

the propriety of the conduct of the Spanish Minister, Señor de Lome, in answering through the newspapers the statements made by Senators derogatory to Spain, and in criticising the expressions used. It is probable that Señor de Lome did, in fact, overstep the line of diplomatic usage, and the offense he gave was only strengthened by the fact that most of his points were well taken. This discussion naturally led to the inquiry whether the Senate had in truth before it accurate information which justified it in adopting the assertions in the resolutions. Senator Sherman asserted that the Committee on Foreign Relations in framing the resolutions acted on confidential information from the State Department. Senator Wolcott demurred to being asked to vote on questions of fact on "testimony reposing in the breasts of the members of the Committee on Foreign Relations"—testimony which they could not divulge to the public and only to the Senate in executive session, and which the House, as it had no executive session, could not learn at all. After all, it was disclosed that the only communication to the Committee from the State Department had been a letter from Señor de Lome giving the Spanish side of the question. By this time the impression was growing stronger over the country that Congress would better obtain a full knowledge of the facts before passing on them. Senator Hoar exposed with great ability the folly of hasty action. The most elaborate speech of the week was by Senator Hill. He advocated the recognition of belligerency, but opposed the third resolution (that the United States "should be prepared to protect the legitimate interests of our citizens by intervention, if necessary") as being based on a low and purely commercial ground. Mr. Hill held that when the time for intervention came it should be for humanity's sake, and on the boldly stated sympathy of this Republic for a people striving to be free. The news of the week from Cuba shows that the insurgents are still holding their own. Another attempt to surround Maceo has utterly failed, and he is believed to be again in the province of Havana. The kind of warfare going on is shown by such dispatches as this: "Nine important towns have been laid in ruins, tobacco-houses have been burned, and a large portion of the tobacco districts is a waste." Skirmishes between the Spanish troops and the insurgents are frequent, but no general engagements of consequence are reported. The financial and commercial conditions of Cuba are pitiable, while Spain is accumulating a war debt which threatens to seriously embarrass her finances.

More than one-half of the delegates thus far elected to the Republican National Convention have either been instructed to support ex-Governor McKinley or are known to favor him. According to present appearances, his nomination upon the first ballot can be prevented only by the presentation of "favorite sons" by the delegations of several States in which most of the voters are known to favor Mr. McKinley. Thus the Pennsylvania delegation is expected to present the name of Senator Quay, the Illinois delegation that of Senator Cullom, the Minnesota delegation that of Senator Davis, the Nebraska delegation that of ex-Senator Manderson. No one of these candidacies is taken very seriously, though we regret to see it stated by responsible papers in Pennsylvania that not a single Philadelphia paper, Republican or Democrat, would oppose Senator Quay if nominated. Senator Cullom's candidacy in Illinois is merely with the consent of Mr. McKinley's supporters. The popular enthusiasm is all for the Ohio candidate. In Minnesota the support of Senator Davis is even more perfunctory. The situation in Nebraska is

best stated in ex-Senator Manderson's own words: "In my own State he [Major McKinley] can and is welcome to name his own personal friends as delegates. All that I ask is that the delegates from Nebraska have an opportunity to present my name, if by so doing they do not jeopardize Major McKinley's interests." If the Presidential candidate were to be nominated by a direct primary, there is no doubt that Mr. McKinley's vote would exceed all others combined. General Clarkson's widely quoted declaration that the strength of the "McKinley boom" has been systematically exaggerated by the press dispatches in no way holds good. There is, however, one declaration of General Clarkson's that does hold good, and that is that nominations are not made at National Conventions from popular enthusiasm. At the National Convention, he says, the votes of the doubtful States will be considered, and (he might have added) the advice of party managers will be listened to. The chief danger to Mr. McKinley's prospects is that the leading party managers, Platt, Quay, and Clarkson, are believed to be against him. Through the presentation of "favorite sons" at the North, and the election of uninstructed delegates from the South, it is still probable that the first ballot will not be decisive.

