

ballots printed for different parties has proved an immense saving of labor to the voter and a considerable saving of expense to the State. As compared with the old system, under which each party was compelled to have a ticket-distributer at each polling-place, the saving of expense has been enormous. This saving of expense has also been a lessening of corruption, for the securing of funds to man the polling-places and the hiring of the men were both sources of evil. Great as has been the gain, however, it seems that the public is not yet content. In the election last week at least two good-sized cities made use of voting-machines. In Worcester, Mass., the machine tried was that which bears the unfortunate name *McTammany*. Its average speed was two or three votes to a minute, and the machine worked well throughout the day. In counting the returns, however, it was slow. The polls were closed at four o'clock, and the first results were not announced until eight. This, however, was an hour better than the record made by the clerks at the preceding Presidential election. In Rochester, N. Y., the Meyers machine was used. In one precinct it was found that after the machine had been worked by forty-six voters only six ballots had been recorded. In counting returns, however, the Meyers machine was a great success. Within twenty minutes after the closing of the polls the results for Presidential and Gubernatorial candidates were known. When these machines shall have been so improved that the voter can see his vote as it is cast, there is no doubt that they will be employed throughout the Union.

One of the most interesting features of the election campaign just closed is the part which women have taken in it; it shows a capacity for campaign work of peculiar character and value. In New York and in Brooklyn small groups of women, never more than four, have visited the homes in the tenement-house districts, to talk with the wives and daughters of workingmen. They have explained to these women the issues of the campaign as they saw them, distributing literature on their side of the subject. This work has been done from the conviction that if the women in the homes were once aroused, the interest of the voters in these homes would also be aroused, their attention called to the real issues of the campaign, and they would be forced to think for themselves, read for themselves, and vote independently of the political boss, the last enemy of democracy. There is not a shadow of doubt that the concerted effort of these women of intelligence has done an immense amount of good. It has revealed to them the poor man's home, and the limits which our civilization places upon that home—a knowledge very necessary to the student of political science. It has carried to the poor woman a living representation of that which to her before has been an indefinite civilization. She has known always that there was a world where women lived who kept servants, who never had to worry about rent or food or clothes, who had plenty to eat at all times, and who never heard children cry from hunger. These women were from that world. They came, not as enemies, nor as critics, nor as charity visitors. Their very presence proved that there was a common cause, a common country, a common danger. A bridge has been built by these political workers over a chasm that will never be bridgeless again. Whether definite political results were effected may never be known, but it is certain that the cause of humanity has been served, and that is the cause that works for righteousness always.

Lord Salisbury's speech at the Mansion House banquet Monday night possesses for American readers a triple

significance. Our Ambassador, Mr. Bayard, in responding to the toast of Foreign Representatives, had referred to our Presidential election in a single significant phrase, recognizing a vital and fundamental fact which it has appeared to us the advocates of free coinage forgot, "the continuity of national obligations." It is this continuity of national life which prohibits a party in one election from disregarding the action of the nation as represented even by party action in previous elections. In response to this Lord Salisbury claimed permission "to congratulate him upon the splendid pronouncement the great people he represents have made in behalf of the principles which lie at the base of all human society." It is not impossible that the mere fact that the election is approved by the representative of the Tory party in England may in certain quarters constitute an additional reason for disapproval in America, but we trust that most Americans will rejoice in every indication of closer and more friendly relations between these two Anglo-Saxon peoples. We do not know that the election has had any influence in promoting the settlement of the Venezuelan question, but the official declaration made by Lord Salisbury at this banquet that the Venezuelan question is substantially settled is abundant cause for rejoicing on both sides the ocean. Lord Salisbury says:

"Our difficulty for months has been to define the settled districts, and the solution has, I think, come from the Government of the United States, that we should treat our colonial empire as we treat individuals; that the same lapse of time which protects the latter in civic life from having their title questioned should similarly protect an English colony, but beyond that, when a lapse could not be claimed, there should be an examination of title, and all the equity demanded in regard thereto should be granted."

This statement is highly diplomatic, and therefore somewhat difficult to comprehend; but we judge that it is correctly interpreted by the New York "Sun," which says:

"The British law provides, among other things, that a title to land which has been unassailed for twenty-one years cannot be invalidated. Venezuela, in other words, will be debarred from confiscating property in any territory she may acquire under arbitration."

Of much greater interest in its bearing on the world's history is the statement of Lord Salisbury respecting the Armenian problem. Cautious as he is to the point of ambiguity, his speech is far more hopeful than that which he made a year ago upon the same question. He does indeed vigorously repudiate the suggestion of Mr. John Morley and others that Great Britain abandon its policy in the East and withdraw from the occupation of Egypt. Great Britain will not, he says, relinquish an acre of ground now occupied by the British; and this statement was, as might have been expected, received with cheers. He also declares that England could not intervene alone in Turkey without raising an army by conscription, which is tantamount to a very positive affirmation that it will not so interfere; but the promises of reforms of the Sultan he treats with scarcely more respect than was shown to them by Mr. Gladstone in his Liverpool speech. He repudiates the idea that there is necessarily any permanent antagonism between Great Britain and Russia; and this statement from a Tory source is quite as significant as were the cheers with which it was greeted. He declares that there is no feeling in Russia to prevent concert of action between the two Powers, and he implies, if he does not explicitly declare, that the prospect of action by all the European Powers acting in concert to turn aside Turkey from the abyss toward which she is drifting is better to-day than it has been at any time since the Armenian massacres began. He who remembers that a Prime Minister's speech must always be excessively cautious will

see some ground for hope of a satisfactory solution of the Eastern problem in these very diplomatically worded utterances of Lord Salisbury.

