

sides, if greater competition were to reduce the wages to a plane more consonant with the pay of skilled female labor, the present demand for domestic service would be vastly increased. If "hired help" could be hired for half what it now costs (and at that rate it would be well remunerated in comparison with other employments), a host of families, especially in the country, would keep servants who now feel it impossible so to do. There is not a particle of doubt that, at the ruling rates, tens of thousands of women can easily find places. There is as little doubt that at smaller but still good wages the number of women who could secure employment in the kitchen under comfortable conditions, exceeds the whole number of workingwomen in New York whose misery is periodically set forth by the newspapers. In other words, this misery might practically be ended by the victims themselves, if they would only give up trying to make a living at dying rates in overcrowded industries, and enter a field where they are sure of steady work at good pay.

And yet, incredible as it seems, it is strictly true that, if the alternative were presented to these women, ninety-nine out of a hundred of them would decide to keep on in their present distress rather than enjoy comfort as domestic servants in the country—since it is in the country that the opportunities for such employment must largely be sought. The *Tribune* printed the other day a plaintive note from a lady in a Connecticut village, which is worth quoting because it so concisely expresses the situation:

"Is there any way by which people living in the country can secure good, reliable help? We see advertisements by those who say they will live in the city or country, but I find that none of them really will go to the country, while there are plenty of places that good women could obtain where they would receive good wages and steady homes."

Anybody who has lived long in the country knows how truthful this picture is. Even if one can get a woman to do housework in the summer, it is more likely than not that she will insist upon running back to the city as soon as cold weather comes on, and taking her chances for the winter there.

The unwillingness—nay, the point-blank refusal—of poorly-paid workingwomen in New York city to take well-paid employment as domestic servants in the country, is the chief cause of the distress which prevails among them. The remedy is in their own hands, and yet they refuse to apply it. In a large proportion of cases the sole reason is because they would rather starve in the city than have plenty to eat in the country; because they would rather endure intolerable ills in a metropolis than enjoy comfort in a quiet town; because they would rather catch glimpses of the luxury of the rich in a great centre than live in a village where nobody is rich and nobody poor; because they would rather go hungry and cold amid the excitements of urban life than be well fed and well housed in a community which leads a humdrum existence.

As for the prejudice against domestic service which keeps so many women out of it, there is nothing to be said in the way of argument. The simple facts about such service are that it is perfectly respectable, thoroughly comfortable, and exceptionally well paid. A young woman has a right to refuse employment under

such excellent conditions, and instead try to make a living in a factory or shop where she can earn only \$3 or \$4 a week. But after making this choice she has no right to complain because she does not fare well, nor have philanthropists any right to invoke the public sympathy in her behalf. It is charged that thousands of women go to the bad in New York every year because they cannot support life on the wages paid factory hands, sewing-women, and shop-girls. But the woman who, on the plea that she cannot earn a living by her needle, enters a brothel because she has a prejudice against entering a kitchen, is a woman who merits no sympathy.

The folly of the talk now so current with half-baked writers on the labor problem can hardly be more forcibly demonstrated than by contrasting their theories with the facts in this particular department of industry. They point out that workingwomen in New York get wages that are not sufficient to live upon, while in their immediate neighborhood are people who are very wealthy, and they insist that a great social problem is here staring at us for solution. So they start off on a wild-goose chase for some legislative remedy which will assure these women good wages, and very likely become captivated with the idea that Henry George's nostrum would secure first-class pay for everybody. All the time the solution of the problem is right under their noses—let the women abandon overcrowded and poorly-paid industries for an employment in which they can get good wages and live well. So long as the workingwomen prefer misery in the city to comfort in the country, and starvation wages in the factory or shop to good pay in the kitchen, it is they, and not society, who must be held responsible for their misery.

Correspondence.

THE EASTPORT COLLECTORSHIP.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: As a former Republican who voted for Cleveland, and has, not always without difficulty, defended him ever since against bitterest attacks of Republican friends, may I protest most earnestly against the change just announced in the Collectorship at this port? The present officer, Mr. N. B. Nutt, has held the position, with a slight interval, through several administrations, with never a whisper against either the integrity or the ability of his service. Rather the accuracy and perfection of his reports have been, as I learn, probably quite exceptional throughout the range of the service in the United States. With clear head and careful judgment he has performed his duties, often (at this particular post) of a delicate and perplexing nature, and has been, if my informant's impression is correct, repeatedly consulted by the Department at Washington and called upon for technical information or opinion.