There is, however, another danger to Mr. McKinley's prospects. Upon the currency question he occupies an intermediate position, and the temper of the country both in the extreme East and the extreme West is increasingly opposed to such a position. These two sections have thus far chosen but few delegates to St. Louis. If the Western delegations shall indorse Mr. McKinley, the chances are that the Eastern delegations will strenuously oppose him. The financial plank adopted by the Ohio Convention last week, though more conservative than the West is likely to tolerate, is received with marked dissatisfaction in the East. It reads as follows:

"We contend for honest money; for a currency of gold, silver, and paper with which to measure our exchange, that shall be as sound as the Government and as untarnished as its honor; and to that end we favor bimetallism, and demand the use of both silver and gold as standard money, either in accordance with a ratio to be fixed by an international agreement—if that can be obtained—or under such restrictions and such provisions, to be determined by legislation, as will secure the maintenance of the parity of values of the two metals, so that the purchasing and debt-paying power of the dollar, whether of silver, gold, or paper, shall be at all times equal."

The New York "Tribune" urges with much force that this means the maintenance of the present standard; and possibly it would be satisfactory to those who oppose the further coinage of silver were Mr. McKinley's personal views equally satisfactory. But Mr. McKinley has shown in his public speeches that he knows what the word "bimetallism" means, and, while he has opposed the free coinage of silver at the old ratio, he has explicitly demanded the restoration of silver to the currency, in order to prevent the fall of prices occasioned by a monometallist policy. Those who deny most strenuously Mr. McKinley's political wisdom have never questioned his sincerity. It is probable that either Speaker Reed or Senator Allison would prove more acceptable to the extreme monometallist faction of the party, though both of these men have been severely criticised for their disposition to "trim" on the financial question. Senator Allison's candidacy, like Mr. McKinley's, was formally indorsed by the Republican Convention of his State last week. The Ohio platform upon the financial question has been denounced as a "straddle;" if so, that adopted in Iowa can only be characterized as a tight-rope performance. It reads as follows:

"If the financial question is to be the issue, then Allison is the man first commended to the Nation by reason of his reputation for financial

resourcefulness and constructiveness and soundness, a fact conspicuously recognized by the pressure of Presidents Garfield and Harrison upon him to take the portfolio of the Treasury in their respective Administrations. He has been favorable to a true bimetallism. He has at all times labored to maintain an abundant currency of gold, silver, and paper, made interconvertible and equal to the best currency of the commercial world."

A reputation for "financial resourcefulness and constructiveness" is certainly the crowning recommendation of a candidate, provided the people wish to abdicate their own functions and leave the issues of the National life and honor to be determined for them by the President.



When the Kentucky Legislature met, it consisted of 68 Republicans, 68 Democrats, and 2 Populists. One of the Populists had been elected by a Republican-Populist coalition, and the other by a Democratic-Populist coalition, and each was in a degree bound to support the Senatorial candidate of the old party which had helped to elect him. All that kept the division from being exactly even was the desire of both Populists that Senator Blackburn should be re-elected because of his consistent advocacy of the free coinage of silver. Had the Democrats been able to unite upon Senator Blackburn, he might easily have been elected. But a dozen or more anti-silver Democrats, under the leadership of Senator Weissinger, of Louisville, refused to enter the party caucus when they found that Senator Blackburn was certain to be renominated. Therefore the balloting has gone on fruitlessly day after day, until now the session is about to close by constitutional limitation. The contest, except as it is within the Democratic party, has not been between sharply defined silver and anti-silver forces. Though the Republican State platform was explicit in favor of maintaining the gold standard, it is asserted that both of the successive Republican candidates for United States Senator have been very doubtful in their opposition to free coinage. Several of the Republican legislators are outspokenly for free coinage, and declare that they will support Senator Blackburn if party lines break down in an attempt to elect Secretary Carlisle. Altogether things were in a bad tangle even before the beginning of last week. Then they became further complicated through the death of Senator Weissinger, who was the backbone of the Democratic opposition to Senator Blackburn, and had with difficulty been able to prevent his election. When he died the Republicans in the House of Representatives decided a contested election case against a Democratic member, in spite of the fact that the Republican claimant had withdrawn from the contest. Then, the Democratic Senate, in retaliation, expelled two Republican members, on the ground that they had held other offices at the time of their election and so were ineligible. When the time came for the joint session to ballot for United States Senator, Democrats objected to the presence of the expelled Republicans. Resort to violence, say the dispatches, was prevented only by the decision of the Lieutenant-Governor that the clerk of each House should call the roll of its members. The Republicans and the Republican-Populist refrained from voting, and thus a quorum was broken. The day following the Sheriff and the Mayor were present to preserve order, but further confusion prevailed until the Lieutenant-Governor ruled that the death and the expulsions would not lessen the number of votes necessary to elect a Senator. After this ruling the presence of the expelled Republicans was assented to by the Democrats. On Monday of this week Governor Bradley called out several companies of militia and placed the Capitol under military guard. No one was permitted by the soldiers to enter the Capitol without a permit from the Adjutant-General. This action

