

orthodox economists are just as much interested in the success of coöperation as other people. No economist of note can be named who would not have sympathized most heartily with these Minnesota coöpers. But it would have been upon the ground that their enterprises were in conformity with laws that are natural and irresistible, and not in opposition to them. There is only one way to end the strife between capital and labor, and that is to make the laboreers capitalists. This end can be promoted by coöperative schemes, not only because, as we have seen, these schemes appeal to an enlightened self-interest, but because they stimulate saving, the mother of capital. The law of the survival of the fittest, although its operation requires to be modified by human charity, is the law under which the human race must exist. The suffering arising from physical or even mental deficiency appeals properly to benevolence; but to attempt by social or political devices to do away with the punishment that falls upon moral weakness, is to engage in a mischievous struggle against a beneficent law of Providence. Until our philanthropists learn this distinction, they may as well abandon the effort to unite a sound political economy with a false and feeble ethics.

A POSSIBLE "ISSUE."

THE bulky volume in which Commissioner Frank A. Flower makes the second biennial report of the Wisconsin Bureau of Labor and Industrial Statistics, contains, among much other matter of great interest to all students of our social problems, a chapter which must command the thoughtful attention of politicians in search of an "issue." One of the questions to which Mr. Flower invited replies from employers of labor was as to the desirability of restricting immigration to this country, with a view to keeping out disturbers and undesirable characters, and in part ix. of the report he summarizes the results of this inquiry. It was discovered not only that there was an overwhelming sentiment in favor of measures which would hereafter bar out paupers, criminals, and Anarchists, but an unexpectedly strong feeling in favor of stopping immigration of all sorts, for a while at least.

The opinions of 484 persons engaged in all sorts of industries were secured, and only sixty-three opposed restriction, while seventy were for total prohibition, and all the rest would establish obstacles of some sort. Ninety-eight of the replies, which are fairly representative of the whole number, are printed. They are for the most part admirably clear and concise, and constitute five pages of uncommonly interesting reading. Only ten answer no to the question, and of these ten one qualifies his negative by adding that he does not think "honest labor" should be prohibited from this country, and another proposes a long term of residence before foreigners should be allowed to vote.

Among the nine-tenths who sent affirmative replies to the Commissioner's question there was naturally a wide range of opinion as to how far interference should go. Some came out unqualifiedly in favor of absolute prohibition for an indefinite period. "Pull in our latch-string totally until we Americanize what we have

here," said one. "No more foreigners of any stamp; we have now a good start, and can populate our land fast enough," declared another. "We can produce enough loafers, as well as desirable people, ourselves," was the verdict of a third. Others recommended a trial of the prohibitive policy for a certain period, as three, five, seven, or ten years, "and then," as an advocate of the latter period says, "ten years longer if needed." Another class would have a rigid inspection of all applicants for admission, either at the ports where they arrive in this country or by our consuls in the countries which they leave, and would send back, or refuse consular certificates, to those who cannot meet the requirements, which range all the way from a voucher of "good moral character," or the ability to read, to a tax per capita of \$500 or a property qualification of \$300, \$1,000, \$2,000, or even \$5,000. A number of persons suggest a refusal of suffrage to the foreigner until after a residence of five, ten, or even twenty one years.

So general a consensus of opinion in favor of a new departure in the matter of immigration would be noteworthy in any commonwealth, but there are special reasons which give it a peculiar significance in the case of Wisconsin. Of all the States in the Union that one contains the largest proportion of foreign-born to the whole population, the census of 1880 showing that the foreign-born voters outnumbered the native by no less than 40,000. Moreover, Mr. Flower points out that of his hundreds of correspondents "a very large percentage of even those demanding total prohibition for longer or shorter periods are foreign-born, and some mention this circumstance as a reason why they know better than others the necessity of taking the question thoroughly in hand." It is worth while to quote the words of two or three such writers:

A trunk-maker—Yes. I would require all immigrants to be able to read and write their own language. I am a foreigner, but had a good education when I arrived here at the age of fifteen, and worked my way up with no help but my education and kind Providence.

A vinegar manufacturer—Yes. I think it would be well if immigration were prohibited entirely for a few years. I am foreign-born, but see that the thing is overdue.