Was it necessary that such a man, looked up to by the whole community as a leader in all good activities, and whose official services must gain in efficiency with every added year of experience—could it be necessary that such a public servant should be supplanted by *anybody*, however personally worthy? And, it may be added, if the unwise policy of protection is still the law of the land, is it not better that it should be administered by a thorough believer in it, as Mr. Nutt is, than by a member of the party whose one pro-

fessed distinctive doctrine looks to an essential change in that policy?

The positive suffering such dismissals may work is seen in this instance, where families, already more or less crippled by the recent terrible conflagration here, will be left without support through the local "clean sweep" no doubt to follow.

It will be hard to bear the reproaches of friends instancing this as an example of the "civil-service reform of this Administration." It is such things as these that strain the allegiance of the Independents who voted for Cleveland. All we can do is to fall back on the many grand things he has done, and the many, many things which, in spite of awful pressure, he has not done. We must comfort ourselves with the reflection that about all the solid gains to civil-service reform, as well as practical illustrations of it, have come since the beginning of this Administration. But oh, why these unnecessary blots and backslidings! One Higgins, as a political handle for reproach, outweighs a score of Pearsons. It is a grand thing that our Collector here has been undisturbed to this moment, and it ought to make Republicans thoughtful who reflect that it would have been almost inconceivable had a Republican administration succeeded a Democratic one a year ago; but *why disturb him at all*, if not for cause? Was it for this we elected Cleveland? It is such things as these that make the judicious grieve, and tempt the Independents, Hannibal-like, to register an oath not only of eternal hatred and warfare against the whole spoils system, but also, if the Democratic party, too, is to prove false to the great reform, then to form a new party on that main issue.—Respectfully yours, H. D. CATLIN.

EASTPORT, ME., November 18, 1888.

MINNESOTA AND TARIFF REFORM.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: In your issue of the 11th inst. you placed Minnesota in the Republican column for 1888. The Democrats of the State feel that the results of the late election justify them in claiming the State as at least doubtful in case the Democracy stand squarely for tariff reform in their national platform.

The late Democratic State Convention placed the following plank in their platform:

"That in national matters there should be a thorough and complete tariff reform. Justice and sound policy alike dictate that the tools of the laborer and the mechanic, the raw materials of the manufacturer, the implements of the farmer, and all things necessary for the life, comfort, and enjoyment of the people, should not be excluded from our markets or enhanced in price by taxes imposed upon them for the profit of protected millions."

To show the Republican position on the tariff question in Minnesota, we quote the *Minneapolis Tribune*, the leading Republican paper of the State. The *Tribune*, a month before election, said:

"The Republican Congressional candidates this fall are more nearly in accord with the Republican party of the country than in times past. Not more than one of the five, the *Tribune* believes, will, if elected, vote with the Democratic Congressmen on tariff questions. . . . It is evident that Republicanism is becoming more robust in Minnesota, and that it will in good time endorse completely the policy of a protective tariff, as the Third and Fourth Districts have done."

The election resulted in three of the four candidates who "would not vote with the Democrats on tariff questions" being defeated by heavy majorities—Wilson, in the First District, having over 3,000 majority; McDonald, in the Third District, about 1,500 majority; and Rice, in the Fourth District, over 5,000 more votes than Gillan, the protectionist member of the present

Congress. The only protectionist in the delegation to the Fiftieth Congress is Lind of this, the Second District. He was elected by a greatly diminished majority, and would undoubtedly have been defeated had it not been for the 11,000 Republican majority in the district. The *Register* of this city is the leading Republican organ in the southwestern portion of the State, and all through the campaign advocated protective tariffs. In its issue of the 11th instant we noticed the following paragraph: "The Republican party leaders in the West must get down from their high-tariff horse or else bury their party."

