

AT LAST.

When on my day of life the night is falling
And in the wind, from unsunned places blown,
I hear far voices out of darkness calling
My feet to paths unknown.

Thou, Who hast made my home of life so pleasant,
Leave not its tenant when its walls decay;
O Love Divine, O Helper ever present,
Be Thou my strength and stay!

Be near me when all else is from me drifting—
Earth, sky, home's pictures, days of shade
and shine,
And kindly faces to my own uplifting
The love which answers mine.

I have but Thee, my Father! Let Thy Spirit
Be with me then to comfort and uphold;
No gate of pearl, no branch of palm I merit,
Nor street of shining gold.

Suffice it if—my good and ill unreckoned
And both forgiven through Thy abounding
grace—
I find myself by hands familiar beckoned
Unto my fitting place;

Some humble door among Thy many mansions,
Some sheltering shade where sin and striving
cease,
And flows forever through Heaven's green ex-
pansions
The river of Thy peace.

There from the music round about me stealing,
I fain would learn the new and holy song,
And find at last, beneath Thy trees of healing,
The life for which I long.

—John Greenleaf Whittier.

COMMERCE ABOVE WAR. Many persons have read with interest the various articles recently contributed to the press in England on the danger which the United Kingdom now incurs of a short food supply, especially of a short supply of wheat. The discussion itself brings into very conspicuous notice the interdependence of the English-speaking people. You buy from the United States fifty per cent of all that we export. Our supply of food is as necessary to you as your market is necessary to us, and yet there are a few noisy persons and presses in both countries who have been idiotic enough to provoke animosity in the past and who might be so wanting in all that makes a man fit to be respected as to provoke a war between the two great branches of the English-speaking people. I do not use the word Anglo-Saxon for the reason that, with a few unimportant exceptions, the members of other families among the nations who have found a way to welfare in the United States are as true to the principle of liberty and of common law as if they had not been born under other conditions. There are also people of some eminence and of so little true insight into what really makes nations great as to have led them to treat commerce as if it were a pursuit inferior to that of the army and the navy; or as if armies or navies, especially the latter, would have any reason for their existence in modern times except for the protection of the commerce from which they have been generated and by which they are supported. The sea power now rests upon

the commerce of which navies are the national police.

We observe that plans are proposed for establishing national granaries in Great Britain in which to store a reserve of wheat, estimated to cost anywhere from fifteen to twenty millions sterling—a singular reversion to the conception of semi-barbaric conditions. Are there not easier and simpler ways to give the people of England positive assurance of the continuous supply of grain from this country, which would rot upon our fields if it were not for the British market. Some of these writers are so ill informed as to anticipate a falling off in the supply from the wheat fields of America. It is only necessary to call their attention to the fact that the potential of our wheat lands has hardly been opened. Witness the fact that part of the Indian reservation north of Texas opened to settlement under the name of Oklahoma but two or three years ago will this year put into market about four million quarters or over thirty million bushels of wheat. There is unoccupied land in that immediate neighborhood sufficient for the production of the present entire wheat crop of the United States whenever anybody wants it, and will pay the cost of production and a small profit over.

In the plans for the national granaries on your side it has been suggested to build them of concrete in order to avoid dampness. Why not continue to make use of the ample granaries of our Northwest, where the dry climate gives assurance that the wheat will be well preserved?

But, say the alarmists, the commerce between the United States and Great Britain might be interrupted, first, by other nations, second, by a quarrel among themselves. How shall these objections be met? There is a very simple solution. We proposed in 1856 not only to abolish privateering but to make private property exempt from seizure upon the high seas, as it is now upon land. War upon the land has ceased in some manner to be an opportunity for rapine and plunder conducted under the necessary conditions of the science of war by lying, misleading, ambushing and spying, getting the advantage of the enemy and striking him in the back, and other military arts. The latter elements are still necessary to the conduct of war, but rapine and plunder upon the land without compensation and bombardment of unprotected cities is no longer tolerated. Why not renew that proposal to establish immunity from seizure of private property on the ferry way or sea way between the ports of this country and the ports of Europe under the supervision of an international police consisting of the navies of both countries? If the other nations did not choose to join they could remain out at their peril. The navies of

the United States and Great Britain combined are sufficient to maintain peace, order and progress over the sea way, which must necessarily be kept open for the mutual benefit of the English-speaking people.

But, says an objector, "Suppose there is a falling out between Great Britain and the United States." Well, suppose there is. That could only be brought about by the reprehensible conduct of small people commonly called jingoes who might happen to have been put in places of responsibility. We have had and have now some examples of this type of irresponsible people in the senate of the United States, and there has been a suspicion on this side that some members of a similar class had even secured position in your Parliament and even in your cabinet. We can provide both against and for them, and we can also provide opportunities for officers of the navy and authors who treat of the naval power as the chief consideration to continue the development of the fighting qualities which are considered by them so necessary to national existence. A little commonsense put in a treaty will provide an arena at some place on the ocean where a sea fight would do no harm to anyone except those who took part in it. It might then be arranged that in case the jingoes of the two countries had come into collision, a certain part of the naval force not required for the preservation of order, might be sent out on each side and have it out, and see which could mislead, deceive or get the better of the other. On this fleet the men who had not sufficient commonsense to keep the peace, might leave their legislative halls or respective cabinets, and take their places on the ships of war for such service as they might be competent to render. It would take no more brain power to shovel coal into the furnace or to serve in binding up wounds in the ward room that it had taken to get into the difficulty which had made a fight of some sort necessary. Of course these men would not be competent to do the technical work of managing the ship any more than they have proved to be competent to do the technical work of managing the government, and would therefore be put into inferior positions.

I venture to submit this plan as a better one for insuring the food supply of the British branch of the English-speaking people than the one of wasting fifteen or twenty million pounds sterling in building silo granaries, so-called, of concrete, wholly unfit for the preservation of wheat in a climate which is not as well suited for keeping grain dry as that in which the grain is now produced. I think my plan may perhaps be accepted as the more sensible one of the two.—Edward Atkinson, Boston.