the Government by public opinion to secure an adjustment of difficulties with this country at as early a date as possible, in order to remove even the possibility of serious disturbance. The Venezuelan Commission has begun its work, and it is now announced from England that all the papers relating to the English case will be published at an early date, in order that all the questions at issue may be laid before the public in both countries, and that the Commission here may be put in possession of all the facts from the English side. This is a very important concession, and ought to be fairly and generously met by our Government. The "Daily News" declares that Lord Salisbury has refused to arbitrate the boundary dispute on the terms proposed by Venezuela, and has declined to recognize the request of our own Government to trace a boundary, but that if the American Commission will define what in their opinion the terms should be, and if a European Power will act as arbitrator, England would be willing to submit her case to the decision of such an arbitrator. The possibility of direct settlement between Venezuela and Great Britain is also reported. These are all methods of escape from the dilemma in which the two countries now find themselves, and they are indicative of a sincere desire to end a situation which is intolerable to two peoples so intimately allied with each other. Concerning the proposal of a permanent court for the adjudication of all issues between the two countries we have spoken in another column.

❀

The resignations of seven Canadian Ministers from Sir Mackenzie Bowell's Cabinet forms a peculiar crisis, never paralleled in British history. Despite the reasons given by the ex-Finance Minister, Mr. Foster, for the resignations of himself and colleagues, it is suspected by some that these decisions were part of a conspiracy to depose the Premier and to put Sir Charles Tupper in his place. As Sir Charles is a friend of the present Imperial Secretary of State for the Colonies, Mr. Chamberlain, it is thought that the latter's influence may not have been lacking. The reason for this influence is reported to be that, if further trouble should arise between the United States and England, Canadian affairs may be directed by a man whose views more nearly approach the Secretary's. On the other hand, it is also reported that the refusal of the Governor-General, the Earl of Aberdeen, to accept the proposed resignation of the Premier himself was the outcome of communication with the Colonial Office. At all events, Sir Mackenzie Bowell declared later that, rather than resign, he had decided to proceed with the reorganization of the Conservative party and carry out the policy laid down in the Speech from the Throne. In that Speech remedial legislation for the Roman Catholics of Manitoba was a prominent feature, and, as might have been expected, all of the Catholic members of the Bowell Cabinet remained true to their leader. It is now announced that he has succeeded in forming a new Cabinet.

❀

It is difficult to sum up in a paragraph the career of a man of such genius and such moral unsoundness as Paul Verlaine, who died in Paris last week at the age of fifty-one, after a life touched by genius and marred by terrible dissipation. In some respects Verlaine recalls Villon, whose unquestioned genius was allied to every form of moral profligacy and unworthiness; who was at once a great poet and a thief; and of whose strangely confused character Mr. Stevenson has given us such a striking study. Verlaine had a vein of the purest poetry in him, and has written some things of exquisite delicacy and purity, not to say of religious feeling. At other times he wrote verses fit only for a saturnalia. His life was in many respects a long-continued saturnalia, with the interruptions of the hospital, the kind of repentance which confines itself mainly to feeling, and which bore fruit in his case in beautiful expressions of regret and devotion. In feeling Verlaine was a devout Roman Catholic; in life he was a hopeless profligate. Notwithstanding the irregularity of his habits and the disease which fastened upon him as the result of his dissipation, his work in prose and verse fills more than twenty volumes. The king of the decadent writers, he played havoc with those laws which French Academicians hold so sacred, and yet secured metrical effects which were beyond the power of almost any other man of his generation. Readers of The Outlook have not forgotten his visit to England and the attention which was shown him there, nor have they forgotten that Nordau brought him forward as one of the most striking examples of the modern degenerate. His life and his art were in hopeless dissonance, and in his case, despite the beautiful things which he did at times, one finds an impressive illustration of the fact that a great productive life must be harmonious; that morals and the highest art are bound together indissolubly, and that no man can violate the laws of sound living without limiting his power, wasting his strength, and impairing the gift of genius. The significance of his work lies in the reaction against academic precision and formality which it illustrated.