The progressive inheritance tax, established by the Liberal Ministry in England in 1894, has yielded an even larger revenue than Sir William Harcourt estimated. The Revenue Commissioners have just published an analysis of the returns for the last fiscal year. These show a total revenue of nearly \$50,000,000, as against less than \$30,000,000 from similar sources under the old law. The only disappointing feature of the new act is the relatively small return from real estate. Under the old law framed by the landed aristocracy real estate was practically exempt. When Sir William Harcourt's act of 1894 put an end to this unjust discrimination, the Conservative landlords pleaded for a concession in the form of a grant from the National Treasury to lessen the local taxes resting upon their property. They have obtained a grant of \$10,000,000 a year, and this turns out to be more than all the taxes paid by real estate, city and country, under Sir William Harcourt's act. Only one-fifth of the property in the estates admitted to probate last year was realty; four-fifths was personalty. This disproportionate amount of personalty was probably due to the vast aggregate of foreign bonds and stocks held in Great Britain. Despite this one disappointment to the friends of the new act, it is perhaps the most successful progressive tax ever levied. The Commissioner's returns show the amount of property subject to the different rates of duty, which vary from less than one per cent. on estates less than £100 to eight per cent. on estates exceeding £1,000,000. From this table the tax paid by each class is easily reckoned. In a condensed form the results are as follows:

Size of Estates.	Number of Estates.	Total Value.	Total Tax.
Under £1,000.....	34,795	£14,400,000	£196,000
£1,000 to £10,000.....	14,460	51,800,000	1,554,000
£10,000 to £50,000.....	2,995	65,800,000	2,745,000
£50,000 and over.....	612	82,200,000	5,330,000
	52,862	£212,500,000	£9,825,000

In other words, the estates of less than £1,000 (or \$5,000) contained seven per cent. of the property, yet paid but two per cent. of the tax; while the estates above £50,000 (or \$250,000) contained forty per cent. of the property and paid fifty-four per cent. of the taxes. The new measure has the approval of Mr. Balfour and most of the leading Conservatives, as well as that of the entire body of Liberals. Inasmuch as the class of families having less than \$5,000 constitute ninety-two per cent. of the people and pay the bulk of the indirect taxes, the conscience of the nation approves of the heavier burdens placed on the large property-owners by the Harcourt act.

The third annual report of the Factory Inspectors of Illinois contains no perfunctory work. Mrs. Florence Kelley, the head of the department, has put into it her heart and conscience, giving the report a vital quality as valuable as it is rare. In one respect the report this year is more encouraging than its predecessors. The percentage of children employed in factories has fallen from 8.5 in 1893 to 4.5 in 1895. This gain is in part due to the fact that the rapidly falling prices of 1893 caused the wholesale discharge of expensive hands, and the substitution of children to do part of their work. In 1895 industry had partially accommodated itself to the new level of prices and wages, and the adult hands laid off were re-employed. In part, however, the smaller percentage of child labor last year was due to the efficient work

of the factory inspectors, who successfully prosecuted several hundred cases in which children were employed contrary to law. One glass company, which was the largest employer of child labor in the State, and which maintained that it could not carry on its business in conformity with the provisions of the law of 1893, is now achieving what it declared impossible. Unfortunately, however, in one trade where child labor is employed under peculiarly hurtful surroundings its employment has increased. This is the tenement-house garment trade. In this trade successful prosecutions have been numerous, but the number and irresponsibility of the employers, together with the difficulty of securing reliable evidence against them, makes the enforcement of the law peculiarly difficult. The Inspectors report that the compulsory education law is shamelessly unenforced. Nearly all the children under sixteen employed in the sweat-shops were illiterate. A majority of them cannot speak English, and among these are some children born in this country. The Inspector criticises keenly the decision of the Supreme Court of Illinois overthrowing the eight-hour law for women and children. This decision, she says, was not based upon any peculiarity of the Constitution of Illinois, but took the broad ground that the Fourteenth Amendment to the Constitution of the United States, framed to prevent the oppression of the negro, precluded any State law restricting the hours of labor of adults. If this decision is sustained, she points out, the United States must fall behind European countries in the humanity of its factory legislation. The arguments upon which the Illinois Court based its decision were, she says, "advanced and rejected in the English Parliament in the fifties."

The magnificent harbor and water-front of New York always excite the pride of the citizen who possesses civic pride. To the same citizen, if he possesses any love of humanity, the magnificent water-front is a reproach. Why should the people's property be surrendered wholly to commerce? Why should the people be almost wholly shut off from enjoying the rights that nature has conferred upon her citizens? This question finally crystallized into a demand that certain piers be reserved for the use of the people in the crowded districts. Again and again has the demand been made. The demand finally took the form of a bill introduced in the Legislature, having the support of the best political organizations and private citizens of New York City. This bill became a law in 1892. It conferred certain rights and obligations on the Dock Board. The Board of Aldermen and different civic organizations have petitioned the Dock Board again and again to carry out the intentions of this law. At last public sentiment and pressure have been victorious. Plans have been submitted to the Dock Board that meet its approval, and, under the direction of the Board, which has secured the advice of a skilled architect, a double-decked house, three hundred and twenty feet long and fifty feet wide, will be built at the foot of East Third Street. The building is of wood and steel, and will have lavatories, seats, tables, and conveniences and space for a people's pleasure-garden. The Board has arranged to permit the selling of milk in this building, but will not permit the sale of intoxicating liquors. The contract calls for the building's completion May 1, 1897. The Board of Aldermen has asked for similar structures at other points on the East Side of the city, and several on the West Side, but the Dock Board considers the whole scheme as an experiment, and has decided to wait and see whether the people stifling in the near-by tenement-houses, whether mothers with sick babies, will come out and sit on the river-front where they