The Independent.

Entered at the Post Office at New York as Second-Class Mail Matter.

"EVEN AS WE HAVE BEEN APPROVED OF GOD TO BE INTRUSTED WITH THE GOSPEL, SO WE SPEAK; NOT AS PLEASING MEN, BUT GOD WHICH PROVETH OUR HEARTS."

VOLUME XLVII. NEW YORK, THURSDAY, MARCH 21, 1895. NUMBER 2416.

The Independent

For Table of Contents see Page 10.

INFLUENCE.

BY LOUISE IMOGEN GUINEY.

AMONG gay children in the sun,
So much is sown, so much takes root!
One mate of mine hath Honor; one
A wasted manhood, flower and fruit.

From long ago, my heedless heart,
Something of thee in each has striven:
In Theodas tho thou claim a part,
For Æmon shalt thou be forgiven?

AUBURNDALE, MASS.

A VISION OF JUDGMENT.

BY ELAINE GOODALE EASTMAN.

I SLEPT—and started broad awake with fear!
My room was light as in the noonday clear,
And lo! an angel with a look severe!

In awful silence he did then unroll
My past before me like an open scroll—
The Day of Judgment overtook my soul!

"Have I so deeply sinned?" I faintly cried;
"Waste—waste is crime!" the accusing Voice replied;
"Look on the record, and thyself decide!"

Then self convicted, weeping and abased—
"Alas, my heedless youth!" I cried in haste,
"When all life's golden moments ran to waste!"

"Not so!"—grave voice that my rash thought condemned—
"Youth's folly oft is wisdom in the end—
'Twere ill to hoard what God has given to spend!

"Look over again upon thy later days
When trials came, thou shouldst have turned to praise,
And sorrows, sent to teach thee heavenly ways!

"Those priceless pains—those sacred, stricken years!
How thou hast squandered them too well appears—
In useless protests and unworthy tears!"

The final words died on some far off shore,
And all was dark, and I alone once more
And broad awake—had I but dreamed before?

O warning dream! O timely, saving fear!
Even loss is welcome now, and hardship dear,
Angel of Judgment! till thou dost appear.

ST. PAUL, MINN.

MUTATION.

BY JAMES CLARENCE HARVEY.

UPON the shores of No-man's-land,
I met an angel, one whose wings
Shed beams of light on either hand,
As radiant as the sunrise brings.
And happy souls, with eager tread,
Passed up and down the sandy slope;
Oh, tell me your fair name!" I said;
She turned and smiled, and answered: "Hope."

Along the shores of No-man's-land,
The angel walked, with folded wings,
And shadows fell on every hand,
The burden that the night-wind brings.
With head turned backward, sad and slow,
She paced the sands, her eyelids wet,
"Hope mourns," I said; and soft and low,
The angel sighed: "I am Regret."

NEW YORK CITY.

COUNT ITO'S DILEMMA.

BY GEORGE WM. KNOX, D.D.

TO-DAY, so says the cable, Li Hung Chang leaves Peking to meet Count Ito and Count Mutsu, with them to decide the destinies of the far East. Never in the long history of China and Japan has there been an occasion of more far-reaching importance. Never did statesmen need more sagacity.

Li Hung Chang and Ito are skilled diplomatists, of long experience, wide knowledge of the world and perfect understanding of their problem and of each other. And of the two Count Ito has the harder part.

He is keen, cool, strong to hold a position, and quick to know when to abandon it. In a long life he has been victor in a thousand conflicts, and temporary defeat has but made him the stronger when opportunity could be won again. But never had he a harder task than now. China has to decide how much it will yield, and only that; and its envoy knows beyond all doubt the mind of the European Powers. Count Ito cannot decide so simply; he must reckon not only with China but with Russia and Great Britain, and most of all with the aroused purpose of the people of Japan.

Japan demands that the objects of the war be secured, demands none the less earnestly that the objects as stated by the press are not defined quite consistently or clearly. Korea is to be independent, with Japan as guardian and preceptor; an ample indemnity is to be paid, and Chinese ports are to be held as security; so much is clear. If that is all, peace will be made readily no doubt. But the Japanese press vehemently declares that more must be secured, that territory must be ceded, an alliance formed, and far-reaching reforms and changes instituted, while now and then claims still greater are advanced. Already the two conditions named above seem rejected by unanimous consent. If Count Ito agree to these an outburst threatens in Japan such as Japan has never seen.