❀

The two most interesting speeches made in Congress last week related to the rules of the Senate and the House respectively. The speech in the Senate was delivered by Mr. White, of California, in support of an extremely moderate rule for clôture submitted by Mr. Hill, of New York. This rule provided that when any bill has been debated in the Senate on different days, aggregating thirty, it shall be in order, without debate, to fix a time for the taking of a vote. Mr. White, in supporting this change in the rules, pointed out that, as the number of Senators had increased, the rule allowing unlimited debate had placed the majority more and more hopelessly at the mercy of the minority. In so large a body as the present an insignificant fraction had the physical power to prolong discussion indefinitely. Furthermore, precedents had continued to accumulate, making factions and even individuals ready to resort to obstructive tactics. He cited a case in the last Congress in which one member got his way by threatening to read a pile of manuscript a foot and a half high and containing at least a thousand pages. "Under our programme," said Senator White, "a single voice neutralizes, nay vanquishes, eighty-seven. Sir Boyle Roche would have said that 'one Senator outnumbers eighty-seven.'" It was a common experience, he continued, for the leader of the majority to be told that if such and such concessions were made the majority would be "allowed to proceed." The rule allowing unlimited deliberation did not even secure intelligent deliberation. The speeches made for purposes of obstruction were so dull as to empty the benches. Many of these speeches were not listened to by a single member except the Senator from Kansas (Mr. Peffer), who considers it his arduous duty to listen to everything. Just as little could the present rules be defended because unlimited debate was essential to the "dignity" of the Senate. "We cannot overcome a single and determined opposing Senator until, his physical powers having weakened, we march to roll-call over his prostrate and panting form. Such procedure is not dignified. . . . While not novel here, it excites universal surprise everywhere else. . . . Every effective assemblage

in the civilized world is controlled by rules which make the transaction of business by the majority always obtainable in a reasonable time. . . . If we are here for work, let work be done. If it be better for the country that no legislation should be had—and I have heard a distinguished man defend our rules upon this ground—then let us meet only to adjourn. . . . I am afraid of majorities, says one. Very true, but I am afraid of minorities. If we cannot trust the majority, *a fortiori* minorities cannot be trusted. The basis of our government is the recognition of the majority. . . . When the majority representing the people cannot prevail within a reasonable time, the condition is menacing." There is no likelihood that this argument will ever be answered, but, unfortunately, there is almost as little probability that it will soon be heeded.

❀

The speech in the House criticising the House rules was less conclusive, but nevertheless contained a most important truth. Mr. Hepburn, of Iowa, proposed to change the rules so as to require the Speaker to recognize whatever member first obtains the floor. At present the Speaker may not only select from those claiming recognition, but may even ask a member for what purpose he rises, and refuse him a hearing at discretion. Mr. Hepburn said:

"If there is any one proposition of the Constitution that is well established, it is the absolute equality of constituencies and of the representatives of constituencies on this floor. This rule of ours puts into the hands of the Speaker the power arbitrarily to silence a constituency during the existence of an entire Congress. This is a deliberative body. Business here is to be done by the people's representatives, and not by the Speaker. I heard it suggested once as coming from the Speaker that there would be no debate upon a certain question, because this was 'not a debating school.' Ah, Mr. Speaker, there is getting abroad too much of the idea of the schoolmaster in the Speaker's chair. I believe it is time to call a halt on that, and to relieve the Speaker of this grave responsibility—to make this House again a deliberative body. Mr. Speaker, this is not an innovation. The innovation is on the other side. Up to the Forty-sixth Congress the Speaker of the House of Representatives was required to recognize the member upon whom his eye first rested. Then the rule was changed and the language of the present rule adopted, giving the Speaker the power to refuse recognition on this floor and to defeat the equality of members."

