

The Nation.

NEW YORK, THURSDAY, APRIL 19, 1888.

The Week.

THE resolution to postpone the Direct-Tax Refunding Bill till next December, adopted unanimously by the Democratic caucus of the House, is a triumph for the opponents of the measure. The bill is not likely to gain friends during the interval, and if it be true that one of the main purposes of it was to reduce the inflammation in the public finances without removing the cause—*i. e.*, to empty the Treasury without cutting down the taxes—that bad motive will no longer operate to defeat or retard action on the Tax and Tariff Reduction Bill. There is reason to believe that the greatest impelling force behind the Direct-Tax Bill was the claim agents' lobby, among whom some hundreds of thousands of dollars would have been distributed if the bill had passed. The postponement of it is an apparent victory for filibustering as a method of carrying on government, but it is evident now that the filibusters have surrendered more than their opponents, because they have agreed that a vote shall be taken on the 11th of December. All that they have secured is delay. If after the lapse of eight months, and after the thorough discussion the measure will receive, a majority of the House still desire to pass the bill, it will be passed without factious opposition. Government by the majority, therefore, has not received any serious detriment. We regard the bill itself as one of the most indefensible and demoralizing that have ever been introduced, since it carries the seeds of the vicious principle that taxes may be imposed by the National Government for distribution among the States. Nothing more demoralizing or unsettling can be imagined than a system of taxation which at once relaxes the watch and guard of the taxpayers on their local governments, and furnishes new sources of supply to the tax-eaters.

The passage of Mr. Beriah Wilkins's resolution, declaring that in the judgment of the House of Representatives the Secretary of the Treasury has authority under existing law to apply his surplus funds to the purchase and cancellation of United States bonds, is a happy deliverance from a painful situation. The Senate having already passed a similar resolution, all doubts are removed. The Beck amendment providing for the coinage of more silver is left dangling in the air. Entire liberty of action is now in the Secretary's hands, and the onus is likewise upon him to employ his discretion under the law. Of course his ability to purchase bonds hinges on the willingness of the holders to sell. Yet the bond market has undergone considerable change since he stopped buying for the sinking fund last year, there being now forty or fifty millions of bonds in his hands as security for Treasury

funds deposited with the banks, the sale of which he can force by calling in the deposits. Altogether, the financial situation is much relieved by the fortunate action of the House, but the relief is only temporary. It cannot be regarded as a substitute for a reduction of taxation and a stoppage of the inflow of money. The purchase of bonds at any fair price has its limits, and we must remember that many months must elapse before any tax-reduction bill can become effective, and that the surplus at the beginning of the present month was upwards of \$104,000,000.

The "great divide," as the River and Harbor Appropriation Bill has long been called, came before the House on Monday. It calls for nearly twenty millions of dollars, and yet its promoters sought to put it through without debate under a suspension of the rules. They easily secured a majority, but happily failed by many votes of the necessary two-thirds, and the measure will now have to take its chances later in the session, after the Tariff Bill is disposed of. The worst feature of this matter is, that we seem to make no progress towards a satisfactory basis of operations as time passes. President Arthur's veto in 1882 of a bill appropriating nearly \$19,000,000 called a temporary halt, but its influence is no longer felt, and apparently nothing short of another veto will check the wild extravagance of the logrollers.

The claim agents and demagogues at Washington have been chuckling over the theory that Mr. Cleveland would not dare to veto any of their pension schemes this year, in view of his probable candidacy for reelection. The three vetoes of private pension bills sent in on Monday will open their eyes. Such a notification that Congressional measures will still be subjected to Executive scrutiny is as necessary as it is welcome.

The appointment by the President of Mr. Lovering as United States Marshal for Massachusetts is a victory for the spoilsmen of the Democratic party, which is the more notable because it is achieved in the State where Mr. Cleveland has in the past done most for the cause of civil-service reform. The term of the incumbent, Gen. Banks, expired some weeks ago, and ever since then a vigorous contest has been going on as to the succession. Gen. Banks had been so careless in his management of the office that he did not deserve reappointment, and the only question was as to what sort of a Democrat should be selected. An excellent representative of the progressive element was brought forward, and, on the other hand, Mr. Lovering, who has always been an open opponent of civil-service reform, and was nominated for Governor last fall at the instance of the odious Democratic ring in Boston because he was an unblushing spoilsman. The President hesitated long, but finally surrendered to the men who have been his

bitterest enemies in everything that has been best in his career at Washington.

