

## AT THE CRADLE.

How still he sleeps! The morning sunlight  
Falls upon his downy head. A song-bird calls  
Without the window, young, rejoicing leaves,  
That garland the new spring, a checkered shade  
Upon the pillow throw, but his bright head is  
Laid.  
In sunlight only: each soft cheek receives  
The radiant kiss. One loving ray  
Lies lightly on his parted lips where play  
The frolic graces of a baby's dream.  
These sporting curls have caught another  
gleam:  
A golden gift it leaves in every tress.  
God bless my baby: every sweet caress  
That leaves a clinging joy about my heart,  
Each loving hope—a loving fear in part—  
Each whispered prayer, his little bed beside,  
Each fond exulting pulse of mother's pride,  
All he has brought of peace and guileless joy  
Return in blessings on my darling boy.  
—Carrie Stern, in *Babyhood*.

## A LITTLE DIPLOMACY.

### It Was Worth More Than Bluff to a Revenue Collector.

Some years ago I received a temporary appointment in the internal revenue department, and was assigned to the duty of looking up violations of the law in regard to manufactured tobacco. All reported irregularities were referred to me for investigation. I was telegraphed by the collector at Nashville, upon one occasion, to go to Shelbyville immediately and take action in a case where a manufacturer, J. H. Ladd, had been using canceled revenue stamps.

When I arrived, I found Capt. Norville, the district deputy, awaiting me with a posse of half a dozen men. Ladd lived twelve or thirteen miles from Shelbyville, in the richest section of the county. I explained to Norville that there was no necessity of going that night as Ladd could not remove his property if he were disposed to do so; that we would start before day in order to make the trip, effect the seizure and return that night. I learned the following from him: He had come up with two of Ladd's wagons a couple of days before in an adjoining county laden with plug tobacco put up in boxes varying in weight from twenty-five to one hundred pounds each; that the stamps on them had been reused; that he had gone the next day with a deputy United States marshal to seize the factory; that when he arrived old man Ladd was not at home and the factory was locked. He had gone to the dwelling for the keys, when Mrs. Ladd told a servant to look for them. She, in the meantime, stepped out into the yard and rang the farm bell as vigorously as if the building was on fire. In a few moments three of Ladd's sons and a hired man rushed to the house as fast as their horses could carry them—they had been plowing—Mrs. Ladd met them at the gate, and, he supposed, explained the situation. They came into the house, a large two-story frame with L. and in a moment into the room where he was sitting, waiting for the girl to find the keys, armed with shotguns.

Mrs. Ladd then abused the officer for everything she could think of, and ordered him to leave and not to stand on the order of going; that if he did not she would have him and the deputy killed and thrown into the hoppen, where they ought to be. The old man did not stand well in the collector's office, and when Norville returned and reported the situation by telegraph I was ordered to the scene. I told him to secure a carriage that would accommodate three besides the driver, and an hour before day we were on our way over a fine turnpike road. When we got in front of the house I saw two men go in from one side, and noticed several faces at the window, two of them females. I ordered the driver to go directly to the factory almost in the rear of the dwelling and at a corner of the garden fence. Leaving the party in the hack I returned to the house, entering by what I afterwards ascertained to be the rear door of the kitchen. An elderly white woman and a negro girl were in the room, washing the dishes and cleaning up after breakfast. I asked politely if this was Mrs. Ladd. She jerked out a "yes." I approached and extended my hand, assuring her I was very glad to see her, and giving my name. I was so friendly, greeted her so cordially, that she was nonplussed for a moment. When I asked if Mr. Ladd was in she answered "yes" in a more pleasant tone, at the same time pointing to a door leading to the main building.

I opened it and walked in, and there sat four men and a fourteen-year-old boy, all except the old man having a double-barrel shotgun lying across his lap. I approached the old man and said:

"This is Mr. Ladd, I presume?"  
"Yes, that is my name."  
I gave him mine.  
"These are your sons, I presume?"  
"Some of them."  
Turning to the one nearest me I said:  
"Your name?"  
"James."

"Well, James, how do you do? I am glad to see you. You favor your father. Eye and forehead exactly."  
I inquired the name of every one, shook hands with each, complimented each. Here I stopped, when the old man said:

"Stranger, since you have got acquainted with all the boys, there is two more you ought to know. One is my wife and the other my daughter."  
"Marinda, Marinda, you and Zoa come in here," he called.

