

United States appears to us to be fairly justified by the condition of affairs in Cuba. And Americans should remember, what apparently the Spanish people have not remembered, that Congress is to be judged by its official action, not by the fiery addresses of a few individual members, speaking to the gallery. But political action which may be justified may be unwise, and that appears to us to be clearly the case with these resolutions. In passing them Congress has taken counsel of its sympathies rather than of its judgment, and it is at least an open question whether it has not helped Spain more by facilitating her search of American vessels and seizure of contraband articles than it has helped the insurgents by its moral support. The pros and cons we have stated above; the balance is well struck by Professor J. H. Beale, Jr., of Harvard University, as follows, in a well-considered article in the Boston "Transcript": "To sum the matter up, the Cubans would gain something, and Spain a great deal, from a recognition by the United States of Cuban belligerency; and this whole gain would be at the expense of the United States, which would derive no offsetting benefit from its action." The denunciatory tone of the Senate debate instantly aroused fierce excitement among the Spanish press and populace. At Barcelona the mob on Sunday stoned the American consulate and insulted the American flag, and was dispersed only after resistance. In Madrid, while there have been no riotous acts, the popular feeling is strong, and only stringent action by the authorities has prevented public demonstrations. It should be added that the Spanish Government has promptly disavowed any responsibility for the assault on the United States consulate at Barcelona, and, in addition to expressing deep regret over the occurrence, has offered to make complete reparation. The situation is one that requires wise and moderate counsels.

In the Senate last week the split in the Republican ranks, of which there have been so many indications, became clean-cut and definite. Senator Morrill, the Chairman of the Finance Committee, again attempted to secure consideration of the House bill increasing the tariff. Every one knew that its defeat would mean no tariff legislation from the present Congress. Negotiations were known to have been in progress to restore the appearance of Republican unity, and the vote about to be taken was perfectly understood to be a formal and final expression of the outcome. Every element in the Senate was well represented, and the attitude of nearly every absent member was stated by a colleague. The result, therefore, was absolutely conclusive. It was as follows: for the consideration of the Tariff Bill, 22; against its consideration, 33. Every Democrat voted against consideration, and likewise every Populist, including Senators Jones and Stewart, of Nevada. These men were joined by Senators Teller, of Colorado, Dubois, of Idaho, Cannon, of Utah, and Carter and Mantle, of Montana. At the conclusion of the vote Senator Morrill announced that he would not ask the Senate for "any further consumption of time." "It is perfectly obvious," he said, "that the Republican party is in a minority in this Senate." No one dissented from this view of the significance of the vote. The Republican party had been placed in a hopeless minority by the votes of States which had been admitted to the Union in the hope of establishing Republican ascendancy. From the standpoint of party strategy the multiplication of Republican States at the West had turned out as disastrously as the enfranchisement of Republican votes at the South. The West and the South had voted together against the Tariff Bill almost as unanimously as they had voted together in favor of silver. Most

important of all, perhaps, the chance of restoring old party lines by again raising a tariff issue upon which to conduct the National campaign seemed to be practically eliminated and a realignment of parties rendered inevitable.

This does not mean that the Republicans who voted with the Democrats and Populists against the Tariff Bill formally repudiated the principle of protection. They merely expressed a sense of the relative unimportance of the tariff issue. Senator Carter, of Montana, the Chairman of the Republican National Committee, in his speech the day following declared that he was still loyal to the Republican platform of 1892, and denied that the Dingley Tariff Bill was consistent with the protectionist principles there laid down. The Republican platform, he affirmed, had not declared in favor of protection to American manufactures, but protection to all American industries. The proposed Tariff Bill, based upon the Wilson Act, established practical free trade in the products of American agriculture and mining, while increasing the protection to American manufactures. Even in the case of wool, which seemed to form an exception to this rule, Senator Carter maintained that the proposed sixty per cent. of the McKinley duties on raw wool was practically worthless to the wool-growers, as the wool sections of the McKinley Bill had been so carelessly drawn that the wool-growers received less than half the protection anticipated. The representatives of the West, he said, could not accept a bill so unfair to their section in the hope that the manufacturers of the East, in the event of Republican victory, would reopen the tariff question and yield to the Western demands. On this point he quoted from Senator Sherman's recent autobiography the description of how the opposition to "adequate protection" of wool in 1883 arose from the conflict of selfish and local interests, mainly on the part of manufacturers, who regarded all articles which they purchased as raw material, on which they wished the lowest possible rate of duty or none at all, and their work as the finished product, on which they wished the highest rate of duty. In other words, what they had to buy they called raw material, to be admitted without protection, and what they had to sell they wanted protected." Western Republicans, Senator Carter claimed, are loyal to the Minneapolis platform, but the protection they demand is the equal protection of all industries. The charge of disloyalty to the party platform, he urged, was not to be brought against the Republican Senators of the West; it rested exclusively against the Republican Senators of the East, who repudiated its declaration in favor of bimetallism, and supported President Cleveland in establishing monometallism. This speech probably represents the attitude of most of the Republicans who voted against their party on the Tariff Bill. Instead, however, of indicating a basis for party reunion, it reveals the sharp division of opinion upon the question on which the party had seemed to be united. Protection to manufactures and equal protection to all industries are almost as far apart as protection and free trade.