We venture to say that in the election of Rice, Wilson, and McDonald the cause of tariff reform has achieved a most glorious victory.

J. A. NOWELL.

MANKATO, MINN., November 17, 1886.

WHAT PROTECTION DOES FOR THE IRON MINERS.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: While the Eastern and the Western Ore Associations are endeavoring to have the Treasury Department recede from its recent decision in regard to the tariff on imported iron ore, it is of interest to workingmen to know what "protection" has done for their advantage in the State of Pennsylvania in the iron-ore business. The following figures are from the annual report of the Pennsylvania Bureau of Industrial Statistics, which was issued last month:

Year.	Num. Hands.	Average Number Days Worked.		Average Wages.	
				Week.	Day.
1885.....	2,023	215		\$4.05	\$0.88
1884.....	2,423	215		5.00	.83

Tons of ore mined: In 1885, 811,709; in 1884, 829,011.

The year 1885 was one of the worst ever experienced in the Pennsylvania ore-mining business. The average includes the wages of a number of boys, whose pay was forty-eight or fifty cents a day; but, after making allowance for these, the men's pay will not average \$1 a day.

In this connection the United States Census figures for the "boom" year 1880 may be quoted. In round numbers, a total force of 32,000 men employed in mining iron ore in the United States earned \$301 for the year's work. This is also less than \$1 a day.

The idle season with these workingmen is the winter, when freezing cold closes navigation, and makes it unprofitable to attempt to work most of the mines. The cold also greatly reduces the chances of the miner to eke out a decent living by finding other work while the mines are closed. It is hard to believe that these underpaid miners can be made to think that they are benefited and "protected" by the tariff.—Yours truly, B. PITTSBURGH, November 16.

BRIBERY AT ELECTIONS.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: Your article on "Bribery in Elections" is timely. This is certainly one of the monstrous evils of the day. The number of those who are ready to barter the "glorious privilege of citizenship" for filthy lucre is steadily increasing. The supply of venal voters fully keeps pace with the growing demand. In this matter there are no hopes of our being able to persuade men to be virtuous so long as we permit them to be tempted. Would it not be well, then, to try and remove the temptation? At all events, might we not devise some method by which this large amount of capital could be saved for the benefit of the whole community instead of being squandered on the least worthy class?

With much diffidence I am about to propose a method which seems worthy of careful consideration. It is a method not without the authority of classic precedent. It is related by Gibbon that

the Prætorian Guards, after the murder of Pertinax, offered the Roman Empire for sale at auction to the highest bidder. Let us, then, turn our polling-places into auction-rooms; let us turn our inspectors of elections into vendue-masters; and let us knock down all the offices to the men who are willing to pay the highest price in brand-new In-God-we-trust silver dollars. Let the business be transacted openly and above board, not, as it is now, secretly and in the dark.

It is commonly reported that a young gentleman paid \$7,000 for the privilege of sitting one year in the Assembly at Albany, with a salary of \$1,500. I am informed, on good authority, that in a town not a thousand miles from here there is held by former supervisors a list of 200 mercenary voters in a total registry of about 600. The method we propose would save the honor of the vast army of men who sell their manhood; and it would also furnish a large amount of money—probably from \$50,000,000 to \$100,000,000 a year—to defray the expenses of government. We submit it to the judgment of all candid persons. Is not our plan far more practicable than Henry George's scheme for the nationalization of land? Is it not at least fully as sound and statesman-like as Mr. Blaine's project, by which he proposed that the national Government should become a broker to transact business for the individual States? JOHN W. GARDNER.

NORTON HILL, N. Y., November 17, 1886.

LOCAL EDUCATION OF THE INDIANS.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: The recommendation to abandon the task of educating Indian boys and girls in the East gives great satisfaction to all Indians and most whites on the reservations. I speak more particularly of the Sioux reservation, where I have lived for many years.

That Indians cannot be educated is not true. We have men who are college graduates, and women who have been thoroughly taught. There is a large number of young people who have had a common-school education and can read and write and speak English fluently. Two whole tribes have become self-supporting in the last four years, and have adopted the habits of civilized life, while there are many more who are working in this direction. Indian ministers and teachers abound, and are doing excellent work, and almost all these are home-bred. The desire for education is general among the wildest. They are, however, in favor of home and opposed to foreign schools.