Mr. Lowell's address at Steinway Hall on Friday night, before one of the most intelligent and attentive audiences we have ever seen in New York, was a rare and impressive occasion. It has come to pass—why or wherefore we cannot stop to discuss here—that we have not just now a single man in public life who ever makes a speech on what we may call the philosophy of politics, as distinguished from practical questions of legislation, or whose utterances, if reported, are read with any care or interest by anybody, or remembered for one hour after they are read. In this respect the descent from the days of Clay, and Calhoun, and Webster, and Wright, and Everett, and Seward, and Sumner is tremendous. Mr. Lowell is, in truth, to-day almost the only American whose talk about politics, using the term in its best sense, is eagerly looked for, all over the English-speaking world, and put away in men's libraries beside the great masterpieces of thought and expression. The address to the Reform Club on Friday was worthy of him when at his best. It would have been difficult for any master of English this century has seen to have crowded into one hour and ten minutes so much apt historical reminiscence, so much shrewd observation, and so much acute analysis of the phenomena, both bad and good, of national life. What was better than all was, that there ran through every sentence a vein of that high morality and courageous hopefulness, and of that supreme confidence that, in the long run, the better cause will have the upper hand, which, to men who are worth much either to home or country, always sounds like a trumpet blast. Every one who listened to him, and, above all, those who have to deal with the unspeakable meannesses and trivialities of factional politics, must have been grateful for being raised even for one brief hour into the pure air and clear light which surround the things that ought to be.

Biddeford is a Maine manufacturing town whose foreign-born population, chiefly Irish and French Canadians, numbered more than a third of the whole number at the last census. A new city government was recently chosen, and the distribution of the "patronage" followed. As always happens in such cases, there was great dissatisfaction, but one peculiar element entered into the case, which was stated with the utmost frankness by an Alderman at a meeting of the City Council. "Fifteen thousand dollars," he said, "will be paid in salaries by the city this year, and how is that sum divided? The Irish get \$725, the French \$625, a total of \$1,350 which the Catholics are paid, to \$13,650 which the Protestants receive." He "arraigned" the Mayor for not exerting more of his influence to secure offices for his Catholic supporters, and complained that at

a final caucus he (the Alderman) had been ignored and "Americans got \$325 in salaried offices, the French Canadians \$110, and the Irish got left." All this seems very absurd, of course; yet what is it but the carrying out to its logical conclusion of what Mr. Lowell calls "the geographical allotment of patronage, as if ability were dependent, like wheat, upon the soil"? When Congress enacts that appointments to the Federal service shall be allotted among the States according to their respective populations, it is not strange that Biddeford Aldermen should insist upon dividing municipal offices according to race and church lines.

The operation of the Soldiers' Exemption Act in Massachusetts—the act which exempts veterans from competitive examination for appointments in the civil service—has been to reduce the number of veterans actually appointed about 75 per cent. The *Civil-Service Record* shows that under the law as it stood before the exemption was passed, forty-nine veterans were appointed to desirable positions during the preceding year. They then had, as they have always had, a preference among candidates who passed an equally good examination. During the six months since they were exempted from competitive examination only sixteen have received appointments, and all but four of these have been in the prison service, "where, owing to the small pay and the necessity of residence in the institution, it was impossible to get enough competitors to make an eligible list." The reason for this change in the fortunes of the veterans as applicants for appointments is, that the soldiers generally believe that the Civil-Service Law is broken down, and that appointments are to be secured now only by "influence." Consequently, fewer veterans apply for examination than formerly. Hence it comes to pass that only one soldier gets a position, and that a very undesirable one, where three or four were successful under the old law. Of course this was the result that the spoilsmen aimed at in the beginning. They wanted to whittle the law away by piecemeal, and to spread abroad the idea that the merit system was no longer in force. It was never any part of their plan to put soldiers in office.

