puts it under the control of the "correctional tribunals," which are composed of magistrates appointed by the Government, and presumably less easily affected by popular clamor or fear. The imprisonment of condemned Anarchists is to be solitary confinement; though with certain minor offenses banishment and residence under police supervision is allowed. But the part of the bill which has aroused the greatest contention, and which is thought by many French radicals, who are themselves far from being Anarchists, to seriously threaten the foundations of civil liberty, is the prohibition, under heavy penalties, of the publication by newspapers of any part of the proceedings in any case involving Anarchists. It is argued by the supporters of the bill that the opportunity of making rhetorical speeches from the dock, to be published in hundreds of papers and spread broadcast over the world, is in itself a strong inducement to crime for a man of inflamed mind who craves notoriety. No doubt there is force in this argument. Anarchism is a disease, and cannot be treated like the more ordinary forms of crime. It will be interesting to observe whether the French Government is able, in point of fact, to enforce this press law. It will be remembered that a similar law was passed in New York State with regard to reporting the details of the execution of criminals. It will also be remembered that the law proved an instant and absolute failure in this point, and that the popular disfavor attaching to this portion of the law for some time injured the other part of the law providing for execution by means of electricity. We are inclined to think that the French people, the great majority of whom are perfectly sound at heart, will accept the present bill, at least as a temporary method of dealing effectively with a peculiarly horrible form of crime, and one with which it is extremely difficult to cope.

❀

In the Senate debates last week coal and iron were lost sight of, and all the interest centered in sugar. Senator Vilas, of Wisconsin, who ably defended the President against Senator Gorman's charges of inconsistency and discourtesy, did not attempt to secure free iron or free coal, but instead attacked the protection given to the Sugar Trust in the Senate compromise. Senator Caffery, of Louisiana, who defended his own State against the charge of preventing the fulfillment of Democratic pledges, declared that the most ardent friends of the present sugar schedules came from States where no sugar whatever was raised. The additional duty of one-eighth of a cent a pound on refined sugar (over and above the 40 per cent. duty on all sugar) was not, he said, the demand of the sugar-producers. It is, however, this additional or "differential" duty which keeps surprising the Senate by the number and determination of its defenders. A "flat" duty of 40 per cent. would itself furnish some protection to the sugar-refiners, since 40 per cent. upon the present price of raw sugar is one cent a pound, while 40 per cent. upon the present price of refined sugar is nearly two cents a pound, and it by no means requires two pounds of raw sugar to make one of refined. This protection, however, does not satisfy the Sugar Trust, which demands an additional or "differential" duty on refined sugar, amounting to nearly four per cent. This additional protection is really greater than it appears, for the wages bill in the manufacture of sugar is next to nothing. (In 1880 less than $3,000,000 was paid in wages in the manufacture of sugar and molasses, though the value of the product was $155,000,000.) A fortnight ago the Republicans and Populists, aided by Senators Hill and Irby, would have defeated this additional duty had not Senator Quay broken away from party lines and voted for its continuance. Last week it came still nearer defeat, when the Senate was considering Senator Washburn's proposition that the Senate conferees abandon this differential duty. Here the vote was an exact tie, and the proposition would have been carried had Senator Stewart, of Nevada, voted with his party instead of failing to vote. The tie vote was equivalent to a defeat, and the Senate and the public were left wondering how many more friends the Sugar Trust could command in case of need. The conferences with the House have been resumed, but the outcome is still uncertain.