Rev. F. S. Stein of Kenosha—Indiscriminate labor immigration should be limited, if not prohibited. Not merely the number, but the character of immigrants should be taken into account. One-eighth of the population of the country and one-third of the insane are of foreign birth, making the number of insane of foreign birth three times as great as it should be. One-fourth of the population of New York State and two-thirds of the paupers are of foreign birth, making the proportion of paupers of foreign birth nearly three times as great as it should be. Truly, these are most suggestive figures, and call for active legislation, proving that Europe systematically exports her paupers and the scum of the country to our shores. Why should our legislators discriminate against a few helpful and industrious Chinese, while they make no effort to stay this polluting tide? I am myself of foreign birth, and I thank God, who brought me to this land, yet I am none the less able to discern the dangerous tendencies of the wholesale influx of foreign laborers.

The opinions given above, with the exception of the last, are those of employers. A similar canvass of the employees, would have been extremely valuable, but is lacking. Despite the absence of such a showing, we find elsewhere in the report reason to suppose that op-

position to immigration would find as much support among that class. Part x. of the report presents a "symposium" of the views and wishes of Wisconsin workingmen upon different phases of the labor problem. Four expressions are given upon the immigration question, and they agree in favoring some action. A Milwaukee tanner says that he and his shopmates do not want any more European labor at present, but could spare several thousands in Milwaukee and not miss them at all; "there should be laws passed to put a stop to or at least restrict immigration." A Marinette carpenter complains that "we poor native-born citizens are just pulled around same as dogs by foreign people; we do not stand any show, and it seems as though everything is coming to the very worst in the near future unless free immigration is stopped." A laborer of the same town recommends the stopping of immigration for four or five years, "so as to give us time to have everything settled quietly and without strikes or any other trouble," since there are too many men in the country now for the work to be done, working even on the ten-hour system. A lumber laborer of Peshtigo thinks that immigration ought to be stopped, for a while, at any rate, except the immigrant brings a certain amount of money or property with him, as "the supply of labor is now largely in excess of the demand."

It has long been evident that a large proportion of our native stock would gladly support measures of severe restriction upon immigration in future, believing that the national stomach has already received as much as it can digest. But little attempt to formulate any such rules has been made, because the managers who control party policies have supposed that a step of this sort would offend the "foreign vote." The investigation of the Wisconsin Commissioner of Labor Statistics shows an unexpected sentiment against further immigration among foreign-born citizens. It really looks as though the most popular thing a politician in that State could do would be to come out against further immigration except under severe restrictions. A test will soon be afforded. Wisconsin has for some years put a premium upon immigration by supporting a State Board to set the attractions of the commonwealth before Europeans, and more than one of Mr. Flower's correspondents calls for its abolition by the Legislature at the approaching session. If there should be a ready adoption of this suggestion, and thus a clear proof that public sentiment in one State is pronounced upon this question, we may look to see the politicians throughout the country who are now so eagerly seeking an "issue," decide to try an experiment with the immigration question.

ENGLISH AFFAIRS.

LONDON, December 16.

THE probability of the Government lasting through the coming session is anxiously canvassed among their followers and antagonists. Ministries seldom trip over obvious obstacles. They are not usually wounded in their most vulnerable point. It is not likely that the Irish question will be fatal to Lord Salisbury. Lord Hartington and he are, indeed, supposed to have decided that

there shall be no Irish question this year. This, however, is a little in excess of their powers. They cannot prevent an Irish question. Mr. Gladstone and Mr. Parnell will see to that. But they may possibly hinder a Government or Parliamentary answer to the Irish question. In the event of events accommodating themselves to the Ministerial programme, the first business, after the debate on the address in reply to the throne, will be the procedure of the House of Commons. There is one instance, I believe, nearly a hundred years old, of a session being opened without a speech from the throne, but this unique precedent, if that can be called a precedent which nothing has followed, is likely to remain unique. The debate may last ten days or a fortnight. The omission of any promise of legislation for Ireland will probably be censured in an amendment which is more likely to be proposed by some member or leading English supporter of Mr. Gladstone's late Government than from the Irish benches. It has no chance of being carried. The union of the Unionists is, at least at this early stage of the business, strong enough to prevent that.