The most significant feature of the Oregon Republican State Convention last week, like that of the Arkansas Convention the day before, was the character of the man who was put to the front as the representative of the party. In Arkansas it was the notorious carpet-bagger, "Pow" Clayton; in Oregon, it was George H. Williams, whose reputation as Grant's Attorney-General was so bad that the Senate would not confirm him as Chief Justice. As fourteen years have passed since that time, it is worth while to refresh the public memory by recalling the meeting of the Bar Association of this city, January 6, 1874, which resolved that it is the "deliberate conviction" of the Association that "the nomination by the Executive of George H. Williams to be the Chief Justice of the Su-

preme Court of the United States disappoints the just expectations of the legal profession, and does not deserve the approval of the people, for the reason that the candidate proposed is wanting in those qualifications of intellect, experience, and reputation which are indispensable to uphold the dignity of the highest national court, and to maintain general respect for the law in the person of the officer who presides over its administration."

The Iowa Legislature adjourned last week, and, as so often happens under such circumstances, the papers say that "the State feels greatly relieved." The feeling is more profound than usual, however, because the Iowa Legislature was an unusually dangerous body. The House of Representatives particularly was controlled by demagogues, who succeeded in rushing through it the most fantastic measures regarding the management of railroads. Fortunately the Senate proved what the national Senate has ceased to be—a check and balance-wheel—and, to quote the words of the leading Republican paper at the capital, "has resisted and defeated more wild and hoodlum legislation than ever had been proposed in any American State before." But the Senate was not able to defeat all the measures that ought to have been beaten. One of the worst that got through was a law making the Railroad Commissioners elective instead of appointive, and thus leaving the constitution of this most important body to be settled by the intrigues and trades of a political convention. A bill was passed prohibiting discriminations in freight charges, and requiring railroad companies to post schedules of their rates, which must not exceed a maximum fixed by the Commission. This is a measure of great importance, the working of which will depend largely upon the character of the men chosen as Railroad Commissioners.

Mr. Simon Sterne, in the last number of the *Financial Chronicle* of this city, advocates the plan propounded in the *Nation* as long ago as 1883 for placing legal restrictions on the striking power of certain classes of quasi-public employees, apropos of the telegraphers' strike then pending. We then said (July 19, 1883), after pointing out the important part played by the telegraph in the life of modern nations, and the immense loss caused by its sudden stoppage:

"Now, the question whether any body of men ought to be allowed for any purpose to inflict this loss and inconvenience on the public, is one of which the growing complexity of modern society will soon compel a peremptory settlement. A few years ago there was a strike of engine-drivers on one of the Massachusetts railroads, and they actually undertook to carry it out by abandoning trains filled with passengers in the open country, remote from a station. A repetition of this device was promptly prevented by penal legislation, so that every locomotive engineer in Massachusetts now holds his place with the understanding that if he abandons his engine on the road for any reason, he goes to jail. A similar theory of the relation of other railroad employees to the public led to the railroad strikes in 1877 and the horrible resulting riots, with enormous loss to the country. If anything of the kind

were attempted again, assuredly some stringent measures for its prevention would be resorted to. The truth is that a society like ours, and like all commercial nations, has become so dependent on the post-office, the railroads, and the telegraph, that they may be said to stand to it in the relation of the nerves to the human body. The loss even for a week of any one of them means partial paralysis. The loss of all three would mean a total deprivation, for a longer or shorter period, of nearly everything which the community most values. It would mean a suspension of business and social relations equal to that caused by a hostile invasion, barring the terror and bloodshed. It is consequently something to which no country will long allow itself to remain exposed. It cannot allow strikes of employees in these great public services, any more than it can allow the corporations themselves to refuse to carry on their business as a means of extracting what they think fair rates of transportation. No Legislature would permit this, and one or two more experiences like the railroad strike will cause every Legislature to take measures against the other. Telegraphers, railroad men, post-office clerks, and policemen fill places in modern society very like that of soldiers. In fact, they together do for society what soldiers used to do. They enable every man to come and go freely on his lawful occasions, and transact his lawful business without let or hindrance."