And in the interests of humanity we may ask, Should Japan make peace upon conditions so indecisive? Lord Wolseley writes thus of the last English war with China:

"It would have been a fatal policy for us—traders—to strengthen it [the Tai Ping rebellion, then in progress] by any action that was calculated to weaken the Emperor's authority. In fact, our commercial relations with China bound us up with the maintenance of the Imperial authority, because it alone would and could protect the native producers. This was so much the case that, next to the defeat of our invading army, the greatest misfortune which, commercially speaking, could overtake us would be a great victory. We wished to mend, not to end, the Imperial Government.

"These considerations were never absent from the minds of those who directed our war of 1860. But it is not often in the history of war that we find the aggrieved side impelled in its own interests to strike, so to say, with a gloved hand, lest the blow delivered should kill outright."

So England struck with its gloved hand, and its blow changed nothing. As an empire China did not know it had been struck. Some of its officials played at military reform; but after a generation "the Chinese army at the beginning of this war was for all practical fighting purposes as useless as that which tried to bar our march to Peking in 1860." So, too, is the Government as incompetent, the administration as corrupt, and the nation as incapable of progress toward a higher life. But Japan does not strike with a gloved hand. It has no interest in maintaining the present condition of affairs. On the contrary, the nation has persuaded itself that stagnant, rotten, false China must be taught a lesson it will not forget—a lesson which will start it upon the path Japan has followed so successfully. For, so the argument runs, China in its weakness is a menace to all the East, a standing invitation to the strong and greedy nations of the West. Only by a progressive and united East can safety be secured.

Can China be reformed peacefully? What sureties can it give? Must it be broken up, in spite of all the pains and deadly risks of such vivisection and dismemberment? Shall Japan become guardian and teacher of the Middle Kingdom, that proud sovereign of the East for centuries? What course of reform will vindicate the war by putting China into a new position, about face to her old posture? Should Japan encamp on the continent, and will anything less than a slice of Chinese territory repay the risks, toils and losses of the war? Will anything less do other than make a show of peace when there is no peace, China straightway relapsing into its old state of ignorant self-content? The Japanese ask these questions with an eagerness that is almost fierce.

But whatever Count Ito's purpose, can he solve his problem as he will? Already we hear of a perfect accord of Great Britain and Russia, with echoes from the Russian press that not a foot of Asiatic soil shall be given to Japan, and the Japanese people well know that the European Powers will not permit themselves to be ignored. But knowing this there is an increasing demand that, nevertheless, Japan decide wholly as she may choose. Count Ito is between two fires.

Government and Diet have been in harmony for six months past, the first time since the Diet first met. They are in harmony that Japan may be one against the foreign foe; but it is only a truce. The great majority of the members of the Diet are the sworn enemies of Count Ito and his Ministry, and the members are true representatives of the people. The war abroad heals slightly the wound at home, and the fight will be on again when Count Ito thwarts the Diet's will. The strife is as to fundamental principles, and must be fought out to the bitter end.

The political situation, before the war, was strained almost to breaking. Government and people were irreconcilable. The war has postponed the final struggle; but now the voice of the opposition press is heard again, in spite of the rigid Government control. Count Ito is asked to remember that he has not the confidence of the people, and is told that the nation must decide the terms of peace as it has borne the burdens of war. With succeeding victories the popular claims rise, and at the mention of probable interference by the European Powers, there are cries of defiance. Should Count Ito listen to threats from abroad, he must face an angry nation at home; should he listen to the newspaper advice at home, he may have to face an armed ultimatum from abroad.

Is the West prepared to fight for the maintenance of the corrupt Imperial Government which has insulted and humiliated Western States for generations, which oppresses its own subject population, which stands as an impassable barrier to progress, which persecutes and murders by mobs instigated by officials both merchants and missionaries, and then protects the high-placed rioters? Is Europe to stand guardian over corrupt, false, hostile, oppressive Government in the far east of Asia as in the far west of Asia?

In any case, Japan is not fighting for commercial advantages, nor does it lack confidence in its own powers to do for China what it has accomplished at home. Its self-confidence is serene, undoubting, and, in its present mood, it may choose another and greater foreign war to peace on terms dictated by the Western Powers.