General Henderson, of Iowa, defended the present rules, and urged that the House might again and again be kept from transacting the business it desired to transact if the Speaker's power were abridged in the manner proposed. It is probable that a complex code of rules would have to be established in case the Speaker's discretionary powers were restricted, for the size of the House of Representatives makes perfect freedom of debate impossible. Nevertheless, there is no doubt that the powers now lodged in the Speaker of the House of Representatives are despotic to a degree without parallel in the English-speaking world. The difficulty with the Senate rules is that, without unanimous consent, debate cannot be cut off; the difficulty with the House rules is that, without the consent of the Speaker, debate cannot be carried on. The power lodged with one man in the House is far less serious than the power lodged with one man in the Senate, for the one man in the House is responsible to the majority. Nevertheless, there is almost as much need of rules in the House to insure freedom to deliberate as there is need of rules in the Senate to insure freedom to act.

❀

Mayor Pingree, of Detroit, has won another remarkable victory. The new company chartered under his administration to lay tracks on streets unoccupied by the old company, and carry passengers at the charge of eight tickets for a quarter, has been abundantly successful, and one of its members, Mr. H. A. Everett, formerly President of the Cleveland Street Railway Company, is quoted by the Cleveland "Leader" as favoring the introduction of three-cent fares in that city, where he is still heavily interested. A larger revenue per mile, Mr. Everett urges, can be obtained from three-cent fares than from five-cent fares. Naturally, the people from Detroit have become convinced that three-cent fares are as practicable in that city as in Toronto, Canada. When, therefore, the old company applied for a fifteen-year extension of its charter (which will expire in a little less than fifteen years), and offered to sell seven tickets for a quarter, the Mayor insisted that three-cent fares should be granted, and that the future rights of the public should be carefully protected. The general public in Detroit warmly supported him in this position. The Board of Trade and Chamber of Commerce did, indeed, call upon him to accept the offer of seven tickets for a quarter, but the Mayor replied by referring them to the overwhelming majority for three-cent fares at the late election, pointing out that the difference between seven tickets for twenty-five cents and eight tickets for twenty-five cents would (with present traffic) amount to over $6,000,000 in the thirty years. Finally the old company issued an order authorizing the sale of eight tickets for a quarter, and thereupon secured the passage of a vaguely worded ordinance extending its charter and exempting its personal property from municipal taxation. At the next meeting of the City Council—Tuesday of last week—the Mayor submitted his veto of this action. The Council Hall was packed with citizens, and the excitement was intense. The Mayor based his veto of the ordinance upon the indefinite grants contained in certain of its clauses, as well as upon the definite grant of exemption from taxation. The ordinance, he urged, should have specified that the company abandon its fights in the courts for an exclusive right to all the streets in Detroit, and that it stipulate the continuance of free transfers and no charge to children under six years of age. The details of the message are not of National interest, but the following clause deserves to be quoted verbatim:

"One of my greatest objections to this ordinance is that it contains no provision for the future municipal ownership of the tracks of the company. Upon this question the sentiment of our people is almost unanimous."

The veto was sustained by a vote of 13 to 18.

❀

In New York a temperance bill modeled after the present law in Ohio has been reported by Chairman Raines, of the Senate Committee on Excise. The characteristic feature of the Ohio law is that it regulates the number of saloons by taxation instead of by the discretionary powers of Boards of Excise. In Ohio, if a majority of the people in the township do not vote to shut out the saloons altogether, the business is open to any citizen who pays the tax required by the State law. No Board of Excise has power over the fortunes of any saloon-keeper, and consequently no saloon-keeper is forced to enter politics in order to secure the election or appointment of a Board of Excise favorable to his interests. This does not mean that the liquor interests are not extremely active in Ohio politics; in fact, the strong pressure of public opinion in favor of a more comprehensive local option law makes them just now extremely active; and at all times they are anxious for a local administration that will wink at their violations of existing law. But in so far as the liquor-dealers conform with the present law, and do not fear local prohibition, their pernicious activity in politics is to a great extent eliminated by their independence of the fear or favor of