I explained that I had met his wife, and a most charming lady she was, but Marinda came in and I was formally introduced to her, and shook hands with her again, and complimented her on her manly boys. Then the daughter came in, who was indeed a modest, sweet girl of sixteen. I could read in the face of every one of them: "What does all this mean?" After I had talked awhile about the weather and crops, I asked Mr. Ladd to step into an adjoining room with me, as I wished to talk to him privately.

"Oh! no, not any, if you please. If you have any business with me blurt it out. This family has no secrets."  
I then told him that I had heard that he had had some trouble with Capt. Nor-

ville, that I was very sorry to hear it, and had been sent down to investigate the matter. The old lady put an arm in the lock at this moment, and I begged her to allow me to finish. She closed her mouth with a snap and folded her hands across her lap in a gentle spirit of resignation. I impressed upon Ladd that he was dealing with the United States government, that he had an interesting family and a farm worth thirty thousand dollars; that he could not afford to resist the government. I had only brought Capt. Norville and the deputy marshal with me, but that if he intended to resist I would return and secure a force that would execute the law. I explained that Capt. Norville had been very clever. He had authority to have arrested his two sons and seized the two wagons and teams, worth all of six hundred dollars.

The old man said: "Squire, you're a slick one. Do you do. I reckon we can't help ourselves, but if you had 'ave come with a crowd we had made up our mind to clean you up off the face of the earth."

He sent his son with me and we made an invoice of his stock, machinery, etc. I locked the door, and, accompanied by the two officers, returned to the house. The entire party scowled at Norville, but never said a word. The guns had been deposited in the parlor on a six hundred dollar piano, as I subsequently ascertained.

I asked if he would act as custodian of the property. This surprised him. I asked if he could make a bond in double the value of the property I had seized, conditioned upon its being forthcoming upon the order of the United States court.

"What?" he said, "leave my own property with me?"  
I explained that the property seized belonged to Ladd & Sons, and that I would leave it with Ladd, Sr. I knew enough about the business to know that he had a large stock on hand partially worked up that must be finished. I gave him authority to do this. This arrangement virtually left things as they were, only he could make no sales. He signed the papers and was evidently in a fine humor. I then notified him that the marshal had a search warrant, and he and Mr. Norville would have to search the house for unstamped tobacco. He jumped up, started to Norville, who was sitting on the opposite side of the fireplace, and said he would die before the scoundrel should make search. Norville had his forty-four in his grip sack in his lap, with his hand on it ready to use. The marshal was so indignant as to draw his, while the boys started toward the parlor. I knew there was no danger of the officers shooting the old man. I followed them in in time to see them get their guns from the top of the piano. Hastily closing the door and putting my back against it, I asked them if they were fools.

"Suppose," said I, "you kill these two men and myself as to that, can you kill all the men in the nation?"  
"But," said the oldest, "we will not have our father insulted."  
I ordered them to put their guns back and pledged them that their father should not be insulted.  
"But they shall not search this house."  
"Then you are going to resist the law. You are going to force me to summon a posse, arrest you all, search the house, tear up your factory and ruin your father. That's your game, is it? Put your guns down, quit acting the fool, and you and I will make the search and Norville will remain where he is."

This compromise was accepted. I searched the house, found some unstamped tobacco and left.

When court came on the matter was compromised by the old gentleman's paying all the costs, a small fine and promising to be more circumspect in the future. It was afterward ascertained that Capt. Norville, being a countryman and an old friend, Mr. Ladd thought he ought not to have enforced the law against him.—Globe-Democrat.

### SHORT-LIVED MARITAL JOY.

A Woman Who Wanted the Man Who Married Her to Unmarry Her.

A young Polish woman, whose maiden name is as unpronounceable as her married name, which is Katerouwske, appeared at the Camden city hall one morning and asked City Clerk Varney for a divorce. She declared that her husband had basely deceived her and that further union with him was a marital impossibility.

"How long have you been married, madam?" inquired the clerk.

"Since yesterday," came the answer.

"What has occurred to disturb your nuptial joy?"