Their reasons are worthy of respectful consideration.

First, so many die who are sent East. That many die cannot be denied, although when in ill-health they have been sent home, and so the school has been saved the odium of their dying there. It is not a question of comparison. The death of one child sent by force to the East should outweigh infinitely the death of a dozen who go of their own accord, and at their parents' desire, to a reservation school.

The second is, that as good and better work can be done in the West. Teachers of Eastern schools have told me that they could not do more for the children than we were doing in schools like St. John's, Cheyenne River Agency.

The third is, that there is all the difference between the two that there is between a plant of native growth and one transplanted. Results show that our home-bred children can take care of themselves after leaving school, while the foreign bred are far inferior in quality, and need the constant and anxious coddling of the authorities.

The demoralizing influences of camp-life are rapidly becoming a fiction. Through the efforts

both of agents and of missionaries a healthy growth of the older people is apparent, and where our best work is being done the people are a set of peaceable farmers. The dances, conjurings, and wild customs have entirely ceased. What is more, there is no drinking, profanity, rowdiness, nor Sabbath-breaking. There may be demoralizing influences around the settlement of white people called an agency, but the influences are from the white and not the Indian element.

Educational work should be done in day schools, mission and Government boarding schools, on the reservation, and perhaps higher teaching in our frontier towns. If exceptional cases need a better training, it would be better for such to be sent alone to some white institution of learning in the East or West, where one Indian is entirely surrounded by white influences. We have done this with the best results. HENRY SWIFT.

AN ETHICAL PROBLEM.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: I beg to submit to you a question in Applied Ethics—a question which often has puzzled me, and which to many others among your readers may also appear as a very difficult one. But let me first state a case which recently occurred in my neighborhood. A man lost his life in an unfortunate accident. Heavy weights of iron and of timber had fallen upon him, some of his limbs and of his ribs had been broken, the lungs and other inner parts had been cut into. The man was not killed instantly; he suffered indescribable pains from eleven in the forenoon till six in the evening, when he finally died. But for a number of hours after the accident had happened he had remained fully conscious.

It being impossible to save the man's life, would it not have been permissible to the attending physician, aye, would it not have been the duty of the same, to ease the sufferer's last moments by—let us utter the word—by applying a drop of strong poison, or a spark of electricity, or any other method whereby a more rapid advancement of the final death would have been accelerated? Could such a physician be declared guilty of murder before a criminal court? Could or would physicians, or teachers of religion and of morals, or teachers of criminal law, condemn such doings as immoral and inadmissible?

Respectfully, F.

NOVEMBER 17, 1886.

[We append the medical view of this problem, as stated in the last number of the *New York Medical Journal*.—ED. NATION.]

MURDER AS A MEDICINAL AGENT.

A newspaper item from Illinois, recounting the death of a child from supposed hydrophobia, states that "some months ago a boy in the same neighborhood had hydrophobia, and he was mercifully smothered with a pillow. Preparations were made to give Daisy the same relief, but the spasms suddenly ceased." A similar instance of therapeutic homicide was reported last summer from the northern part of the State, and there is some reason to fear that in many rural regions a barbarous practice, not uncommon in past generations, finds surviving advocacy, not only among the rustic populace, but even with some practitioners of medicine. To say nothing of the difficulties of diagnosis which might lead to the occasional smothering of simply hysterical patients, it may not be amiss to intimate that the law draws an arbitrary line beyond which the killing of patients becomes wilful murder, and even the tacit assent of a physician, or his subsequent condonation of the intentional taking of life, would render him an accessory. Despite the emotional argument which holds it as a doctor's highest duty to painlessly put an end to his clients when his prognosis is hopeless, the fact that a person is certain to die of disease is not acceptable as a valid excuse for killing him or her by adventitious means.

