

ONE day Chicago courts granted twenty-six divorces inside of two hours and twenty minutes. It won't be long until those courts will have to be run by electricity.

A PROFESSIONAL ball player has just fallen heir to \$25,000 and announces that he will retire from the diamond. He has 25,000 good reasons for doing so.

A CATTLEMAN dropped \$18,000 in a little poker game at Kansas City. Apparently the real estate dealers of that town have not left the city, but have only changed their occupation.

THE latest addition to the colony of divorce-hunters at Sioux Falls is a Congregational clergyman. Sioux Falls and Dwight are running neck and neck as resorts for the upper classes.

The report of the loss of the British steamer *Moseme* says briefly: "All on board saved except the captain." This seems to have the ring of the old days and is a noble epitaph for the drowned man.

THE world failed to fly into smithereens according to the pleasant prophecy of a Kansas City seer. People who bought lavishly on credit because of this prediction will have plenty of time to repent.

LOCAL authorities at Holly Springs, Miss., now wear the belt for dense stupidity. Richard Brousing, of Chicago, whom they arrested under the supposition that he was John L. Sullivan, was absolutely sober at the time.

THE big theater hat will have to go. Another suit for damages has been brought, this time in Minneapolis. When men pay their money to see a show they are not going to be satisfied with the flowers on a woman's big hat.

A FIERY Westerner has sued the managers of a theater for allowing a couple of girls to sit before him wearing hats so large that he could not see the stage. If he would publish his address contributions to support him in the prosecution of the suit would flow in from all over the land.

IT has reached a point where Chicago must mend her lawless ways and brace up for the World's Fair. Train robbing in the Western wilds is bad enough, but when a mail wagon can be held up, robbed and the plunder gotten away with right in the heart of Chicago, outsiders will begin to think that they would rather spend their leisure hours somewhere else.

IN a murder trial in Pennsylvania it was established by medical evidence that a person hit on the head might be so affected as to go across the street, get a revolver, come back and shoot the assailant with deadly aim and all the time be entirely unconscious of what he was doing. He was not necessarily insane, but simply incapable of forming an idea or having a motive. Moral: Don't hit people.

DENMARK looks very carefully after the interest of its paupers, and there is comparatively less pauperism there than anywhere else in Europe. It has recently amended its poor laws, and among the new features are the following: "Husband and wife must not be separated if they conduct themselves properly. Aged and feeble persons must not be placed where they will be disturbed or annoyed, and children must not be placed under immoral influences." These are wholesome and prudent provisions and will doubtless meet the views of the philanthropic of all countries.

THE case of Sawtelle, the New Hampshire murderer, who has just died, shows that the law in that State is a peculiarly stupid one. No person found guilty of a capital crime can be hanged until he has been in prison for a year. If the time were extended a trifle murderers might all realize the wish of the Western malefactor who, when told that he would have his choice as to the manner of his death, replied that he preferred to die of old age. The Sawtelle wretch richly deserves the rope, and a system that preserved the latter nature took him off, in its own fashion, cannot fail to bring the administration of justice into contempt.

THE Princess May Victoria, whose father, by the way, used to be called the Duke of Tick, because of his impetuosity, is a good-natured, spunky young person of respectable middle-class appearance, whose hair is not dressed as English young women and New England young women of good family are accustomed to dress theirs, but in the much-frizzed, curled and brought-down-on-the forehead way which is fashionable in Vienna and St. Louis.

ONE important fact is too much disregarded by certain statesmen of both political parties just at present. There has never been a time when the country would cease to exist because of the death of a single citizen. There have, however, been times when the nation could attend funerals more frequently without regretting the cost. In a nation of 65,000,

one man does not weigh as much as he appears to when standing on the scales created by his own self-esteem.

We are not troubled in this State with violent altercations or exhibitions of violence on railroad trains, but at the same time a decision of the Supreme Court of the United States may be of interest to travelers. This decision was sent back to the Mississippi court from which it originated, a case in which an unruly passenger was shot by the conductor, for which shooting a verdict of \$7,000 was returned against the railroad company. The Mississippi court refused to charge the jury that, if from the manner and attitude of the passenger, the conductor had reason to fear an assault and shot under the belief that he was in imminent personal injury, the company was not responsible. The Supreme Court decides that the jury should have been so charged.

BYRON addressed men as reptiles; Emerson as inferiors; Longfellow as critics; Wordsworth simply soliloquized, careless whether his voice be heard or not; Bryant spoke more to the intellect than to the heart—in select thoughts and chary expressions; but Burns and Whittier will be more deeply loved, if not longer remembered, than others, from the fact that they speak to us in the language of the heart and from the broad level of humanity. Besides this quality of generous, genial manhood, Whittier is distinguished by a vigorous moral earnestness. His creed may not be entirely orthodox, but his spirit is essentially Christian. No poet has more beautifully expressed a profound conviction of the reality and value of the great moral principles and obligations of our nature. Rejecting the shifting sand of human theories as the foundation of his faith, how grandly has he built upon the solid rock of the Divine Justice and Love!