"Why, my husband told me he had one thousand dollars in bank, owned any quantity of real estate and was going to let me live in clover. I found on getting home that if there was any clover pasture for me I'd have to find it myself. His stories of bank accounts are fables, pure and simple, while the real estate yarn is a hollow mockery."

Mrs. Katerouwske was very indignant when told she could not get a divorce outside the chancery court, which would not grant such a document for the reasons detailed by her.

"Humph!" she ejaculated, as she left the hall, "it's very funny that the man that married me can't unmarry me."—Philadelphia Evening Bulletin.

Mendelssohn began to compose in his twelfth year, and so methodical were his habits even then that the manuscript volumes containing his own scores of his works are in an unbroken series until his death. These are forty-four of these great volumes, all written by his own hand and now preserved in the imperial library in Berlin.

Schubert was precocious. He learned to play both piano and violin at five years of age and was put under the care of the village organist, who soon said: "I can teach him nothing. Whenever I wished to give him something fresh, he knew it already." Schubert wrote over twelve hundred songs and an enormous quantity of other music.

## STEVENS SCORED.

The Ex-Minister to Hawaii Severely Criticized.

While the Hawaiian matter was under debate in the house on February 3, Mr. Rayner, of Maryland, democratic member of the committee on foreign affairs, in reply to a tirade against President Cleveland's policy, by Mr. Hitt, reviewed the acts of Ex-Minister Stevens with scathing condemnation, holding him responsible for a wrong that cannot be rectified, and declared it as his belief that President Cleveland would be sustained in his course. Mr. Rayner's speech was in substance as follows:

"I desire to be fair in the brief discussion that I shall devote to the subject. I am not sufficient of a partisan to appoint every act that proceeds from my own party, and to criticize and condemn everything that is done by my opponents. I have endeavored with an unprejudiced mind to investigate this case in all of its elaborate details and have tried to arrive at a honest conclusion, without any political bias whatever, and I shall give you the conclusions that I have reached and the judgment that I have arrived at for whatever it may be worth.

"My opinion is this: In the first place, I am convinced beyond all manner of reasonable doubt that Mr. Stevens, the minister of the United States, was an active participant in the overthrow of the monarchy in the kingdom of Hawaii; and, in the second place, the president has now committed and is committing, in having submitted the matter to congress, I am satisfied that, according to the usages and principles of international law, we have no right by the use of arms or force to remedy the wrong that has been committed, and that all efforts for a peaceful solution of the matter having terminated we have no further right to intervene, and that it is our duty for the president to recognize the present government, that is now in charge, and our duty in the future to recognize such form of government as may be determined upon by the wishes and suffrages of the people of the island.

"Now, as to the proof that the monarchical form of government was overthrown by the armed forces of the United States and that the said government would not have been overthrown but for such unlawful intervention upon our part: There is no difficulty about this. It is now in charge, and our duty in the future to recognize such form of government as may be determined upon by the wishes and suffrages of the people of the island.

"We could not select a stronger case before any impartial tribunal of favor than the case of the queen, who was overthrown by the intervention of the United States, and who was made the forces of the United States, and to no other. What I would like very much to have is the honest judgment of the house upon this question when I have submitted the facts that strike me as the salient points in this controversy.

"My political opponents will not discuss the question in this house whether Mr. Stevens was guilty of a crime against the government to which he was the accredited representative and was guilty of violating the laws of nations, because of the very strong evidence that is so overwhelming upon this point that there is no doubt whatever of his guilt, even admitting for the sake of argument that so far as he was concerned the United States was honorable and his motives inspired by the highest principles of patriotism."

Mr. Rayner at some length quoted from the Hawaiian evidence submitted to congress concerning the landing of the troops and the establishment of the provisional government, arguing that the queen would not have been overthrown except by the interference of the American marines, and, referring to Minister Stevens, he said:

"We will convict him by his own letters written months before these troubles began; by his own admissions and confessions, evidence that is recognized as the very strongest evidence in law. His is a defense that is utterly falsified by every fact that attests through the whole of the testimony and the correspondence that has been submitted to us. You talk about taking down the flag of the United States. I want to know what right had the government of the United States to raise its flag over the capital of the islands. I charge that the flag of the United States had no more right to wave over the Hawaiian monarchy than the flag of the United States had no more right to wave over the government buildings in Brazil, or in any other territory where the people were powerless to resist him."