AN ANGLO-SAXON EXTRADITION
TREATY.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: Is there any excuse for the state of things existing through the imperfections of the extradition treaties between civilized nations? What objection could be made, for instance, to a treaty between the United States and Great Britain which should consist of these two simple provisions—(1) that the treaty shall include all acts which are punishable by the laws of both countries, political offences being excepted; and (2) that the treaty shall continue in force only while each of the contracting parties shall keep in force a statute declaring that in any prosecution for an act not punishable by the laws of the country from which the defendant was brought, it shall be a good defence that the accused has not, since his extradition, been set free, and so remained for thirty days continuously?

BEVERLY WRIGHT.

BOSTON, November 19, 1886.

A BILL OF PARTICULARS RENDERED.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: In response to an article in your paper of November 11, entitled "A Bill of Particulars Needed," I venture to suggest the following as tangible and particular grievances of the working portion of the community.

(1.) The existing system of taxation is such a grievance, for the following reasons. Of that part of it known as the tariff it may be said that:

- (a.) It is for the benefit of special classes.
- (b.) It is excessive.
- (c.) It limits the opportunities of employment; and, as a consequence,
- (d.) It lowers the rate of wages.

The weight of taxation is made to fall on the necessities and commoner luxuries of life, rather than on realized property—in a word, on the poor and not on the rich. Free trade, heavy probate duties on large bequests, and a graduated income tax, increasing the rate per cent. in proportion to the amount of the income, would be changes helpful to the mass of the population.

(2.) A second grievance is, the approved and legalized methods of business. To be specific, Mr. A or corporation B has, by force of circumstances, control of the labor of say 1,000 men. The theory of the law is, that if they do not like their employer's terms, they can work for themselves or sell their service in some other market. The actual fact is, that in a multitude of cases there are no alternatives to the employer's terms but starvation or the poor-house. The case is substantially that of the rack-rented Irish tenant. The tenant could not benefit himself by his legal rights of free contract, but the law was obliged to recognize and enforce his equitable claims to a place on the face of the earth and a fair proportion of the products of his labor. In regard to the Irish tenant and his landlord, the American public is pretty well agreed that this principle is right, but it seems to have no thought of applying it to American mines, factories, and railroads. Without regard to the equities of the case, it allows an employer to make all he can from the labor of his workmen, and to pay them the lowest rate hunger compels them to accept. The profit-and-loss account may show unmistakably that the work of each man on the average is worth to the concern \$1,000, \$1,500, or \$2,000; and the wages account may show as unmistakably that the average wages are \$400, \$600, or \$800, yet there is no tribunal, such as that provided by Gladstone's Irish Land Bill, to which an appeal can be made for a more equitable division of the products of the common labor. Capital and labor here are as much business partners as landlord and tenant in Ireland, yet the law re-

cognizes only the partnership interests of the senior member of the firm. If his capital is assailed by violence, the law is prompt and energetic in defence; but a coal, or a lumber, or a railroad king may at any time, for a personal advantage or a mere caprice, suddenly deprive a multitude of men of their means of livelihood, or may systematically harass and half starve them, and no court will entertain a suit of complaint. Look at the coal owners of Pennsylvania and the wages paid their miners, and say if it is not true.

(3.) Is it too vague a statement for "a bill of particulars" to say that public opinion approves of "demand-and-supply" wages, and that the Church feebly and inaudibly protests against them; that it rarely or never translates its central doctrine, Do unto others as ye would that they should do unto you, or, Bear ye one another's burdens, into such practical language as, Pay your workmen all your business will afford, or, Think it a theft to pay a man only half what his work is worth to you?

To the smaller extent of their power the workmen are often as unjust and unfeeling as their employers, but their wrong conduct does not alter the fact that great changes must be made in the laws and in public sentiment before they will conform to those Christian ethics that all men now profess to approve, before that finer spirit of justice which is called benevolence makes life to the mass of workmen not a weary struggle for existence, but a fair opportunity for growth and enjoyment.—Respectfully,

CHARLES W. PEARSON.

EVANSTON, ILL., November 15, 1886.

[(1.) Mr. Pearson appears to have forgotten that what we called for was a list of the grievances of workingmen *as such*—that is, of manual laborers for wages—which were capable of remedy by legislation. The tariff or the general system of taxation is not such a grievance, because it affects all classes—farmers, lawyers, teachers, and doctors—as well as workingmen. We should think it very absurd if the farmers, as a protest against the badness of the tariff, should separate themselves from the rest of the community and organize as a class hostile or semi-hostile to the other classes.