NEW YORK CITY.

THE ART OF CONVERSATION.

BY THE REV. H. R. HAWEIS, M.A.

"CONVERSATION," say Emerson, "is an evanescent relation." Do you see that Emily is tongue-tied? All the afternoon she has been sitting about in the house, pretending now to read "Dodo," now to finish that crochet shawl for the Rev. Eliman Fairweather's fancy bazaar. Her brow is not exactly clouded; but Mamma asks her whether she has seen the fowls fed, and she murmurs "No," without raising her head from her languid fingers. "Has she noticed that Polly sits and sulks, and won't eat his seed?" "No." "Is she going to play lawn tennis at the Bouncers' that afternoon?" This remark has to be repeated, and is answered by another monosyllable; and then Mamma gives it up. What is the matter with Emily?

Enter the Rev. Eliman Fairweather. He almost runs toward Emily's mamma, and hardly seems to see the daughter. "My dear Mrs. Makeweight, how glad I am to find you at home! There is the greatest excitement in the village. Martha Priggins has actually been tossed by a cow—tossed, my dear lady! But fortunately I was passing, and I opened my umbrella suddenly—quite suddenly, you know—and—and—oh, I beg your pardon, Miss Makeweight!—*how* do you do?—*how* do you do? No, she was not hurt at all, I assure you. The girl was only fourteen, and very active—the horns caught her clothes, but the cow was frightened by my umbrella, which I threw down; and actually she lowered her head

will. The law of libel does not appear to touch this matter; tho as wills are opened to be read by anybody, what is in them must surely come under the legal head of "publication." This, too, is a cowardly method of attack, since the assailant cannot be answered, and reminds one of the author of a certain posthumous biography of which Dr. Johnson said "he presented a pistol but had not himself the courage to pull the trigger."

LONDON, ENGLAND.

FEDERATION OF THE REFORMED CHURCHES.

BY PROF. JOHN T. DUFFIELD, D.D., LL.D.

No more important business will come before the next General Assembly than final action on "The Plan of Federation of the Reformed Churches," reported to the last Assembly, and referred by the Assembly to the presbyteries "for their information and advice." The Plan proposes the formation of "an ecclesiastical assembly which shall be known by the name and style of "the Federal Council of the Reformed Churches in the United States of America holding the Presbyterian system."

With the highest respect for the brethren who originated and those who advocate the Plan proposed, and in hearty sympathy with them, we trust, in the motive prompting the movement—"The glory of God and the greater unity and advancement of the Church"—we respectfully submit the following reasons for our conviction that the adoption of the Plan by the General Assembly would be unadvisable.

1. Art. 4 is as follows:

"The Federal Council shall consist of four ministers and four elders from each of the constituent denominations."

The number of communicants in the constituent denominations mentioned in the report, as given in the valuable statistical table in THE INDEPENDENT of January 3d, is as follows:

General Synod of the Reformed Presbyterian Church..	5,000
Synod of the Reformed Presbyterian Church.....	9,588
Associate Reformed Synod of the South.....	9,793
Reformed Church, Dutch.....	94,615
United Presbyterian Church.....	104,058
Cumberland Presbyterian Church.....	184,138
Reformed Church, German.....	221,473
Presbyterian Church in the United States.....	876,520
Total.....	1,595,185

From these statistics it appears that, according to the proposed Plan, one Church of 5,000 and two others of less than 10,000 would each be entitled to the same representation in the Council as the 876,000 members of the Presbyterian Church. One half the Council would represent about 125,000 communicants, the other half over 1,375,000. A majority of five eighths of the Council would represent about one-seventh of the whole number of communicants. Should an organic union of any two Churches at any time occur, their representation would be reduced one-half. If a schism should occur in any of the Churches, even the smallest, the representation of the same communicants would be doubled. As if to emphasize the incongruity of the representation in the Council, Art. 21 prescribes that "the expenses," including "the expenses of the delegates to the Council," shall be "provided by a *pro-rata* apportionment on the basis of the number of communicants in each denomination." A Federation on the basis proposed, magnifying the importance, and that indiscriminately of the reasons for the present divisions of the Presbyterian Church, instead of promoting the unity of the Church, would tend to perpetuate existing dis-unity and would put a premium on further schism.