He dwelt upon the abdication of the queen, quoting her letter to Minister Stevens and his reply. He pointed out that the words "declined" was written in Mr. Stevens' handwriting on the back of the queen's communication, and asked what right the American minister had to refuse it. Again, speaking of Mr. Stevens, he continued:

"Mr. Stevens has undertaken to defame and malign almost everyone who has appeared against him in this case. I have nothing to charge against him personally. He may be a man of the most honorable motives and of the most devoted standard of moral conduct. The only trouble about him is that he is entirely too good. He belongs to a race of beings who appear to have been thrown upon this earth through sheer mistake. He is compelled, I have no doubt, to carry around with him a very heavy pack of weights to keep himself from being suddenly translated into Heaven.

"Our friend Mr. Boutwell, whose ability I recognize, and whose earnestness of purpose I admire, has gotten possession of the flag idea, or rather the flag idea has gotten possession of him; he is in the flag like the Irishman is with the shillalah; whenever you see a head hit it; whenever you see a place to plant the flag run her up."

The question of Mr. Blount's appointment was also argued by him, as was the real position of the "de facto government." Mr. Rayner continued:

"Let me come to the second branch of this discussion: What shall we do now? Nothing, Mr. Speaker, absolutely nothing. A great wrong has been committed, a crime has been perpetrated that cannot be justified before the nations of the world. The president, in the exercise of his power and authority, has offered to recognize the wrong. It was a wrong, then, he was right in the conclusion, and such will be the intelligent verdict of his countrymen. He could not have stood by with folded hands and sanctioned by his silence the concealment of this iniquity. It was a grave and delicate question to deal with, and he has treated it with the unflinching integrity and courage that has characterized all of his official acts. He has assumed the whole of the responsibility, and when his conduct is calmly considered he will be fully justified at the bar of public opinion. If you once admit that our minister was at the head of this conspiracy, then it became the duty of the president under every dictate of justice to attempt to make restoration of the rights that had been plundered. We have nothing to do with the character of the queen or her former government. She may be as great a tyrant as ever wielded the scepter of oppression; she may be possessed of the most savage and ferocious instincts. That is not the issue. The question is, was she robbed of her liberty? Was she dethroned? Was she despoiled of her kingdom and her crown by the infamous interference of a minister of the United States? If so, it was right, it was honorable in the highest degree, it was in accordance with our traditions and with every impulse of the national conscience to make an honest and peaceable attempt to redress the grievance which she had suffered and to restore the title of which she had been robbed. This attempt has been made, and the provisional government has refused to accede the demand, and the president has submitted the whole matter to congress for our action and determination. What is to be done? This is the practical question."

"I want to be very plain about this. As far as I am concerned, I would make no further effort whatever in behalf of the fallen sovereign of these islands. In my opinion she has passed into history, and I would let her remain there. When she refused to accept the conditions of the amnesty that were proposed and insisted on exercising the rights of a savage and was willing in this enlightened age to stain her soul with the blood of some of her best citizens, though she claims to have had the technical right by law to do so, she placed herself beyond the pale of civilization, and however much I condemn the crime of which she has been the victim, and detest the policy which made that crime possible, I would, in view of her conduct, permit her to depart from the scene of her former glory, and I would make no further effort whatever to reconstruct her throne or to restore the supremacy of the monarchy that she represented."

"I tell you, Mr. Speaker, that as deeply as I love my country, with all the consecrated devotion that I would lay upon her altars, with a fervid reverence for her flag wherever its colors greet the eye, I would rather see that flag lowered and trampled upon than raised as a pirate's ensign and placed in the hands of every buccannering demagogue to use not as an emblem of honor, but as an instrument of terror and oppression to the helpless and enfeebled races of mankind."

WHAT IT MEANS.

Democratic Legislation on the Sugar Question.

The days of taxed sugar and a subsidized sugar trust are numbered. The day of an untaxed breakfast table for the poor man is at hand.