Then will come the consideration of procedure. It is possible that Mr. Gladstone may insist that the course which he himself took is the proper one to follow, and that a separate session should be held to deal with the proposed rule. The Home-Rulers would support him, but probably not all of his own party would go with him in this matter; and if the project of immediate legislation for Ireland is set aside on the debate on the address, perhaps he may not think it worth while to reopen the matter. The immediate danger to the Government lies, according to some very close and interested observers, in the character of their procedure proposals. If Lord Randolph Churchill carries his point of closure by a bare majority in the Cabinet, it is very doubtful whether he will carry it in the House of Commons. Mr. Gladstone, I believe, favors it, and might possibly vote with him. But a very large number of Conservatives agree with Mr. Chaplin in something more than deprecating it; the Home-Rulers will resist it tooth and nail on its own merits, and as a means of showing their power to upset governments. In the event of Ministers being defeated on this proposal, Lord Salisbury would, it is thought, resign, Lord Hartington would be sent for, and a moderate Liberal Government would be formed, resting for its support on the Conservative party, thus reversing the parts played by the two sections of the Unionist party in the present arrangement. Those who think this arrangement probable or desirable, hold that Conservative support of a moderate Liberal Ministry presents a stronger combination than moderate Liberal support of a Conservative administration. The example of Lord Palmerston's long and peaceful Government is cited in confirmation of this view, which has something to say for itself, and would have more if Lord Hartington were Lord Palmerston. But he is not; and further it must be remembered that Lord Palmerston's own followers were a majority of the House of Commons, while Lord Hartington's are, and are likely to remain, a small minority. Of course, if Lord Salisbury strongly desired to retain office, he would take care to avoid procedure rules such as a majority of the House may wish to accept, even at the cost of having to part with Lord Randolph Churchill. But Lord Salisbury's health is delicate, and he is understood always to have thought that a Ministry presided over by Lord Hartington would be more stable than one of which he was the head. An arrangement of this kind, however, would leave undetermined two unknown and rather unmanageable

quantities in the political equation. Mr. Chamberlain could not very well be a member of a moderate Liberal Government depending on Conservative support; Lord Randolph Churchill would scarcely retain the leadership of a party which had revolted from him. These two adventurous persons, who have much in common, and a strong natural liking, might possibly come together, in which case any ministry would have lively times.

This forecast, which, of course, is subject to all sorts of provisos and conditions, is, I know, entertained by some members of Mr. Gladstone's last Government. I confess that I do not quite share their belief in its realization. Lord Hartington would, I believe, with difficulty be persuaded to take office as the leader of a Parliamentary minority, and therefore dependent on and obedient to a Conservative majority. Nor would that majority lend itself readily to the arrangement. The spoils will be to the strongest. Then there is the chapter of accidents which defies foresight. It is possible that Ministers may decide to ask for further powers for the maintenance of law and order in Ireland; in that case procedure rules and local-government bills will be adjourned into a Parliamentary *Ewigkeit*. The judges of the Irish Queen's Bench having pronounced Mr. Dillon's "plan of the campaign" to be a criminal conspiracy, Lord Salisbury may proclaim the National League, as Mr. Gladstone proclaimed the Land League. But then Mr. Gladstone had the most rigorous coercion act at his disposal which any Minister ever possessed, and could and did lock up, without intervention of judge or jury, anybody whom it was inconvenient to allow to be at large. Lord Salisbury has no such "resource of civilization" at his disposal; it would take a long time for him to get it, and without it the proclamation of the League would be a bull against the comet. In any case, the Local Government Bill for England, on which a committee of the Cabinet has deliberated, and of which the President and Secretary of the Local Government have sketched the outlines, is not very likely to become law next session. The indication of its provisions given by Mr. Ritchie and Mr. Walter Long does not augur well for it. The system of representing classes, whether by having *ex-officio* members of the County Boards, or by fancy franchises, or indirect elections, is one which public opinion is scarcely prepared even to consider. But Lord Salisbury may be riding for a fall on this measure if he cannot get one on the procedure business.