Everything which has since happened in the matter of railroad strikes gives ample confirmation to this view. It is becoming plainer and plainer to every rational observer that the transportation service of the country cannot be carried on under the present mode of running railroads. There is, in fact, to anybody who knows anything of human nature and human affairs, something positively ludicrous in the present attempt to manage great armies of employees on extensive lines of traffic under the inspection of Powderlys and Arthurs. We recognize its absurdity in the case of the army and navy. If it were proposed that every military post or man-of-war should have a "General Worth Foreman" to give advice to the soldiers or sailors when to refuse to do duty, and what conditions to make before obeying orders, the whole civilized world would indulge in a shout of laughter. It is not, however, necessary to go to the army or navy for an illustration of the absurdity of our present system. The merchant service suffices for the purpose. Sailors are not compelled to ship in any crew, but when they do, and sign articles, they have to do their duty to the end of the voyage. They are not allowed to strike. If they attempt to strike, it is called mutiny, and treated as a criminal offence which sends them to jail. In order to see the reasonableness of all this, one has only to suppose the engineers and firemen of an Atlantic steamer to announce to the captain, when two days out from New York, that they were "tired," and would work no more, or would only work long enough to carry the ship into Halifax; or the cook to announce that he would do no more cooking unless the steward or waiters were dismissed on the spot; or the sailors to say that, owing to the discovery of goods of a boycotted firm in the hold, they would neither reef, steer, nor look out during the remainder of the voyage. The immemorial law and custom of the sea will undoubtedly some day have to be applied to the work of transportation on land. Engineers and firemen and switchmen will have to enlist or sign articles agreeing to do certain duty, and obey

lawful orders for a certain period, under pains and penalties.

Mr. Chauncey Depew is reported in the *Philadelphia Press* as having stated that he "knew, of his own personal knowledge, where several Blaine Irish clubs disbanded in consequence of Mr. Burchard's alliterative remark, and went over to Cleveland." This is very interesting, if true, because it is the first time that any one has come forward in these three years, in spite of repeated challenges, to say either that he himself changed his vote in consequence of Burchard's remark, or knew of any one else who had done so. The nearest we have ever come to the fact, if fact it be, has been in hearing from some one that he knew some one else who "probably" or "doubtless" knew of somebody whom Burchard had driven away from Blaine. But here is Mr. Depew, who says that he knows, "of his own personal knowledge," not only of individuals, but "several clubs," who deserted Blaine in a body because they did not like what Burchard said. We trust Mr. Depew will, in the interest of historical truth, give us the names and locality of some of these clubs, so that the matter can be inquired into. We would not question his reports if we did not know, from his unfortunate experience about the Dutch tariff, that he is a trifle credulous in political matters. He allowed some unscrupulous Dutch "business man" to stuff him with a story last summer about ruinous changes in the Dutch tariff, or, as he called it, the passage of a "free-trade law," and not only never took the trouble to verify it, but repeated it to a reporter nine months later, as having some bearing on our present tariff controversy. We trust some impecunious "Irish club" has not been imposing on him in this case from sordid motives.

That the negroes are making substantial material progress is proved by the report of the Comptroller-General of Georgia, which shows that the amount of property upon which they paid taxes rose from five millions in 1879 to nine millions in 1887. This is an average increase of ten per cent. a year, whereas the property of the white people increased only five per cent. a year during the same period. It is noteworthy that the growing prosperity of the negroes in the South dates from the time when they ceased to depend upon the Government, and learned that the black man, like the white, has his own way to make in the world. One of the most hopeful signs for the race is the evidence that they have mastered this lesson which is found in the adoption, by a recent negro convention at Macon, Ga., of a common-sense resolution declaring that "this Convention regard the acquisition of a good English education, the accumulation of property, and the making and saving of money, the thing to do."

