.4	107.9
Salt Fish .....	101.5	111.7
Milk .....	100.2	106.2
Mutton and lamb .....	107.8	114.1
Fresh pork .....	101.8	124.0

The report comments on figures in other tables as follows: "The price of fresh roasting and stewing beef in 1890, it is shown, was 99.5 per cent of the average price during the ten-year period from 1890 to 1899. In 1891 the price was exactly the same as the average price for the ten-year period—that is 100.0. The lowest point reached was in 1894, when it was 98.6 per cent of the average price for the ten-year period. The highest point reached was in 1902, when it stood at 118.6. In 1904 it stood at 112.8, or 12.8 per cent higher than the average price for the period from 1890 to 1899. Eggs show a marked increase in price during the last few years. In 1900 the price was 99.9 per cent of the average price for the ten-year period, 1890 to 1899; in 1901 the price rose to 105.7, in 1902 to 119.1, in 1903 to 125.3 and in 1904 to 130.9. The price in 1904 was 31 per cent above the price four years previous."

**I**N THE SAME report is presented a compilation of the relative prices in the United States of certain groups of related articles of food between 1890 and 1904. The report says: "Under 'cattle products' are shown the three articles, beef, fresh roasts and stews; beef, fresh steaks, and beef, salt. The price of each of these three articles was higher in 1891 than in 1890; that of the two kinds of fresh beef was lower and that of salt beef was higher in 1892 than in 1891; prices of roasts and stews were lower and of steaks and salt beef higher in 1893 than in 1892; all three articles show lower prices in 1894 than in 1893; in each year from 1895 to 1902, inclusive, the price of each of the three articles increased; all were lower in 1903 than in 1902; prices of roasts and stews and salt beef were lower and steaks higher in 1904 than in 1903. In the group 'hog products' all the five articles take the same course in each of the six years, 1891 to 1896; in 1897 all except lard were higher than in 1896; in 1898 all except salt ham were higher than in 1897; in each of the four years, 1899 to 1903, all five articles were higher than in the year immediately preceding; in 1903 fresh pork, dry or pickled pork and lard were lower, while bacon and ham were higher than in 1902; in 1904 all were lower than in 1903."

**A**N INTERESTING calculation as to the cost of living is given in the following quotation: "In the North Atlantic states the average cost per family (assuming that food was purchased in the same quantity each year and that the expenditure for each of the various articles bore the same relation to the total expenditure for food each year) was \$330.35 in 1890, \$333.26 in 1891, etc. The lowest cost was \$312.91 in 1897, and the highest was \$360.70 in 1904, a difference of \$47.79. For the United States, considered as a whole, the average cost of food per family in 1890 was \$318.20. In 1895, the year of lowest prices, it fell to \$296.76; in 1904 it reached the highest point of the period, being \$347.10, a difference between 1896 and 1904 of \$50.34, or 17.0 per cent. The changes in the cost of living as shown relate to food alone, representing 42.54 per cent of all family expenditures in the 2,567 families furnishing information."

**T**HE ENTIRE postal money order system has been revolutionized because of the conduct of a Brooklyn woman who, it is alleged, issued forged money orders. The New York World tells the story in this way: "For some time the government experts at Washington had desired to alter

the form of money orders so as to avoid frauds, but it was not until the young postal clerk's operations were detected that the experts discovered a way to prevent crookedness in that branch of the service. All of the outstanding blanks are being called in and new blanks, like express orders, are being printed at Washington in a rush. The new order when torn from the book by the postal clerk leaves a stub which shows the amount of the money order. The auditor of the New York postoffice said that the name of the missing clerk of the Sixth avenue sub-station is Lydia A. Engelke, and that she is 21 years old and lives with her parents somewhere in Brooklyn. The auditor said Miss Engelke's method was to issue money orders for \$100 each, payable to F. J. Needham, deposit \$1 in the cash account of her sub-station in each case and cash the orders at a private bank further up Sixth avenue, representing herself to be F. J. Needham. By accident, the postal authorities say, she chose the name of a Fourteenth street publisher. The forged money orders passed through the clearing house and the general postoffice without detection until last Saturday, when seven post-dated money orders for \$100 each all cashed the day they were issued, aroused suspicion and led to inquiry and the clerk's flight. The auditor said that with the existing form of money order blank it would be possible for a money order clerk to issue 100 forged orders for \$100 each, clearing \$10,000. As there are 245 of these offices in New York alone, the authorities were staggered by Miss Engelke's operations and the peril involved. The missing young woman has, so far, eluded the cleverest postal detectives in the service."

**T**HE CONGREGATIONAL ministers of Chicago held a session September 12 and discussed the "tainted money" question. Rev. W. A. Bartlett, pastor of the First Congregational church, proposed that the Chicago ministers unite in a telegram to the board of commissioners for foreign missions, whose annual meeting was soon to be held at Seattle, urging that body to refuse the admission of any resolution on "tainted money." Doctor Golden, a Congregational clergyman of Chicago, had already left for Seattle, after announcing that he would introduce in the board a resolution condemning the solicitation or acceptance of funds "from persons whose gains are generally believed to have been made by methods morally reprehensible and socially injurious." Doctor Bartlett's proposition was after a long debate voted down.