of the Governor has been bitterly denounced by Democrats all over the State. At this distance we cannot judge of the provocation for the extreme course pursued by the Governor. But, whether necessary or not, the fact that the militia should have been called out to keep the peace in the Legislature is certainly a signal disgrace to the Commonwealth.



On Sunday of last week a largely attended mass-meeting was held in Central Music Hall, Chicago, under the auspices of Hull House, to consider the failure of the Illinois factory law to suppress the evils of the sweat-shop. Mrs. Florence Kelley, a member of Hull House who has held the post of Factory Inspector, gave a discouraging picture of the present situation. The law, she said, had even failed to prevent the further growth of the sweating system. There were, she said, three hundred more sweaters than ever before. The failure of the law, she continued, was due to the action of the Illinois Supreme Court in declaring it unconstitutional to interfere with the "liberty" of women and children to work in shops more than eight hours a day. Instead, however, of urging the revision of the State Constitution, or of the State Supreme Court, or the passage of a moderate law, which the Court could not overthrow in the name of liberty without making it clear that it acted in the interest of slavery, Mrs. Kelley declared that the "only hope" lay in an "appeal to the National Congress." The measure whose passage she urged was the bill introduced by Representative Sulzer, of this city, placing a tax of \$300 upon every clothing contractor or sweater, and requiring him to pay an additional \$300 for every person to whom he sublet any part of his contract. This solution of the sweat-shop problem was generally indorsed by the other speakers. Assistant Factory Inspector Franey, of New York, urged that National legislation must be supplemented by State legislation, and both be supplemented by the insistence of buyers that goods shall bear the union label guaranteeing that they were made under decent conditions; but he also strongly urged the Sulzer Bill. Judge Tuley urged the organization of the working classes so that courts would not dare to break down laws in the interest of labor in ways so remarkable; but even he did not criticise the Sulzer Bill. The only criticism of it, we would judge from the long report in the Chicago "Times-Herald," came from Rabbi Levi, who expressed the fear that a tax on the manufacturer for each sub-contractor employed would merely decrease the number of contractors without materially lessening the amount of work done under sweat-shop conditions. The meeting ended with the adoption of a resolution calling upon the Congressmen from Illinois to further the passage of the Sulzer Bill. From one point of view the meeting was a most encouraging one. The great audience comprised many of the most influential citizens of Chicago, and the spirit shown promises the eventual banishment of the inhuman hours and unclean conditions of the modern sweat-shop. Nevertheless, the outcome of the meeting was disappointing. A law which leaves sweat-shop workers where they are, and merely reduces the number of contractors competing for their labor, is more likely to lessen wages than to lessen hours. An evil like the sweating system is to be put down only by widespread and persistent local efforts, such as Hull House has stood for. National legislation is to be looked upon as a final supplement to such efforts rather than a present substitute for them.



The earnings of college-bred women, and the comparative payment of women and men for the same work, is the subject of an interesting portion of the last volume of the Massachusetts Labor Report. The Association of Collegiate