The way in which the Commissioners of Charities and Correction have removed

"Fatty" Walsh from the Wardenship of the Tombs is almost as discreditable as his appointment. They have got rid of him by a preamble and resolution which might be used by the Professor of Logic of the College of the City of New York as an example of mixed fallacy and absurdity. Their argument is that inasmuch as Mr. Rhodes, the lawyer, now makes no charge against "Fatty" of an attempt to extort illegal fees, and as the illegal fees which Fatty did extort did not go into his own pocket, *therefore* the Board denies that bad language used by "Fatty" to Mr. Rhodes is a good cause of removal, and accepts his resignation. The meaning of this is, as far as we can make any meaning out of it, that the Board does not mind having the warden of a jail extort money from prisoners and lawyers as long as it cannot be traced directly to his own pocket, as if any "Fatty" of experience ever allowed unlawful gains to be traced directly to his own pocket; but it cannot abide "improper language used in the course of official business." This is irresistibly funny, in view of the fact that these very gentlemen, who are so particular about the speech of their subordinates, put in one of the most important places in their gift an old liquor-dealer, gambler, and pugilist and street rough, to whom the use of foul, profane, and abusive language is probably the most fixed habit of his life. The selection of a "Fatty" for a place requiring chaste and refined expression is about as droll as the selection of a brothel-keeper for the matronship of a reformatory would be. Our advice to the Commissioners is: "When you do these disgraceful things, do them boldly and frankly. If you think a 'Fatty' is fit to govern the jail of a Christian community, do not, after you have put him there, pretend to be disappointed or surprised by his bad behavior. Say frankly that this is just what you expected, and that you do not care five cents what anybody thinks about it."

The Anti-Poverty Society has retired from the Academy of Music, and will hold its meetings henceforth in Cooper Union. The reason given for the change is the necessity of finding a lower rental, the receipts being much less than heretofore, and the work of driving poverty from the face of the earth going on with correspondingly slackened pace. We doubt if the change will prove beneficial to the work. So long as the crusade against poverty was carried on in the Academy, it had an air of "style" about it which was a great incentive to contributions. The "ladies of the Society" were able to sit in boxes and listen to the attacks upon the Catholic Church which Dr. McGlynn made, and they were willing to pay as much for their seats as for the abuse which he poured forth so fluently; but now all the brilliancy has gone out of the meetings. There will be no boxes to sit in, and the musty flavor of McGlynn's harangues will not be lessened by being taken down in a cellar for weekly delivery. It really looks as if poverty would not be abolished this year after all.

The love of seeing other people fight valiantly for noble causes, which pervades the writing of a certain class of literary men with a taste for political philosophy, has been amusingly illustrated in the case of Kingsley, Froude, Carlyle, and Goldwin Smith, who are all fond of "making short work" of obnoxious people at home, and inflicting terrible slaughter on foreign enemies. Froude's delight over Rodney's victory in the West Indies, as compensation for the recent loss of a great empire through gross misgovernment, furnishes one of the most diverting passages in his book on the West Indies. It ought to be read in connection with the comments of Franklin on the same event, in order to see the difference between a real statesman and man of affairs, and a babbling rhetorician who gets his military experiences over a quire of paper and a bottle of ink. This *furor bellicosus* seems in these latter days, as we have more than once pointed out, to have reached some of the scientific men, of whom poor Prof. Tyndall is a fair sample. The thunders against Gladstone which the Professor discharged from the Alps all summer were among the most diverting incidents of the Irish trouble, particularly when he denounced Gladstone for his attacks on the Orangemen, among whom he (the Professor) had "first learned to read his Bible." Now, however, he has apparently reached the conclusion that persuasion is wasted on this wicked old man, and he brings to his notice, by way of warning, the saying of the other sage, Thomas Carlyle, that "A minister who is wicked enough to propose to sever Ireland from England, deserves to have his head brought to the block."