IN cool, deliberate daring a performance at Portsmouth by English Torpedo Lieutenant Sturdey, furnishes one of the most notable instances on record. To prove the correctness of falsehood of his views regarding the availability of a steel-spiked boom intended to check the rush of a torpedo boat, the Lieutenant and four volunteer seamen made a rush in a boat provided for the occasion against a test boom. The trial was so hazardous that the lives of all concerned were especially insured for the benefit of their families by order of the admiralty. The importance of the experiment as a means of making an actual test of the advisability of a promising means of defense alone justified the risk in the eyes of the officials. The torpedo boat was sent at the boom at full speed. It was caught, spiked and torn so that when finally set free it foundered before reaching shore. The men were rescued in a severely bruised condition. By the outcome of the affair Lieutenant Sturdey's views were disproved. He had said he could break the boom but he had established his own bravery and dash beyond a question. He and his four companions are of such stuff as makes naval heroes in time of need.

THE masses of the Mexican people have taken occasion more than once recently to display their unfriendly feelings towards Americans notwithstanding the prosperity which American capital and enterprise are developing in that country. It is said that in many parts of Mexico Americans cannot travel without the danger of insult or molestation, and that the display of the American flag has more than once provoked hostile or unfriendly demonstrations. The memory of the Mexican war still remains and the masses probably feel towards us somewhat as the French do towards the Germans for taking back their two provinces. But so far as the area lost by the Mexicans is concerned, it is utterly hopeless that a single acre of it ever will be recovered, hence it is stupid folly for the Greasers to be sulky or revengeful and to display their personal animosity towards Americans. The progress and prosperity of Mexico as well as the development of its resources depend upon American trade, capital and friendship. Whatever tends to weaken or alienate the latter can only react upon Mexico. It is for its immediate and material interests to cultivate friendly relations with this country and to invite American investments and free intercourse between the two peoples.

THE Potato Among Germans.

It is doubtful whether many of our German fellow-citizens, from the north of the Fatherland especially, who can afford it, will sit down to a dinner without their dish of German potatoes before them in some form or shape of culinary art. The endless variety of dishes prepared of potatoes in their totality, known only to German cooks and German housewives, would fill half a column. There is a German restaurant not many squares from the corner of South and Baltimore streets whose Saturday potato-pancake lunches are famous all over Maryland. Even sourkraut without mashed potatoes is only half a delicacy to the true Teuton. Herring, however, with boiled or roasted potatoes in the shell is the ne plus ultra appetizer before or after genuine Bavarian. But as only the genuine German herring is the true solace for the thirsty soul after a banquet among the singers or students, so only the genuine German potato is the proper ingredient for a genuine German "kartoffel salat," or, which is still sublimer, a "herring salat."—Baltimore Sun.

THE Potato Among Germans.

When the McKinley tariff, which increased the duties on wool, went into effect, it was predicted by McKinley and his associates who made the bill that it would boom the wool industry, raise the price of wool and decrease the imports of foreign wool. The American Wool Reporter's annual review of the wool market shows how complete has been the failure of the tariff to do what was expected of it. "The course of the wool market," says the Reporter, "during the past year has been a great disappointment to the trade, as well as the wool growers. As far as the volume of business in primary markets is concerned, there is no very radical difference to be noted, taking the year as a whole, the aggregate of sales, being not far from those of the previous year."

WHO OWN TAX-LAWS?

PROTECTION IS FOR PRIVATE INTEREST.

The Number of Tariff Beneficiaries—Fewer Workmen Dependent on the Tariff than Are Engaged in Producing Articles for Our Export Trade—Wool and the Tariff in 1891.

How It Works.

A year or more ago a well-known New York lawyer raised the question, "Who owns the United States?" In an article published in a popular magazine he presented a collection of facts, partly within his own knowledge and partly the fruit of careful personal inquiry, that were startling, even to those who believed themselves awake to the phenomenal massing of wealth to this country. His conclusion was that the United States are to-day practically owned by 250,000 people, or one in sixty of the adult population, and that with the unchecked momentum of existing forces the number will be reduced in thirty years to 50,000, or one in 500 of the adult population.

The greatest force in this rapid, and as all must admit, perilous concentration of wealth must be looked for in another question: "Who owns the taxing power in the United States?" I shall seek an answer to this question; for it is a fact as capable of proof as any fact in politics can be that the taxing power in the United States, so far as it works through the tariff, has been transferred to private ownership and only in a subordinate sense subserves any public purpose.