Though the republican and assistant republican obstructionists have managed to involve the house in an unseemly tangle, there is no obscurity in the measure which was passed the other day in committee of the whole by a vote of 161 to 88. The bounty is abolished outright, and all sugar, raw and refined, is to be free. Such is the measure which a democratic congress will undoubtedly give to the country.

How could a democratic congress do less? In a democratic tariff formed on the theory that all tariffs are evil, there is no place for a tax on an article which appears first in the list of plain necessities of every household. In a scheme for the honest and economical administration of government there is no money to be taken from a depleted treasury to enrich a robber trust, to burden the poor with an insidious and widely disseminated tax in the interest of a coterie of millionaires—that is McKinleyism; it has no place in democratic legislation.

The sacrifice of revenue due to the abandonment of the tax on sugar will be very large, but from its total are to be subtracted the millions heretofore paid in bounties. The difference will still be large, but were it fourfold what it is the necessity for the repeal would be no less urgent. Indeed, the virtue of the new legislation is proved by the character of those who oppose it. It is the plutocracy of both parties that recoils from the proposition to lift this burden from the common people, because at length the plutocrats, democratic as well as republican, realize that the deficit thus created must be made good by a tax upon their own superfluities. Free sugar is hateful to the heartless and unpatriotic rich because it means taxed incomes. It means the unmasking of hidden wealth which has never paid its own share to taxation, but compelled poverty to bear the unequal burden. No man whose income is not far in excess of four thousand dollars will feel a feather's weight of the new burden. How many wage earners of America derive that sum from their labors? How many merchants, how many professional men? Count them and you will have the number of those whose taxes the poor man has been paying, but will shortly pay no more.—Chicago Times.

THE REPUBLICAN DEFICIENCY.

Real Cause of the Present Depletion of the National Treasury.

All the republican organs follow the cue of the Tribune in treating the treasury deficit and the necessary increase of the public debt as due to "democratic incompetence."

The best answer to this is supplied by facts which cannot be denied and figures which cannot be impeached.

When the democrats turned the government over to the republicans in March, 1889, there was an available cash balance in the treasury of over \$185,000,000. Nearly \$100,000,000 of this sum was in free gold. The revenues were then exceeding the expenditures at the rate of \$105,000,000 a year.

When the democrats received the government back in March last the surplus in the treasury had disappeared. The gold reserve was patched up by Mr. Foster's device of borrowing from New York bankers. The \$98,000,000 of free gold above the \$100,000,000 reserve had dwindled to \$980,000.

The country gained in gold imports during President Cleveland's first term \$54,772,000. Its net loss during President Harrison's term was \$122,534,000.

The annual surplus followed the accumulated surplus under the Harrison-Reed-McKinley rule. The billion dollar congress cut off \$60,000,000 of revenue, while raising the tariff taxes in every schedule save two. It added \$60,000,000 to the pension list, increasing it in four years more than the total cost of the list in 1880, fifteen years after the close of the war. It added \$70,000,000 to the regular annual appropriations. It looted the treasury with one hand and threw away revenue with the other, for the express purpose of preventing such a reduction of the tariff as the people ordered in 1890 and again in 1892.

Every dollar of the deficiency that exists or is in sight is due to republican legislation and republican extravagance. The new bond issue will be known in history as the republican deficiency debt.—N. Y. Herald.

Sometimes the devil fish, in order to escape attack or observation, darkens the water about him by the emission of an inky cloud in which he hides himself. At other times he pretends to be what he is not by assuming the color of the sand upon which he sprawls himself. The republicans in the house of representatives are fighting the Wilson bill with devil-fish tactics. They sometimes darken counsel by words without knowledge or bearing; and again, refuse to answer when their names are called, hiding in the fog of their own argument and hoping to defeat their opponents by inaction.—Philadelphia Record.

THE PEOPLE'S VERDICT.

How the Republicans Have Ignored the Country's Interests.

The republicans in 1890, while preparing and thrusting upon an unwilling people the McKinley abomination, talked much of the mandate they had received from the people in 1888, when a majority of the people voted against them. No question of raising the tariff was before the people in 1888. It was a question of reducing it, and the republicans obtained a majority of three in the house on the subterfuge that the tariff, while needing revision, ought to be revised by its friends. Then they proceeded to reduce the revenues and to increase the public burdens.