The basis of representation proposed is defended on the ground of analogy to that of the United States Senate. To this we reply that in framing the Federal Constitution, equal representation of States in the Senate would never have been seriously considered had not the Senate been supplemented by another house of Congress in which representation was based on population. It may be added that the recent course of Senators from certain numerically insignificant States, sacrificing the interests of the nation to promote a purely local interest, does not commend to the larger Churches of the country the United States Senate as a model for an ecclesiastical Federal Council.

2. The Southern Presbyterian Church with 199,167, a number considerably larger than the aggregate of one-half the Churches of the proposed Federation, in 1893, and again in 1894, positively declined "to enter into the Federal Union proposed." The deliberate judgment of so large a body of American Presbyterians should, under any circumstances, receive respectful and weighty consideration, and especially under existing circumstances. Should the Northern Church enter the Federation it would indirectly settle adversely a question of ecclesiastical union of deep interest at the present time in both sections; a question whose favorable settlement there is reason to believe would promote "the glory of God and the unity of the Church" far more effectually than any federation such as is proposed, the *organic* union of the Northern and Southern Churches.

3. Four of the eight Churches of the proposed Federation not only use the Psalms exclusively in "the service of song," but make their exclusive use "a term of communion"; that is, one-half the Council and the Churches they represent would not unite with the other half and the Churches they represent, in the sacrament of the Lord's Supper. Without the slightest reflection on the churches referred to for their exercise of their unquestionable right of private judgment we respectfully ask, is a "federation" of Churches so discordant on a subject so important as divine worship, advisable? Unless it be assumed that the Presbyterian Church is not just as conscientious in its views on hymnology and inter communion as the Churches referred to, is federation practicable? The plan prescribes that "in the conduct of its meetings the Council shall respect the conscientious views of the federated denominations." We presume this was intended to provide that in the devotional exercises of the Council the Psalms were to be used exclusively, the "doxology" was not to be sung, and that there would be no sacramental communion service. But one of the two specified objects of the Federation is to promote "co-operation in home and foreign missionary work," and in such co-operation whose "conscientious views" are to be respected? In these latter days when the Lord is blessing so abundantly *the singing of the Gospel* in the extension of his kingdom, shall the Presbyterian Church in its evangelistic work refrain from singing Gospel hymns, in any locality in Christendom or heathendom, out of respect for the conscientious views of brethren who regard the use of such hymns in worship as an offense which should exclude the offender from the communion table? Or is it understood that the brethren who have been using the Psalms exclusively propose to unite with other evangelical Churches in the use of Gospel hymns "in the home and foreign missionary work"? If so, the Conference on Federation has accomplished a most desirable result even if the plan proposed should not be adopted.

4. The plan provides:

"All matters of discipline shall be left to the exclusive and final judgment of the ecclesiastical authorities of the denominations in which the same may arise;

also:

"The acts, proceedings and records of the duly constituted authorities of each of the denominations shall be received in all the other denominations as of full credit and with proper respect."

Now is it advisable for the Presbyterian Church to give a solemn pledge that it would not admit to its membership a minister or layman suspended from the communion of one of the federating Churches for voting, or for being voluntarily present at religious services in which the Psalms were not exclusively used in worship?

5. One of the Churches of the proposed federation is a secession from the Presbyterian Church, on the ground of the requirements for the ministry prescribed in the Form of Government and the doctrinal teaching of the Confession of Faith. The Church referred to has revised the Confession, and substituted what is virtually Arminianism for the Calvinistic system. Without any reflection on the course of this Church, or any intimation that it should not in all appropriate ways be fraternally recognized by the Presbyterian Church, we call attention to what is involved in the adoption of the proposed Plan of Federation, namely—if a few presbyteries, or even a few ministers with their churches, should withdraw from the Presbyterian Church for any reason—say, the question of "inerrancy"—and should organize "The Progressive Presbyterian Church," or "The American Presbyterian Church," the seceding organization would be entitled to membership in the Federation, and to a representation in the Federal Council numerically equal to that of the Presbyterian Church. Would not a Federation on such a basis be a standing invitation to schism?