**T**HE CONGREGATIONAL board of foreign missions, in session at Seattle, decided to reject all resolutions pertaining to the contributions of "tainted money." This action was taken with respect to a resolution offered by Washington Gladden, which resolution provided that the missionary board should not solicit money from men who have gained their wealth through means dishonest and oppressive. Writing to the Omaha World-Herald, John Williams, one of Omaha's best beloved clergymen, says that so far as the Gladden resolution goes, the missionary board might receive money if offered without solicitation from men who have gained their wealth dishonestly. He cites the fact that one of the speakers at the conference said that while it was wrong to receive money from these questionable sources if offered openly and ostentatiously, yet the money could be rightly accepted if offered privately and without ostentation. Mr. Williams thinks that in both the Gladden resolution and the speech referred to "the high moral principle involved is surrendered, probably through parliamentary timidity, in order to gain something for an apparently desperate cause in the present conference."

**M**R. WILLIAMS contends that if it be wrong to solicit money for missions from men who have gained their wealth dishonestly or from men who are openly accused of doing so by responsible men, then it is wrong to receive it without solicitation. He adds: "If it be wrong to receive such gifts, when offered openly, ostentatiously, then it is wrong to receive them when offered quietly, in secret. It seems to me, sir, that these gentlemen would place their churches in the position of what is known as a fence for stolen goods. It would be wrong for the manager to openly solicit a thief to deposit a part of his stolen goods with him for a virtuous purpose. But it would be harmless to receive and apply them, if offered without solicitation. It would be wrong to receive and apply these goods to a virtuous end if offered ostentatiously, but if the thief comes by night and offers them they may be ac-

cepted thankfully. Mr. Rockefeller's wealth has been obtained either honestly or dishonestly. If honestly, then it can not be wrong to solicit gifts from him for missions, or any other good cause, or to receive them, however openly or ostentatiously offered. If gained dishonestly, as charged then, whether by solicitation or otherwise, whether offered ostentatiously or otherwise, the man or the church that takes the money partakes with the thief, so long as he continues in his evil course, without open confession and amendment. Dr. Gladden's appeal to the future, such as it is, does not deserve to succeed and it will not in that form. He has fatally compromised his noble position taken at the outset, probably for some tactical purpose. I deeply regret it. Sin rests in the thought, in the act, not in the publication of the thought or the act."

**T**HE CADILLAC, MICHIGAN, correspondent for the Detroit News-Tribune, under date of September 17, says: "Charles B. Nelson, aged 31, died here today at the home of his parents, after carrying a bullet imbedded in his heart since 1898. He was shot while sitting in a Chicago park by someone whose identity was never discovered. Quick consumption was the immediate cause of death. Nelson had frequently submitted to X-ray examinations, which showed the location of the bullet, and he has been on exhibition in museums. His wife died in Milwaukee Monday. Reports were current that the young woman had taken her own life upon hearing that her husband was dying."

**T**HE WALL STREET JOURNAL does not appear to be very hopeful—or fearful, as you please—of railway rate legislation. The Journal says: "It is almost certain that any bill desired by the president on this subject would be passed by the house of representatives, but it would meet with determined opposition in the senate. While the senate committee which has been investigating the subject is to prepare a bill, there is no likelihood whatever that, in its initial form at least, it will conform to the idea of what is needed so often expressed by the president in his public addresses."

**W**RITING IN the Denver News, Senator Thomas M. Patterson says that when congress meets—if no extra session is called—two issues will press for consideration and will be "played against each other." The senator explains: "The senate will be complaisant in the matter of tariff reform, and will roll that profound proposition up the difficult hill of unlimited debate. But nothing worth while will be accomplished, because the speaker of the house and the speaker's committee on rules will 'stand pat.' The public will get the benefit of the tariff debate—nothing more. Radical action by Germany, Canada or some other important market might modify this plan. But the play will be made as outlined unless the hand of the party is forced by action abroad. The other topic—one close to the president's heart—is the regulation of railway rates by the enlargement of the powers of the interstate commerce commission or the creation of a special court, with power to act, placing the burden of appeal upon the railroads. On this proposition the position of the two houses is reversed. But despite this change of position, the play of the leaders is the same. The house will 'save the face' of the party by passing, with marked enthusiasm, a bill which embodies the president's views and even the majority of democrats will be forced to support it. In the senate this bill will go to committee, and when it emerges therefrom—very late in the session—it will be 'talked to death' or amended, the amendments being so constructed as to insure opposition in the house."

**S**ENATOR PATTERSON points out as interesting facts that the house of representatives stands with the president as regards railway rates, but against him as regards the tariff, while the senate is against him on the question of railway rates and may support his views on tariff reform. Senator Patterson concludes: "The making of laws is a legislative function and not an executive but so far as it is right for him to do so it is certain that the influence of the president will be steadily exerted in favor of these two policies. He has an immense popularity which has lately been increased by his success in bringing about peace between Russia and Japan, and the question is whether the president with his personal popularity and the support of the great bulk of the people can bring congress around to his way of thinking."