Mr. Loud, of California, Chairman of the House Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads, has reported a bill to cut down the deficits in the Post-Office Department, due to the abuse of the "second-class" mailing privileges accorded to periodicals and newspapers. Such publications are by law carried for one cent a pound, while books and circulars are charged at least eight cents a pound, and most packages of other than printed matter are charged sixteen cents a pound. The average cost of transporting and handling all mail, including letters, is a little over eight cents a

pound. The Post-Office Committee of the House does not propose a radical equalizing of rates, but demands that the exceptionally low rates accorded to periodicals shall not be extended to the books now entered at the post-office as "serials," the advertising matter now entered as "second class," and the sample copies of legitimate "second-class" periodicals. In 1887 the Post-Office Department called attention to the rapid growth of the abuse now aimed at, and each year since has added to the seriousness of the situation. In 1888 the weight of the second-class mail distributed was 143,000,000 pounds; in 1895 it had risen to 265,000,000 pounds. The bill proposed requires that nearly all printed matter other than the regular editions of periodicals sent to paying subscribers shall be charged one cent for two ounces or less. This change will make it more expensive for the publishers of regular periodicals to send out sample copies, but it is to be hoped that no reputable newspaper will on this account oppose it. The bill should have the commendation of those who believe, as *The Outlook* does, in the principle that no special class of citizens should receive pecuniary support through the taxation on their behalf of the rest of the citizens of the country. If the Nation is ever to have one-cent letter postage, the carrying of printed matter at a loss must be cut down.

In the New York Legislature it was found last week that the Raines Bill substituting a tax for a license system in the control of the liquor traffic could not pass the Senate in the form reported. A decisive number of Republican Senators from the cities refused to enter a party caucus upon it and be bound by the decision of the majority. Those having the measure in charge were therefore forced to consent to the most reasonable of the amendments demanded by the city representatives. The provision that one-half of the revenue from the new tax system should go to the State and the other half be retained by the counties in which it was collected was changed to a provision that one-third should go to the State and two-thirds be retained by the counties. Although the injustice of the earlier provision was greatly exaggerated by the city press, the change unquestionably provides for a juster distribution of the revenue. No county can now complain that it is being seriously overtaxed in order to lighten the burden of State taxes upon other counties. With this amendment made, all but three of the Republican Senators consented to support the bill in whatever form the majority of their party colleagues might determine upon. The remaining amendments that had been proposed by the city Senators were, as a rule, voted down by decisive majorities. Among those rejected were the propositions to reduce the tax on grocers and storekeepers to one-half; to allow bars in grocery-stores, as at present; and to make the license fee for clubs only half as great as the fee for saloons. As the measure now stands it is by no means ideal, but it is a distinct advance upon the present system. So long as it does not bar the way to further advance it is to be accepted and made the point from which to continue the march.

In Ohio, despite the Republican majority of nearly four to one in both branches of the Legislature, the bill, so nearly passed last year, providing a comprehensive system of local option has been again defeated. A majority of the representatives elected were understood to be pledged to its support. A majority of the Republicans in Ohio, as the vote a few years ago on the prohibitory amendment showed, are in favor of complete prohibition. Probably not

one Republican in five, and possibly not one in ten, was opposed to this local option measure, which all the temperance elements of both parties supported. Yet the Legislature has deliberately rejected the demands of the great mass of the citizens, and has been governed by the demands of the minority which makes a business of politics. The discontent of the anti-saloon Republicans is naturally widespread, but whether it has any real depth cannot at this time be determined. In Iowa the situation is similar. The House of Representatives—Republican by a majority of just four to one—has defeated the bill providing for the resubmission of the prohibitory amendment to the Constitution. This action violates the compact between the two factions of the Republican party under which the present law was substituted for State-wide prohibition. In South Carolina Governor Evans has availed himself of his constitutional power to appoint the police commission for the city of Charleston. The reason for his action was the dismissal by the local authorities of the Chief of Police who had enforced the dispensary law. A few papers representing the Conservative faction in politics have published inflammatory and almost treasonable articles condemning the Governor's action, but the Governor seems to have the great mass of the citizens back of him in his determination that the one hundred legal dispensaries shall conduct the entire liquor business of the State, and that the sale of liquor to be drunk on the premises shall not again be tolerated. We are glad to observe that President Andrews, of Brown, has followed Dr. Shaw, of this city, in cordially recognizing the work done by the Reform party of South Carolina in the suppression of bar-rooms.

The great labor mass-meeting held at Cooper Union in this city last week to protest against the pending bills appropriating from \$70,000,000 to \$100,000,000 for additional coast defenses was a most hopeful sign of the public awakening to the evils of militarism. The meeting was called by the Central Labor Union, and was addressed by Henry George, Ernest H. Crosby, and several of the best-known of New York's labor leaders. Cooper Union was crowded, and, contrary to the reports of the metropolitan papers clamoring for a "vigorous foreign policy," the vast audience was practically unanimous in support of the policy of peace abroad and reform at home advocated by the speakers. When the resolutions were put, over two thousand men and women rose to their support, while the opposition numbered but seven persons. In part the resolutions ran as follows:

"Resolved, That we protest in the name of the organized workingmen of New York, and call upon all workingmen's associations through the land to protest, against the appropriation at this time of one cent more for the erection of a fort or the building of a war-ship.

"Resolved, That we pledge ourselves, and ask our brethren in other places to pledge themselves, to vote against every member of Congress, no matter what his party or professions, who shall support any of these bills.

"Resolved, That the American Republic is great enough and strong enough to set to the world an example of a nation that fears no foreign foe, and that refuses to join in the monstrous armaments that are bolstering the thrones and crushing down the masses of Europe.

"Resolved, That we call the attention of preachers of all denominations to the fact that the workingman who was crucified eighteen hundred years ago for his denunciations of the unjustly rich was a peace-at-any-price man, and that a truly Christian nation would no more have standing armies and standing navies than it would have soup-houses and tramps."

It is needless to say that we are in the heartiest accord with the spirit of these resolutions. Already the Nation has departed dangerously from the best of our American traditions—hostility to war, and to the armaments that make for war. Already our naval expenditures exceed those of any