By the admission, even by the boast, of those who framed the McKinley bill, we have now a "tariff for protection with incidental revenue." Now protection is for the individual and private interest, and revenue is for the government.

They are that portion of our producers who make goods that might be imported into our market by goods imported from abroad.

They alone can be beneficiaries of a law that shuts out of the country such goods, admits them only under heavy burdens and penalties, and any advantages claimed for others must be filtered to them through these direct beneficiaries.

I am not aware that any one competent to do so has listed these beneficiaries and ascertained their number as compared with our full population. But very competent inquirers have ascertained facts from which a "shrewd" guess can be made as to the number of those who enjoy—thanks to a great political party—the prerogative of taxing the American people, for their claim to possess this prerogative is made, not in their own name, but in the name of the laborers they employ. Fortunately, we can very accurately estimate the number of their employees, as compared with our entire wage-earning population.

Secretary Manning submitted to three prominent statisticians, among them Prof. Simon Newcomb, the distinguished mathematician and writer on economic subjects, the question, how many employees were engaged in the industries supposed to be protected in whole or in part by the tariff. Their answers, made without concert and after careful study of the census of 1880 and our revenue laws, were in striking concord. The average of these answers was but little more than 5 percent. of our working population. A recent attempt to solve this same question has been made by a gentleman whose ability to deal with statistics is not surpassed by any authority.

Mr. Edward Atkinson, in a letter addressed to the Boston Herald a few weeks ago, and in a speech which I heard him make before the Reform Club of Massachusetts, gave both his method of solving the question and the results he had reached. I will only do with the latter, and that for the purpose alone of answering the question at the head of this article. As the census of 1880 was used in the year one of every three, two, or nine-tenths of our population, was occupied in trade, making altogether 17,400,000 gainful pursuits.

These were distributed in round numbers as follows: In agriculture, as farmers or laborers, nearly 8,000,000; in professional and personal service, 4,000,000; in trade and transportation, nearly 2,000,000, and in manufacture, mechanic arts and mining not quite 4,000,000.

For the entire country forty-four of each hundred are engaged in agriculture, but in the Southern States, including Missouri, the number so engaged is seventy of each hundred.

Mr. Atkinson finds that of this entire wage-working population 1,200,000, at most, or can be in any way subject to foreign competition, while, on the other hand, 1,400,000 in agriculture and 200,000 factory operatives, mechanics, and machinists depend wholly on foreign sales and the export of the products of their labor for their sustenance.

This is one of the most suggestive and telling facts brought out in the tariff controversy, and cannot be too strongly dwelt upon. After all the boasting of the tariff as the protector of American labor and a creator of a home market, there are 400,000 more laborers wholly dependent on the export and sale of their products in foreign markets than there are laborers protected from competition in any measure by the tariff.

We have, therefore, the following distribution of our working population:

Number who are wholly dependent on the export of the products of their labor for their sustenance, 1,400,000. Number subject in some measure or in part to import of a foreign product to compete with their own, 1,200,000. Total, 2,600,000 individuals by the tariff except as consumers, 14,600,000.

Total, 17,400,000.

Who, then, we may now ask, own the taxing power in this country? The capitalists who employ the 1,200,000 laborers specified in the above table. As to their number we can only guess, but if we average ten employees to each employer we have 12,000,000 out of the population of 1880—say 130,000 of the present population, the average number of the direct beneficiaries of the tariff laws. Here, then, is our privileged class, enjoying two privileges elsewhere accorded to royalty alone; first, an exemption from their just share of the burdens of government, and the sovereign prerogative of taxing all the rest of the people for their own benefit.—Congressman W. L. Wilson, in St. Louis Republic.

Wool and the Tariff in 1891.

When the McKinley tariff, which increased the duties on wool, went into effect, it was predicted by McKinley and his associates who made the bill that it would boom the wool industry, raise the price of wool and decrease the imports of foreign wool. The American Wool Reporter's annual review of the wool market shows how complete has been the failure of the tariff to do what was expected of it. "The course of the wool market," says the Reporter, "during the past year has been a great disappointment to the trade, as well as the wool growers. As far as the volume of business in primary markets is concerned, there is no very radical difference to be noted, taking the year as a whole, the aggregate of sales, being not far from those of the previous year."

THE Potato Among Germans.

A street car conductor in Maine felt like grumbling because a woman asked him to "wait a second" while she went into her house to change her dress.

principal wool market of the United States, during 1890, show an increase over 1890 of 34 per cent. of domestic and 37.4 per cent. of foreign wool, while the total sales during the year aggregate only 1,331,230 pounds more than in 1890. At the same time the stocks on hand at the close of this year, as compared with 1890, are as follows:

1891.
Domestic..... 25,574,493
Foreign..... 2,952,450

This, taken in connection with the receipts and the total sales for the year, show clearly that while there has been a large increase in the consumption of foreign wool, it has been at the expense of that of domestic growth. What in view of this becomes of the claim made by high-tariff organs that the decrease in the importation of goods during the year means a larger consumption of domestic wool?