In 1892 the people not only gave the democratic candidates for the presidency and vice presidency a large plurality, but gave the democrats a majority of more than ninety in the house and the control of the senate. These facts, being a matter of public record, cannot be denied. But the republicans say now that because they held some republican states last November, carried a democratic state on local issues and have lately captured a democratic district the mandate has been recalled. This did not prove very effective in the house, but they hope that it may have better success in the senate.

If the republicans had been guided by the rule which they now lay down there would never have been a McKinley bill to repeal. So far as the mandate of a minority of the people in 1888 could be tortured into meaning anything, it was only a permission to the republicans to reduce the tariff instead of having the work done by the democrats, who, they said, would go too far if intrusted with the task. When they were about to pass the McKinley bill, prominent members of their own party reproached them privately and publicly for their breach of faith in this respect.

More than this occurred. The elections in November, 1889, resulted in sweeping democratic victories. Iowa and Ohio elected democratic governors, and Massachusetts barely missed doing so by a bargain in certain wards of Boston. New York, that had voted for Harrison in 1888, resumed its place in the democratic column. It was a republican Waterloo, only exceeded by the phenomenal defeats which they sustained in 1890 and 1892.

Was this a revocation of the republican mandate? According to what they say now, it was. The McKinley bill was not yet begun. Congress had not met. If the republicans are serious now, it was plainly their duty from their point of view to give up all notion of raising tariff rates in order to prohibit imports. But they went on and framed the McKinley bill. Iron manufacturers in New England sent their mammoth petitions for a restoration of the rates of 1857, the law which their Henry Wilson said was the best ever framed. They disregarded this memorial. Kansas, which had been a republican stronghold, implored them not to destroy her smelting and threatened to desert the party if they did, a threat that was faithfully carried out. Nevertheless, the smelting industry was driven to Mexico. It would take too long to tell of the protests from other sections that were disregarded.

None of these things, nor all of them together, were then considered a recall of the popular mandate. McKinley and his accomplices insisted that they were irresistibly driven forward by the mandate of the people to rob the treasury for the benefit of trusts, to reduce the revenue by prohibitory duties instead of lower rates, and to increase expenditures to an extent that was sure to lead, as it has led, to a deficit. Such is the history of republican respect for the mandate of the people. With this recent history fresh in the minds of the people, they should have the grace to remain silent upon the subject now.—Louisville Courier-Journal.

A GOOD SUGGESTION.

One Way of Improving Republican Electoral Methods.

The republicans have long insisted that the representation of the southern states in congress and the electoral college ought to be cut down to correspond with the relatively small vote which they cast in elections, but no practicable way of carrying out the idea has ever been suggested. But there is one method of making representation correspond with ballots which the party can adopt, and that is to apportion delegates in national conventions with some reference to the number of votes cast. The national committee is considering the matter, and seems likely to adopt some plan before the convention of 1895 is called. It seems grossly unjust that states where the party hardly maintains an existence, like Georgia, should have as much influence in selecting candidates as Iowa, for example. Moreover, the system of allowing a few managers in such states to name delegates who represent nothing has been fruitful of scandals, the buying of colored men having become notorious. It would be a great gain to the cause of political morals if representation in republican conventions were based upon votes rather than upon population.—N. Y. Post.

Frenchmen are alarmed at the discovery of a very perceptible decline in the tariff of their country. France enjoys the thrift-promoting advantages of a high protective tariff, and if at any time thrift is not promoted as much as it should be it is the solemn duty of the French protectionists to screw the tariff up a few notches. This is the remedy prescribed by the eminent Dr. McKinley, of Ohio, who promoted the "thrift" that we are now enjoying over here.—Chicago Herald.

No industry was ever permanently benefited by taxation on trade. The abolition of the coal tax will work in the end for the benefit of the West Virginia mine-owners, as Mr. Wilson says. And it will work at once to build up every other industry on the Atlantic coast.—N. Y. World.

BETTER CONDITIONS INDICATED BY IMPROVED LEGISLATIVE POLICY.