(2.) Mr. Pearson has again forgotten that his bill of particulars must specify not wrongs or hardships simply, but wrongs or hardships capable of remedy by legislation. Has he ever known anybody who passed into control of the labor of 1,000 men by "force of circumstances"? Ability to employ labor means the possession of money. Has he become possessed of money by force of circumstances, and does he know any one who has? Possession of money comes in ninety nine cases out of one hundred through force of character—that is, industry, frugality, sagacity, and foresight. Is he prepared to enact a law providing for the regulation of wages in factories and mines? If so, to whom shall the work be intrusted; and on what force will he rely to keep capitalists in the business, after the control of the business in its most essential feature has been taken out of their hands, and given to politicians elected, say, annually? Suppose a factory, after being managed in the Georgeite way, were to fail, and the laborers left to "starvation or the poor-house." Would anybody be compelled to provide them with a new factory and good wages, and if so, who? If, moreover, the factories were not doing well, would it not be necessary to raise the

prices of these goods by law, and compel people to purchase them so as to keep trade lively? Moreover, the analogy with the Irish land legislation is misleading. That legislation gives the tenant greater control over his farm, but it does not involve the Government in the work of superintending his mode of farming. The case would be parallel if the Government, after ousting the landlords, were to become a general landlord itself, and undertook to see that every farmer in Ireland kept his farm in good condition. People of the Georgeite persuasion are constantly suggesting changes in the social organization which, whether desirable or undesirable, involve additions to the work of public administration such as the world has never seen, or any branch of the human race ever even attempted, and they fail to tell us where the capacity necessary for them is to be found. Is it possible that Mr. Pearson has never thought out the mode in which he would provide for the State superintendence of all the mines, factories, and railroads? Let him consider for a moment the condition of New York manufactures if they were controlled by the Board of Aldermen. Does he seriously suppose that the men who have money in them would leave it there for one month?—ED. NATION.]

WHAT CONGREGATIONALISTS SAY THEY
BELIEVE.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: Allow me, as a matter of historical accuracy, to give my authority for the statements made in the *Nation* of November 4 with regard to what Congregationalists profess to believe, called by your other correspondent, the Rev. Mr. Parker, "noteworthy mistakes."

(1.) As to the source of information. Though born and bred in one of the old Puritan Congregational churches, and almost learning my alphabet from its "Assembly's Catechism," I did not rely on that for my knowledge, but on 'The Official Record of the National Congregational Council Held in Boston in 1865.' This Council was composed of the representatives, as declared by itself, of nearly three thousand churches; and as such, to quote its own words, was "competent to testify in the form of a confession what system of doctrines is received and maintained in the churches which it represents" (see p. 50)—manifestly a very different body as to authority from Mr. Parker's hypothetical board of "house-holders."

(2.) As to the exact language used in its Declaration of Faith. It is, as adopted in the old Plymouth burial-ground, and then carefully amended the next day in Boston:

"Standing by the rock where the Pilgrims set foot on these shores, upon the spot where they worshipped God, and among the graves of the early generations, we, elders and messengers of the Congregational Churches of the United States in National Council assembled—like them acknowledging no rule of faith but the word of God—do now declare our adherence to the faith and order of the apostolic and primitive churches held by our fathers, and substantially as embodied in the confessions and platforms which our Synods of 1643 and 1680 [declared by the Council, see p. 31, to be in doctrine almost identical with that of the Westminster Assembly], set forth or reaffirmed. We declare that the experience of the nearly two and a half centuries which have elapsed since the memorable day when our sires founded here a Christian Commonwealth, with all the development of new forms of error since their times, has only deepened our confidence in the faith and polity of those fathers. We bless God for the inheritance

of these doctrines. We invoke the help of the Divine Redeemer that through the presence of the promised Comforter he will enable us to transmit them in purity to our children" (Official Report, p. 153).—

language, surely, which is ample justification of my statement that "it declared almost unanimously its adherence to the old Puritan Confession of Faith based on the Westminster Confession, and first adopted in this country in 1648."