❀

The sugar investigations for the past fortnight demand attention, not for the testimony elicited, but for the testimony not elicited. The newspaper correspondents who made charges but refused to give their authority are not being prosecuted, and Washington brokers are being called upon one after another, and are refusing with apparent impunity to state what Senators have been speculating in sugar through their offices. The brokers are not to be blamed for refusing to give such evidence, but the court which does not punish for contempt the witnesses refusing to testify, itself deserves the contempt shown it by the witnesses. Senator Allen, of Nebraska, did not put the case too strongly when he wrote as follows in his minority report to the Senate:

"The defiance of our authority by the witnesses Edwards, Shriver, Walker, Chapman, McCartney, the Havemeyers, and Searles, and possibly others, demonstrates to me that if the Senate ever expects to arrive at the truth of any matter under investigation by a committee appointed by it, it must promptly take contumacious witnesses in hand, and deal with them without delay, as they would be dealt with in a court of justice under like circumstances. To turn such witnesses over to the Grand Jury of the District of Columbia for indictment and prosecution, and not require them to be brought before the bar of the Senate to purge themselves of contempt, and, failing to do so, punish them for a refusal, is a practical abdication of the authority of the Senate."

❀

The case against President Debs and other officers of the American Railway Union, which came before the Circuit Court at Chicago last week, was first deferred until September and afterwards transferred on appeal to the Court of Appeals. The grounds upon which this appeal was asked were that the bill asking for the injunction was not properly prepared nor properly supported by affidavits, and that the Court could not take cognizance of the things stated in the bill. The attorneys for Mr. Debs and his associates claimed that only one of the telegrams submitted to the Grand Jury had ever been sent out by them. While granting the appeal, Judge Woods made it clear that the defendants were still bound by the injunctions against interference with inter-State commerce or with the mails. Bail was fixed at $5,000, and given. Some fear is expressed that the prosecution will first be deferred and then abandoned, as happened after the riots in '77. Such an outcome would be little short of a catastrophe. The supremacy of the law requires that those who resorted to violence shall be punished, and it also requires the determination by the highest courts of what the law is respecting the rights of railway labor organizations. To keep the law uncertain is both to prolong its violation and to arm with unjust power those best able to bear the expenses of litigation.

❀

Professor Bemis, of Chicago University, has had the courage to demand, in an address in one of the Chicago churches, that the railroads must abandon the boycott if they would call upon the Government to prosecute their

men for employing it. A railroad president who was present in the audience rose and declared that the charge that railroads employed the boycott was false; but Professor Bemis calmly referred him to the refusal of railroad associations to honor the tickets or transport the freight of an offending road. The railroad president then claimed that this was "not a boycott." Professor Bemis did not think it necessary to reply, as it was evident to the audience that this was the very kind of a boycott against which the Inter-State Commerce and Anti-Trust acts were aimed, while no law had been passed aimed at the kind of boycott employed by the men. Professor Bemis, very sensibly, did not indorse the latter boycott, but simply demanded equality before the laws for corporations as well as men. In this demand we most heartily concur.

❀

The National Labor Bureau, under Carroll D. Wright, continues to do excellent work. A special report has just been submitted to the President upon the slums of New York, Chicago, Philadelphia, and Baltimore. The most important results relate to the number of the liquor-saloons, the proportion of the foreign-born, and the extent of illiteracy. In New York City, taken as a whole, there is one saloon for every 200 people; in the slum district investigated, one saloon for every 129 people. In Chicago the figures are almost identical; in Philadelphia and Baltimore the proportions are the same, though in Philadelphia the number of the saloons is but one-fourth as great, owing to the difference in the licensing system. As regards the proportion of the foreign-born, in New York it is 43 per cent. for the city at large, and 63 per cent. for the slum district; in Chicago, almost the same in each case; and in Philadelphia but 26 per cent. for the city at large, and 61 per cent. for the slum district. In Baltimore the proportion of foreign-born is, of course, very much less (as the working people are largely colored), but the disproportion between the slum district and the city at large is the same as elsewhere. As regards illiteracy, the percentage of illiterates for the city at large is 8 in New York, 5 in Chicago, 5 in Philadelphia, and 10 in Baltimore. For the slum districts it is 47 in New York, 25 in Chicago, 37 in Philadelphia, and 20 in Baltimore. The returns for the number of saloons probably exaggerate somewhat the amount of drinking in the slums, inasmuch as the slum districts taken (at least in New York) include a great many stores and factories, and the saloons of every city are thickest in its business quarters. Nevertheless, the existence of one saloon for every twenty-six families indicates how tremendous is the liquor traffic's drain upon the resources of the wretchedly poor. The average saloon in this country yields $500 a year in taxes to the Government, besides what it yields in profits to its owner, in rent to its landlord, and in wages to its bartenders. Yet even this disastrous tax upon the incomes of the very poor probably causes less poverty, not to speak of less suffering, than the loss of earning power to the patrons of the saloons. The entire report calls for thought and action among those who believe that the work of Christ is the elevation of the poor.