The new tariff on wheat in Germany is equal to \$1.19 per 220 pounds, or 30 per cent. ad valorem. The object of it is to exclude American wheat from South Germany, and to compel Bavaria, Baden, and the Rhine country to buy Prussian wheat exclusively. But it is much cheaper to supply the South German people with American wheat from London. Moreover, the South Germans are accustomed to American wheat; they even like it better than Prussian wheat. On the other hand, Prussian wheat is very conveniently situated for the English market, and very inconveniently for the South German market. Accordingly, a bill has been introduced in the Reichstag to enable North German merchants to export wheat to England, and to import an equivalent amount of American wheat to South Germany free of duty. In order to make the swap easy and frictionless, it is proposed that the exporter of North German wheat shall have the right to sell his permits of importation just as he would sell a bill of exchange. The drollery of all this circumlocution, by which the consumer is sacrificed to the producer, has not penetrated the German mind to any great extent, but there is much suffering in South Germany in consequence of the deprivation of American supplies of food. Why do not some of our high-tariff men, who are such fast friends of the American farmer, propose a measure of retaliation?

WOOL AND MUTTON.

MR. WILLIAM LAWRENCE of Ohio, a great authority among wool-growers, has written a letter to the *Boston Commercial Bulletin* to show that what this country wants in order to achieve great prosperity is the very highest tariff on wool that anybody can imagine. Even the tariff of 1867 was not high enough for him. He allows this, indeed, to have been a great and glorious tariff, and even announces the very startling discovery that "sheep-growing as a distinct industry did not begin to acquire great importance until after the wool tariff of March 2, 1867." He neglects to add, what has been a thousand times proved by official statistics, that sheep-growing as a branch of general husbandry began from that very year to decline, so that in ten years the sheep on farms devoted in large part to other crops had shrunk to half their former numbers. Reiteration and reference to official documents on this point seem to have no other effect on the victim of the wool-tariff mania than to cause him to reiterate his historic falsehoods with increased confidence and excitement.

But Mr. Lawrence has a grievance against that tariff. He says: "The act of 1867, however, discriminated in favor of the importation of the long wools of the Cotswold and Down sheep, and, in practical effect, admitted them at a less rate of duty than the clothing wools. The duty was less, because, though that act imposed the same rate of duty on unwashed combing and clothing wools, yet it admitted *washed* combing wool at the same rate of duty as *unwashed*, though on washed clothing [merino] wools the duty was double that on unwashed." And he has nothing to say of the terrible tariff of 1883 except that it "continued the same discrimination."

Now we come to Mr. Lawrence's humor. It is of a rare and racy vintage. The arguments are not rare by any means, but the grouping is irresistible, for the simple reason that it is close and honest, and leaves the harmony and inharmony to manifest themselves in their own full and exuberant force. Thus:

"We now import annually the long combing wools to the amount of about 5,000,000 pounds, mostly produced in England and Ireland. If Congress would insert in the tariff law six words—'on washed combing wool double duty'—the result would be (1) that in five years or less the long-wool sheep would be increased 20,000,000; (2) we would not import one pound of foreign long-combing wool; (3) we would produce in this country all of such wool we need; (4) the price would be 30 per cent. less than it is now; (5) the wool manufacturers would secure cheaper combing wool; (6) those who consume delaines and other goods made of such wools would procure them 30 per cent. cheaper than now; (7) farmers would raise comparatively fewer cattle than now, but they would produce mutton from Cotswold and Southdown sheep which would more than supply their place; (8) they would make more money in raising such sheep than from cattle, because, in addition to the mutton, wool would afford profit; and (9) the cities, the manufacturing districts, the whole people, would have a greater abundance of cheaper, more healthful, and better meat food than now."

From which it appears that by stopping the importation of 5,000,000 pounds per annum of long wool we shall make a market

for the fleeces of 20,000,000 long-wooled sheep. That is to say, each average fleece of long wool weighs a quarter of a pound. It would seem that if the staple is really very long, it must be remarkably thin on the sheep's back.

It appears, too, that the farmers who are to own these 20,000,000 long-wooled yet thinly clad sheep are to sell both wool and mutton a great deal cheaper than they now do, and yet make a profit on the investment which all their close economy and hard work in rearing and shearing, and all the mathematical resources gained at the public schools, fail them now to figure out.