Concerning prices the Reporter says:

"In the matter of prices realized the trend of values has been almost steadily toward lower figures, when there has been any movement. The year has been characterized by long periods of depression, and after each period of weakness there has not been one rally calculated to lift values upon a higher plane. In spite of the increased duties upon foreign wool, imports of the latter show a decided increase, as those who have been at all familiar with our market reports very well know. The strengthening influence, therefore, that was to come from anticipated reduced importations has been characterized by its absence. The result is that the markets at the seaboard and in the interior close the year at practically the lowest point of the year, and, on the average, with wool about two cents per pound lower. Ohio and Pennsylvania fleeces have shown the most marked depression, which is significant, certainly, in view of the fact that the growers of those wools were the most clamorous for the increased duties, and that it was their interests more particularly than others that the tariff was designed to protect."

How general has been the fall in the prices of Eastern wool is shown by the following table prepared by the Reporter:

Dec. 31, 1891. Dec. 31, 1890.
Variety..... Cents per lb. Cents per lb.
Ohio and Pennsylvania..... 30 31
Ohio X and above..... 20 20
Ohio..... 28 29
Ohio No. 1..... 30 31
Michigan X..... 20 27
Michigan No. 1..... 33 4
Michigan delaine..... 32 33
Michigan..... 34 35
Ohio fine unwashed and unmercantile..... 20 25
Michigan..... 15 22
Ohio..... 28 30
washed..... 33 39
No. 1 Michigan..... 33 37
No. 2 Michigan..... 33 31
No. 3 Michigan..... 33 31
Kentucky, Michigan and Indiana, 1/2 combing..... 22 23
No. fourth blood..... 27 27

Concerning the probability of increased importations of wool next year, the Reporter says: "We noted the probability, in our review of last year, of increased importations of foreign wool, and the outcome of events has justified our predictions, and to-day indications point to a still further use of Australian and other foreign wools than we have seen during 1891. Many houses which never handled Australian wools before have done so during the past few months, and others are preparing to do so."

Increased importations and sales of Australian wools, in the face of higher duties on the one hand and increasing stocks of domestic wools at lower prices on the other, together form a striking commentary on the inefficiency of a higher tariff as a remedial measure for the grower. With like conditions prevailing in the year 1892 there is no reason for expecting a different state of affairs than have prevailed during the past year."

The failures of the wool tariff briefly summarized are: 1. It has failed to raise prices of domestic wool. 2. It has failed to decrease the imports of foreign wool.

Why, in view of this, does it longer remain on our statute books?

WHO Pays the Tariff Tax?

The following table shows the value of dutiable imports, and the amount of duties collected for the past five years:

Year	Dutiable Imports	Duties collected	Average rate of duty
1887.....	\$40,933,321	\$14,022,321	47.10
1888.....	40,744,144	12,106,559	30.00
1889.....	48,756,768	23,076,983	49.13
1890.....	507,071,764	23,640,095	44.41
1891.....	465,453,773	215,071,729	46.25

Total..... \$2,377,532.01 \$1,059,285,322 46.40

The values of imports given above are the values of the goods at the place of purchase—that is, the prices at which the goods are offered for sale to anyone in foreign markets. The duties collected represent the tax which is imposed on these goods by the United States at its custom houses. Who has paid into the treasury of the United States the \$1,023,285,320 within the past five years? It was certainly paid by one of the two parties concerned in the importation of the \$2,377,532,01 worth of goods, either by the importer or the foreign manufacturer. If the importer paid the duties he added the amount to the price of the goods, and as Mr. Depew says, the tariff tax "rested on the bottom," that is on the consumer. But Secretary of the Treasury Foster says that the tariff is a tax, and that the foreigner pays it for the privilege of selling his goods in our markets. If his view is the right one he who has paid the tariff in the past five years been doing a most unprofitable business in exporting goods to the United States, for every dollar's worth of goods which he has on hand—say in Liverpool—to be shipped to the United States he must pay not only the cost of insurance, handling, and freight—which amounts to say five cents—but also 46-40 cents in duties to the United States. His net return, therefore, when he lands his dollar's worth of goods here, is less than 50 cents.

Is any one stupid enough to think that this is true? If foreigners send their goods to the United States, do they not do it because they can get more for them than they can get for them in their own country? If this is true the consumers in the United States, not the foreign manufacturer, pays the tariff tax. Which view of the matter is the more reasonable one?

THE Hartford Times of the 16th instant publishes the following from its correspondent in the