❀

The appeals to the members of the Judiciary Committee of the House on behalf of the Senate Anti-Lottery Bill have borne fruit. On Friday the bill was favorably reported by Mr. Case Broderick, of Kansas, and referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union. What is now needed for the bill is a few such friends in the House as Senator Hoar proved himself in the Senate. The Tariff Bill had the right of way in the Senate when his watchful support secured action upon it, and the same kind of support may yet secure final action in the House, despite the absorbing interest in the tariff schedules. That the bill should be reported by Mr. Broderick, of Kansas—the State in which the anti-lottery sentiment is the strongest—seems a favorable indication, and we trust that the letters from constituents to other Congressmen may make easy the work of bringing the measure to a vote.

❀

The Republican State Conventions held in Illinois, Iowa, and Wisconsin last week distinctly receded from the advanced position in favor of silver taken by the Vermont, Pennsylvania, Ohio, Kansas, and California Conventions a month ago. The Illinois Convention simply declared itsel in favor of "bimetallism," with all dollars interchangeable. The Iowa Convention favored "the largest possible use of silver as money that is consistent with the present maintenance of equal values of all dollars in circulation," while the Wisconsin Convention indorsed the use of silver as currency "to the extent only that it can be circulated on a parity with gold." It is true that the Iowa declaration is not inconsistent with a belief in free coinage, for every free-coinage advocate claims that silver dollars would continue to be worth as much as gold dollars if the free-coinage act gave them the same interest-bearing and debt-paying powers. Nevertheless, the Iowa platform, as well as those of Illinois and Wisconsin, is one upon which the most extreme opponent of silver might consistently stand. The same might be said of the platform adopted by the Minnesota Republicans a fortnight before. That document expressed the belief that "the restoration of silver as ultimate money to the currency of the country is absolutely necessary for the business prosperity," but merely recommended "the use" of both metals, "maintaining the substantial parity of value of every dollar in circulation with that of every other dollar." Surely no one in any party could object to this programme.

❀

Turning to other issues, it is notable that no one of these Republican Conventions condemned the income tax. The Minnesota and Wisconsin Conventions showed a good deal of concern about the labor question, but the resolutions adopted were alike flattering to laborers and capitalists, and will count for nothing. And no one of them—not even the Iowa Convention—so much as mentioned the temperance question. With the exception of a few subordinate points, any Eastern Democratic Convention might have adopted any one of these Republican platforms if the tariff planks were omitted. It seems, therefore, that the tariff issue will again be the only one presented to the people by the two great parties. If so, the apathy which distinguished the campaign of '92 bids fair to be exceeded this year. Indeed, the campaign thus far develops no excitement outside of the States where the third party is an important factor. It is exciting in Alabama, where the "Jeffersonian Democrats" have united with the Populists; in South Carolina, where the "Reformers" are Populists under another name; in Virginia, where the Populists and Prohibitionists propose to join forces. It is also somewhat exciting in Minnesota and Nebraska and several States in the far West where the fusion of Democrats and Populists is possible, if not probable. But east of the Mississippi River and north of the Ohio there is thus far no excitement manifested anywhere. In this great district Republican gains are everywhere expected, but it is doubtful if they will be great