There may be some force in the prediction that an increase in the wool tariff would cheapen mutton. Whatever may have been the cause, mutton was never so cheap in this country, compared with other meats, as in the years following the enactment of the wool tariff of 1867. It was in many of the central wool-growing States a drug in the market. In their mad haste to get rid of the sheep which had just been taken under the Government's protection, the farmers sold what they could to the ranchmen, and then turned to the butchers. Those persons who liked it feasted and surfeited on the "wholesome food." But the trouble is that a great many people cannot eat it. Hence the mutton market is limited and more easily glutted than that of other meats.

Within the limit thus fixed, the long-wooled mutton sheep pay the best now, in the Western States, and the wool-growers are turning their attention that way. "Breed for mutton, and let the wool take care of itself," is the maxim laid down by a practical grower of long-wooled sheep, in the *Iowa Homestead* for April 6, and he adds that "Recent low prices have tended to increase its use, and there is reason to believe that mutton may yet rank alongside of beef." He is apparently unconscious of the fact, stated by Mr. Lawrence, that the long-wooled mutton sheep have less "protection" than the merinos—another illustration of the rule that the more protection sheep have, the worse they thrive and the less they pay.

Since 1824 the American people have tried every possible experiment in the way of clothing themselves with wool and feeding themselves with mutton, except the simple one of letting each man pay for his wool and his clothing and his mutton exactly what they are worth, without bonus, bounty, or subsidy to any other man. All the experiments have been unsatisfactory. Even that of 1867, which the wool-growers and manufacturers united in asking, Mr. Lawrence now tells us was a mistake. If all these experiments, running through half a century, have turned out badly, would it not be philosophical to try the other one, and see what the effect would be of putting the production and consumption of wool and mutton on the same basis as that of hides and beef? The ancient Egyptians considered the ox a more sacred animal than the sheep. We have followed the opposite superstition, and have regarded the sheep as the only domestic animal worthy of veneration. Let us put them on an equality for once, and see what

the effect will be upon the industry and morals of the community.

LONG AND SHORT HAUL IN ENGLAND.

THE contest over the Railway and Canal Traffic Bill in England is, in some respects, not unlike that over the Inter-State Commerce Law in America a year ago. The bill, as framed by the Government, contained a clause substantially like our own short-haul clause in its effects; that is to say, it threw upon the railroad companies the necessity of proving special circumstances and conditions if they wished to maintain their present local discriminations. The representatives of the agricultural interests went further, and wished to make a hard-and-fast prohibition to which there should be no exceptions. They have succeeded in carrying an amendment to that effect in the House of Lords.

The case generally comes up in forms like this. American meat can be shipped either from New York to London by direct steamer, or from New York to Liverpool or Glasgow, and thence by rail to London. But in order to secure any share of this traffic, the railroads have to content themselves with very low rates—no higher, in fact, than the difference between the current steamship rates from American ports to London, and those for which steamships are willing to carry the same article to Liverpool or Glasgow. This leaves the railroad companies a very narrow margin. To secure this foreign business, they are obliged to make rates which would be ruinous if applied to their whole business. The same principles hold good in their trade with France. If French hops can be brought to London by direct steamer, the railroad from Folkestone to London can charge only the difference between the steamship rates from France to London and from France to Folkestone. The consequence has been that French hops were charged very much less from Folkestone to London than English hops had to pay from intermediate points.

These are cases where discrimination would not be prohibited by the American law, as interpreted by the Commission. The lower through rate is justified, and, in one sense at least, rendered necessary, by water competition. But there are several reasons why English shippers would not be ready to accept such an interpretation of the law. In the first place, it would make it almost a dead letter; at any rate, it would limit its application much more than it does with us. Two-fifths of the stations in England are affected by water competition, and it is probable that ninety-nine-one-hundredths of the local preferences are more or less directly due to that cause. A statute which could not reach these cases would fail of the object for which it was designed. Secondly, these preferences in favor of markets which can be reached by water are specially obnoxious to the English shippers, because they seem expressly designed to favor the foreign producer. If the Scotch cattle-raiser has to pay twice as much as his American competitor for precisely the same service, he can make a strong appeal for legislative aid on