While politics are in the conditional mood, the world of London takes its pleasure in its routine fashion. There is one unfortunate breach in the routine. Miss Ellen Terry's strength, and possibly her patience, have given way under the repetition of *Margaret*, I am afraid to say how often—in algebraic formula, for the *n*th time. As no actor or actress can ever take a holiday without going to the play, as he or she must always be in a theatre, before the footlights if not behind them, Miss Terry has betaken herself to Paris in order to see "Hamlet" at the Théâtre-Français, to compare M. Mounet-Sully's personation of the *Prince of Denmark* with Mr. Irving's, and possibly Mlle. Reichenberg's rendering of *Ophelia* with her own. During this interval the part of *Margaret* is being acted with much grace and tenderness by Miss Winifred Emery, who is usually Miss Terry's "understudy," to use the slang of the stage, and who is as good a substitute as could be found for her, though in only one respect has she a superior qualification for the part, and that is a chronological one. It is the tragedy of the stage that on it, far more emphatically than in any other pursuit, while art is long, life is short, and that, when the

artist is most consummate, large provinces of his kingdom slip from him. In France they manage these things better. A *Romeo* of fifty or a *Hamlet* of sixty would not be tolerated, would scarcely tolerate himself. It is curious, in comparing a French playbill of to-day with the list of the personages in an original edition of the drama which may be in question, to see how the youthful lover of the first production has become the noble father of the revival, and the tender *ingénue* has developed into the stately matron. The notion of the English stage that there must be always one leading man, or one leading lady, who must take the leading business, that *Lear* must be *Romeo*, and *Lady Constance*, *Rosalind*, shows how egotism and love of self-display tend to overpower not only artistic feeling, but even the sense of personal propriety. In Mrs. Chippendale, when Mr. Irving comes over, the American play-goer will see a possible *Martha*; in Mrs. Sterling, comely old lady though she was, the English audience have until lately had a *Martha* whose art could not hide the outrages of nature, which has no human respect for age, but wantonly insults and deforms it.

The return of Mr. Toole to his theatre, or rather as *Horatio* says, of a piece of him, for long illness has restored to him the gracility of his youth, has been cordially welcomed. Mr. Toole is the last representative of farce in England. It has its solitary home on King William Street. A good farce was a good thing, but apparently the English public have had too much of it, and in any other part of the world an English farce of the present day would be unintelligible. The beings that it represents exist nowhere, though they have a certain distant resemblance in accent, gesture, and dress, to some classes of Englishmen. But abroad, even in the United States, they must appear as unreal as a centaur, or a unicorn, or a mermaid. In Mr. Toole, farce has deprived the stage of a comedian. The habit of acting simply in parts written up to his own peculiarities has led him to exaggerate those peculiarities, until the announcement that Mr. Toole will appear in another dress would sufficiently indicate the only variety in his so-called characters. Nevertheless Mr. Toole has a strong hold upon the audiences. There is perhaps too much of a disposition in England to convert the theatre into a sort of Young Men's and Young Women's Mutual Improvement Society. At the Lyceum, the audience listen gravely as they might do to a more or less popular lecture on science, with experimental illustrations. They would almost as soon applaud in a church as there. Mr. Irving is a sort of high priest celebrating a solemn ritual, with his acolytes and attendant ministers. This is all very well. The reaction which it presents was, perhaps, inevitable from the legs, the costumeless indecency, and the music-hall imbecility of burlesque. But the reaction has gone to an extreme length; for, after all, the primary object of an amusement is to amuse. An accomplished actor, formerly a member of the Lyceum company, says that the absence of any response at the Lyceum Theatre, and the melancholy attention of the audience, are almost paralyzing. Empty benches, artists' manikins, or tailors' dummies would, save for the effects on the treasury, be as agreeable to act to.

The rush of academic youth and persons of fashion to the stage continues. Mr. Robert Benson, an Oxford man whom the passion of the stage struck when he was performing in the "Agamemnon," now traverses the country, Thespian-like, with a company of his own. His principal actress is, I believe, a very accomplished