(3.) As to whether the declaration was formally and officially made, or whether, as Mr. Parker says, it was "an informal and general statement of their personal beliefs at the time." The history of its adoption is as follows: First, there were two successive committees officially chosen "to consider the propriety of submitting to the Council a declaration of the common faith of our churches." The reports made by these committees were fully discussed at a regular meeting of the Council on the seventh day of its sessions, after which, to give the matter especial solemnity, the Council adjourned till the next day and to the old Plymouth burial-ground. In this hallowed spot, with all possible seriousness and formality, the report quoted above was adopted; and then the next day, at another regular session in Boston, and at an hour previously set apart for its consideration, it was again brought up, carefully amended as to its phraseology, and, to quote the exact words of the official report, was "solemnly reaffirmed and finally adopted by a rising vote, in connection with prayer and the singing of 'My faith looks up to Thee' and the Doxology"—only one person, the Rev. George Allen, protesting against it. If a declaration thus solemnly and repeatedly adopted by "the representatives of nearly 3,000 Congregational churches" was "an informal and general statement of personal beliefs," and only a "Boston declaration," it would be interesting to know what is the Rev. Mr. Parker's idea of a formal and particular statement and of a national declaration.

(4.) With regard to the existence of "Congregational churches," not "church" (the word "church" is Dr. Withrow's, quoted by your correspondent himself, not mine), and with regard to the use of "the present, not future tense" in the declaration, both are used, the Council praying that "we may be enabled to transmit them—these doctrines—in purity to our children," and promising that "with them we will carry the Gospel into every part of our land, and with them we will go into all the world," evidently meaning that they were declaring the settled, permanent beliefs of Congregationalism. It is indeed true that "at St. Louis, in 1880, a committee of twenty-five was appointed to frame a new confession of faith"; but as two different ones were framed, both of which have been severely criticised, and neither of which has ever been acted upon by any Congregational Council, the one adopted in 1885 remains as the latest official statement of Congregational beliefs.

(5.) Mr. Parker's request to name some one "living Congregational seminary, professor, paper, or minister" who holds the special doctrine of the old confession "that all the heathen perish," is entirely futile, for what weight would such a single instance have, either on the one side or the other, as compared with the formally declared adherence to it of the representatives of nearly 3,000 Congregational churches, most of them still living? Moreover, if no one holds now to such a belief—as Mr. Parker intimates—then, in the name of common sense, what is all this pother in the religious world about, all this struggle in the "American Board" and at Des Moines against sending out missionaries to the heathen who believe there will be a chance for them not to "perish" in the world to come? With a real difference of belief between the com-

batants on this point, the fight, to outsiders, seems foolish enough; but with only a Pickwickian difference between them, with only a "never" and a "hardly ever," the eloquence, learning, logic, and piety brought to bear on the subject are, surely, an exhibition of opéra bouffe which surpasses anything ever put on the dramatic or even on the political stage. K.

THE PERSISTENCE OF PROVINCIALISMS. TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: In reading a good many recent newspaper letters from different persons in one of our Southern cities, descriptive of late events there, I was struck with the continual occurrence of the Southern use of *will* for *shall* and *would* for *should*; especially in conditional sentences such as, "If so and so happens, we *will* find that he," etc.; or, "If so and so should happen, we *would* find that he," etc.

Let me hasten to explain that I am not one of those schoolmasterly people who are made wretched by other people's expressing their ideas in their own way. On the contrary, I am quite in sympathy with a person, nearly related to me, who began his college teaching with shocking and saddening a whole faculty, by printing the opinion that "it is me" is very pretty English in certain connections. I have never been able to feel that we shall either be saved, or not saved by the orthodoxy of our philology or our grammar. The most important thing seems to me to be that our knowledge of philology should not involve our ignorance of literature, and that our neighbor's grammar should not hinder our getting his ideas. In the letters referred to, there was certainly much that was admirable for vividness and truth of description.