The passage of the Wilson bill by the house of representatives by a decisive majority marks the beginning of a new industrial era for the United States. For the past thirty years the face of the nation has been turned backward upon all questions affecting economic and industrial conditions, and we have been praising, preaching and practicing middle age customs in the treatment of economic and industrial problems so far as they can be affected by legislation. Had such legislative policy prevailed at any other time than in the latter half of the nineteenth century, when new inventions have caused tremendous advances in mechanics and brought about material improvements by accomplishing the division of labor and the substitution of machinery for the work of the hands, it would have retarded and thwarted the growth of the nation, would have checked intellectual progress if it had not really and actually produced retrogression. But the impetus which was given to trade and commerce by the invention of steam motor power, and the subsequent production of mechanical agencies, has carried the nation forward as it were by force and with its back to the future.

In short, Speaker Crisp was correct in his statement when he declared that the protective policy which had been practiced in the past by the United States was similar to that which has kept China stationary and isolated for the past thousands of years. We have attempted nothing more nor less than the building up of a legislative Chinese wall around the United States, blocking and impeding commerce and preventing the extension of American influence in other parts of the world. Had it been continued America would stand a hundred years from to-day as she does now, and republican politicians would still be preaching the policy of protection to her "infant industries."

With twenty years of untrammelled commerce, beginning with the passage of the Wilson bill, America will be the mistress of the world's commerce, trade and industry. Chairman Wilson correctly described the day of the vote upon the passage of the Wilson bill as one of the most glorious in our history, and that the record of the house of that day would permanently record no passing event, but a great epoch in American history, and that in the future it would be a matter of pride to every man who voted for that bill to point to the record of that day and the part which he played in its proceedings.

In short, the work of congress, signified by the passage of the Wilson bill, is the result of the triumph of natural law and human progress. McKinleyism has retarded and thwarted the operation of this law for a period, but the reaction will be all the more powerful and effective and the progress of the nation henceforth will be the more rapid for the temporary check which resulted from the protective policy which, though administered for half a century or more, is really but a moment of time in the life which this great nation is destined to complete.—Kansas City Times.

PARAGRAPHIC POINTERS.

—If the entire country were afflicted with a loss of memory the outlook for the g. o. p. would be dazzling.—Detroit Free Press.

—Like the protection policy which it essayed to defend, Mr. Reed's speech was stretched a little too far.—Louisville Courier-Journal.

—Many of the mills that are closing down nowadays are located exclusively in the scare headlines of the McKinley organs.—Boston Herald.

—The chief grievance that the republican flock gathers at the capital have against Secretary Carlisle is that he is bent on maintaining the national credit despite their efforts to prevent it.—Detroit Free Press.

—Referring to the argument of a republican contemporary that the one hundred proposed amendments to the Wilson bill indicate widespread dissatisfaction with it, the Buffalo Courier (dem.) says: "Judged by the same standard, the McKinley bill must in its earlier stages have been an extremely unpopular measure. After it got into the house and before it became a law it received 134 amendments."

—There is a story that Mr. Harrison has sent an envoy to Maj. McKinley with a message of peace and a promise of support to the latter's presidential aspirations. The story may be true. Mr. Harrison may already have forgotten the part Maj. McKinley played in the Minneapolis convention, which resembled nothing so much as the trick Garfield played on John Sherman in the convention of 1880, except that the latter succeeded, whereas the McKinley performance was a ghastly failure. At any rate Mr. Harrison has his choice between Maj. McKinley and Tom Reed, and even so righteous a man as he could hardly repress the human temptation to hate Reed worse than he hates McKinley.—Chicago Times.

The Sugar Trust.

Mr. James H. Maury has contributed to the New York World a startling array of figures to disclose the inwardness of the sugar trust, which dictated the McKinley sugar tariff. The trust controls refined sugar. It gets all the benefit of the McKinley duty on refined sugar and gets its material free. This trust has an actual capital of \$17,740,000 and has unloaded stock on the market to the amount of \$75,000,000. As the bonds covered more than the value of the plant, the stock is all water. The government bounty of about \$10,000,000 a year goes chiefly to the trust. Consequently the McKinley tariff and bounty have made the individuals who dictated them and organized the trust so enormously rich that they can spend a million or two to beat the Wilson bill. The sugar trust is a formidable precursor of the possibilities which may grow up under the domination of a McKinley party in this country.—St. Louis Republic.