young lady from Girton or Newnham. Lady Monckton, the wife of the Town Clerk of London, a very great person not only officially in the city, but socially outside of it, has apparently made the stage a profession. She is working for nearly the two hundredth night at the Haymarket. Mrs. Greenall, who is doing *Lady Teazle* at the Strand, is the wife of a colonel in a crack regiment, a near relative of Sir Gilbert Greenall, a Conservative baronet of Mr. Disraeli's creation. Mr. Brookfield of the Haymarket, one of the best character actors of the time, is the son of the late well-known Canon Brookfield, formerly chaplain to the Queen. Mr. Beerbohm Tree belongs to a well-known city family. Mr. Arthur Cecil, born Mr. Arthur Blunt, is a nephew of the Rector of Chelsea, and Mr. John Clayton, properly Mr. Calthrop, his colleague in the management of the Court, is the son of a country gentleman of Lincolnshire, I believe. The Messrs. Hawtreys, of the Globe Theatre, belong to the family of Dr. Hawtreys, the former headmaster of Eton. The gentleman calling himself Mr. Carton is the son of the late Mr. Crickett, and the brother of Mr. Anderson Crickett, the eminent oculist. Mr. Morell, a new comer at the Strand, is the son of the equally eminent Dr. Morell Mackenzie. In Shakspeare's time the universities contributed no small proportion of actors and poets to the stage. Ben Jonson's disparagement of Shakspeare's small Latin and less Greek, and Robert Greene's ridicule of "Shake-scene," probably represented a feeling not rare among his academic comrades. The stage in England has been throughout its history—as much as the sea or the road—a refuge for adventurers more or less well born or well taught, who were not content to jog along in the deep ruts which the heavy-laden traffic of society makes for itself.

The accidental mention in the last paragraph of Girton and Newnham—homes for girl-graduates, with or without golden hair, prudes for proctors, and dowagers for deans—reminds me that Mrs. Pfeiffer, the well-known poetess, recently your visitor, whose *Flying Leaves from the East and West* records her impressions of Asia and America, is about to take up arms for the higher education of women. She has a little treatise in preparation directed against the doctors and some "perverts" of her own sex, Mrs. Lynn Linton, for example, who maintains that the temperament and strength of girls are not equal to the strain put upon them by the University system of education. Mrs. Pfeiffer will, I believe, contend that the mental cultivation of women, followed in the manner which is now frankly challenged, directly and largely contributes to physical health and strength; such precautions, of course, being taken as prudence observes in every pursuit.

L. L.

TENDENCIES, EVENTS, AND FORCES AT WORK IN IRELAND.

DUBLIN, December 11, 1886.

NOTHING has more tended to strengthen the confidence of the Irish masses in their political leaders than the great extent to which the advice of those leaders—Mr. Parnell and his lieutenants—has been, whether from prescience or good luck, proved wise, at least from a worldly point of view. A steady rise of rent, based chiefly upon the improvements of the tenant, a rise in the standard of living which had affected all classes of the community, a doubling of the rate of wages (which, it is true, did not much affect the cottier classes, who depended upon their own labor)—these, added to a few bad seasons, gave fresh impetus to the agrarian agitation in Ireland. But there were many who had sympathized with the agitation, who yet regarded it as almost

cruel to advise the tenants generally against taking the fullest advantage of the new Land Act, and entering into fresh contracts with their landlords under court settlements. A heavy fall all round in prices of agricultural produce has fully justified the warnings put forth five years ago, and few except the most rigid upholders of the theoretical sacredness of contract now deny that as a rule it will be impossible for tenants to pay even the rents fixed by the Land Commission. The Commissioners themselves, by their late decisions, are emphasizing the conclusions of the tenants. Most considerate and wise landlords are voluntarily giving large abatements; and the land question, if it were ever closed, may be said to be fully opened again. Against the Marquis of Clanricarde and others, who are determined to extract their full or only partially reduced rents, and perhaps against some whose rents are not unduly high, "a plan of campaign" has been inaugurated and is assuming portentous dimensions. The tenants come together and agree as to what reduction they are to "demand." If their proposals are not accepted, they pay the proffered rent into the hands of trustees bound to utilize the fund for the benefit of evicted tenants, who are thus enabled to defy the landlord to do his worst.

We are only at the beginning of the campaign, so can hardly tell how the plan will work. It may be stated that the landlord has his remedy in eviction: but no one in the present temper of the country would touch the farms at any rent, and a landlord working boycotted land under police protection on his own account cannot make it pay. Apart from this, as Mr. Stead, who has fully studied the possibilities on the spot, shows, in a late number of the *Pall Mall Gazette*, eviction upon a large scale would be attended with great difficulties:

"On the Clanricarde estate there are two thousand tenants, on the Dillon estate at least as many who have adopted the Plan of Campaign. Are these four thousand families to be evicted 'at once'? Even if no delays could be interposed which would postpone the issue of the decrees till January, there are only 310 days in the Sheriff's year, and even if there be no active resistance offered, it will take him a full year in each county to evict the tenants on these two estates alone. Evictions can only take place between sunrise and sunset. The days are short in winter, and it will take him all his time even to identify the evicted farms. On the Clanricarde estate there is not a man left who will guide him to the place where the farms lie, and the Government has just forbidden the police to act as guides to the evictors. Even if the tenants are evicted, that will not bring his rent in to the landlord. The fact of the matter is that, however unpleasant it may be for us to recognize the fact, the Irish tenants have only to stick together in demanding reasonable reductions in order to bring their enemies to their knees. That is the fact, and it will not help the matter to go into fits of fury and to cry aloud to the Government to display more 'energy and alacrity' in enforcing the law."

For the present, then, the tenantry are jubilant. *United Ireland* writes "Victory," and several trusted members of the Parliamentary party are busily engaged giving rent receipts for thousands in different parts of the country and handing the money over to trustees, who invest it out of the country. It is openly recommended that these trustees should be men of straw, against whom "garnishee" orders would not avail, and the implicit and I believe justified confidence placed in such men by the people is a refutation of accusations of personal greed and dishonesty which have invariably been made by the opponents of the national cause. The honesty of "the campaign" is another question. It is based upon the acknowledgment that both landlord and tenant have now a property in the holding; and that the landlord party have rejected all attempts at the institution of a tribunal for judging the fairness of present rents. Still, the

very persistency of the protestations of some of its advocates betrays a certain doubt which will not, however, in any way interfere with the plan being carried out against the landlords. Several landlords have already been "brought to their knees." It would be more honorable on the part of the tenants, and would tend more to landlords granting reductions without letting matters go to extremity, if in such cases the tenants paid the amounts they originally proposed. This is not always done. The Dawson tenants in the County Westmeath offered to pay on a reduction of 15 per cent. This was refused, and they entered on the campaign. The landlord gave in, and the trustees of the fund have just paid the rents, not on the reduction of 15 per cent., but 20 per cent. on judicial rents, 30 per cent. on non-judicial rents, and 50 per cent. off "in certain special cases."

A bygone statute of Edward III. was, during the Land-League agitation, furbished up and made to do duty against people whom juries would not convict. John Dillon, for his utterances in connection with the "plan of campaign," has been summoned under this act before the Judges of the Queen's Bench, and there being very little doubt that he would be ordered to give bail to be of good behavior, and that an uncompromising man like him would, as Mr. Davitt and Mr. Healy did under like circumstances, refuse to give bail, it was very generally believed he would be imprisoned. But circumstances have occurred which it is supposed may moderate the action of the Government. The omniscience of the National party, even in the arcana of the Castle, has been shown by the manner in which upon several occasions Government documents of the most confidential character have been brought to light. And this is what has happened now. The confidential written opinion of Mr. Holmes, the Attorney-General, "I do not see how any action can be taken by the Executive" regarding the collection of rents by trustees under the "campaign," has, through some extraordinary piece of stupidity or treachery on the part of some Government employee, been given to the public; and this has shaken the confidence of the Government party in proceedings against an advocate of the campaign.

The Government has yet another complication on its hands under the following circumstances: There were, some weeks ago, evictions at Woodford. They were resisted by the people, who, under the very eyes of a force of some 500 constabulary, went to the extent of throwing boiling water and quicklime on the bailiffs, and letting loose hives of bees against them. A number of persons accused in this connection were sent forward to be tried at the Sligo assizes. The National party challenged the fairness of the jury lists under which these men would be tried. An indignation meeting was announced. The Government "proclaimed" it upon the grounds that it was an attempt to terrorize the jurors by whom the prisoners would be tried. The meeting at Sligo was suppressed by force, not without some broken heads; and the police and military were led chasing all around the neighborhood after bogas or real gatherings of a like character. The assizes came on a few days ago, the jury panel was formally challenged and tried, and Chief Baron Palles, a judge of great independence, declared that although the sub-sheriff "was not guilty of fraud, partiality, or wilful misconduct," still, "if the law allowed him any discretion, he himself would quash the panel, owing to the irregularities which had been proved." The Government have acted on the spirit of what the Chief Baron said. The assizes have been adjourned, and a new panel is to be arraigned. And so in many respects within the past few weeks the Government and the Executive have been placed in a false