But the persistence in certain localities of distinct peculiarities or "errors" of speech is noteworthy, and becomes quite interesting when we reflect that these merely superficial and unimportant idiosyncrasies are doubtless accompanied by a multitude of deeper-seated characteristics, equally persistent, and persisting from the same cause. Opinions and points of view are geographical as well as dialects. When you hear the peculiar use of *will* and *would*, to which I have referred, you can predict with some certainty how the speaker will be found to feel on the question of public school vs. private school, or as to the co-education of the sexes. As when you hear the prominent final *r* of a particular section of the Middle West (not a trill, but a heavy sound made with the flat of the tongue, as in *watuR*) you are enabled to give a shrewd guess as to the speaker's view of loyalty to the grand old — party, and of the candidacy of that blatherskite — (himself an example, by the way, of a very persistent provincialism).

The cause, as we all know, of these local peculiarities of speech, as well as of opinion and prejudice, lies in the being more or less shut up to local influences exclusively. Whether or not it could be shown that human influences decrease in power exactly as the square, or the cube, of the distance at which they act, it is certain that there is some such remarkable inverse relation. Just as truly as the illusion of the vanishing perspective constantly imposes on the intelligence, so the diminished potency of human influences constantly cheats and stunts the character. We are all the time moulded, in spite of us, by forces close at hand. We reach out after books from England, and Russia, and Assyria, but in the meantime it is the local newspaper that does for us. While we are trying our best to push out and widen our circle, the circle itself seems elastic, and forcibly narrows in upon us. It begins in childhood. First the family industriously works to hedge in the child; then the little vil-

lage clamps itself around him. The managers of the schools select the worst of the competing textbooks, on the ground that it was prepared nearest home. They even pass a rule that no teacher shall be brought in from abroad so long as there is a home-made candidate. Thus in every way our views, instead of being renewed and enlightened from outside sources, are continually bred "in and in." The State of California has even gone so far in this belittling and mind-pinching policy as to have prohibited the use of school-books from other sources, such as those written by some of the foremost scientists, historians, and scholars, directing the Board of Education to "cause to be prepared," made, and sold text-books for their own use. Presently we shall have some distant State forbidding the importation of Shakespeare, and undertaking by legislative enactment to produce him on the spot from local talent.

It is certainly a curious phenomenon that a peculiar use of an auxiliary verb should have such adhesive power as to remain for generations in the South, resisting the all but universal usage as found in other modern English written speech. Does it not go far to prove that the distant, even when brought from the distance in the shape of books, has little effect upon us as compared with the near? E. R. S.

NOVEMBER 12, 1886.

APROPOS OF HORSESHOE CRABS.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: Mr. H. W. Turner refers in your last to the *Limulus* alleged to have been found off San Francisco Bay last summer, but which was not, so far as I have been able to find out, submitted to any naturalist for determination, and is the first recorded instance of the occurrence of *Limulus* on the west coast of America. There is a *Limulus* in Japan. The waters of Alaska belong in many respects to a different faunal area from that represented about the Farallones near San Francisco.

It is of the highest importance to know whether the Japanese *Limulus*, like many other animals, reappears on our western coast; or whether the San Francisco specimen was transplanted in its young state with Eastern oysters—like our common soft-shelled clam, now the chief mollusk of the San Francisco markets, but formerly unknown there. It would also be of great interest to know if one or the other, and which, reaches the shores of Alaska.—Yours respectfully,

REVIEWER.

Notes.

J. B. LIPPINCOTT Co. have in press the 'Recitations' of Mrs. James Brown Potter; 'A Signal Success,' by Mrs. M. J. Coston, whose work is not a novel, but a bit of autobiography in connection with her invention of the Coston signal light; and 'Modern Idols,' biographical and critical studies, mostly of contemporary writers, by Wm. Henry Thorne.

The managers of *Lippincott's Magazine* announce a narrative poem by Miss Rose Elizabeth Cleveland, to appear in the January issue of that magazine. It is called "The Dilemma of the Nineteenth Century."

'Years of Experience' is the title of an autobiographical work by Mrs. Georgiana Bruce Kirby, one of the later members of the Brook Farm Association in 1844-46. The reminiscences of her acquaintance there and subsequently in some of the philanthropic movements of the time promise to be of no little interest. The volume will be published by G. P. Putnam's Sons.

Cassell & Co. have in press a holiday edition of