6. As mentioned above, one of the specified objects of the proposed Federation is to promote "the co-operation of the federated denominations in home and foreign missionary work." The most notable fact in connection with the progress of Christ's Kingdom at the present day is the cordial co-operation of Christians of different denominations in evangelistic work. With this spirit abroad in the Churches, and existing agencies interested and active in promoting and directing co-operation, is a new organization for the object mentioned either necessary or advisable? If deemed advisable, why a "federation"? And since the object is one in which all evangelical denominations have an equal interest, and it is not proposed to make inter-communion or confessional orthodoxy a condition of membership why should it be restricted to "Churches holding the Presbyterian system?"

And why restricted to "missionary" work?

7. The second and only other specified object of the Federation is

"To keep watch on current religious, moral and social movements, and take such action as may concentrate the influence of all the Churches in the maintenance of the truth that this is a Protestant Christian nation, and all that is therein involved."

It is undoubtedly true that the large majority of the nation are nominally Protestant Christians. To what extent *nominally*, is indicated by the statement in the suggestive article by Dr. W. H. Roberts in THE INDEPENDENT of January 31st, that "the actual voting strength of Protestant Churches is not more than 3,500,000, while fully 6,500,000 actual voters are not members of any church." The latter aggregate does not include Roman Catholics or Jews. As a large part of the nation are neither Protestant nor Christian it is not clear what the precise "truth" is which it is a special object of the Federation to maintain. The obscurity is increased by the additional indefinite clause, "and all that is therein involved."

As the language in question was, no doubt, deliberately chosen, we presume it was intentionally indefinite. It may be interpreted, and probably was intended, to intimate that a prominent object of the Federation would be to expose and oppose the influence of the Roman Catholic Church as a political power. The interference of the clergy of the Roman Catholic Church in political affairs is, undoubtedly, a serious and growing evil, and may justify some form of organized vigilance and activity to counteract it. At the same time we have a very decided conviction that it would be a grave mistake to organize a Federation of Churches or an Ecclesiastical Council to do the work of an American Protective Association. An ecclesiastical organization for this purpose would be objectionable for the same reason that the action of the Roman Catholic clergy referred to is objectionable. Further, it would be without any *constitutional* warrant. Chap. XXXI, Sec. 2 of the Confession of Faith is as follows:

"It belongeth to synods and councils ministerially: (1) to determine controversies of faith and cases of conscience; (2) to set down rules and directions for the better ordering of the public worship of God; (3) to receive complaints in cases of maladministration, and authoritatively to determine the same."

Now, under which of these functions of an ecclesiastical council will it be claimed that it is legitimate constitutional business for a Presbyterian council to maintain that "this is a Protestant Christian nation, and all that is therein involved"?

Further still, it would be without any *scriptural* warrant. It is not easy to draw precisely the line which separates the proper work of the *organic* Church from work which devolves on church members as citizens; that is, in their political, not their ecclesiastical relations; work in performing which they may and should co-operate with all citizens like-minded, whether professors of religion or non-professors, believers or unbelievers. But there is such a line, and it ought not to be difficult to decide on which side of the line is the business of "maintaining that this is a Protestant Christian nation, and all that is therein involved." The Church was instituted and commissioned by Christ to "preach the Gospel," and to "teach whatsoever he commanded"; and it does not appear that either personally or by his inspired Apostles he ever gave any commandment on the subject mentioned.

8. Art. 6 contains the following:

"The Federal Council may advise and recommend in all matters pertaining to the general welfare of Christ's kingdom."

Now why would the *advice* of a body constituted by representation so anomalous and possibly unrepresentative, be specially entitled to consideration? Would not any special importance attributed to it as the advice of "the Federal Council of the Reformed Churches of the United States" be largely factitious, and possibly fictitious? On some of the "current religious, moral and social movements"—for example, the Prohibition Party movement—might not a majority of a council constituted as proposed advise what would not express the judgment of the great body of American Presbyterians?

In this connection it should be remarked, that on an exciting issue, the representatives of each Church would represent only the views of the majority at the time of their appointment. An unrepresented minority of the Northern Church might be far greater numerically than the aggregate of more than half the Churches of the Federation. And this suggests a further remark—incidental yet entitled to serious consideration—the selection of four ministers out of 6,600, and four elders out of 25,800, to represent the Presbyterian Church in the Federal Council, would in all probability be the occasion at each meeting of the Assembly of distracting and protracted excitement and unpleasant personal feeling more intense than that which occasionally occurs at the election of a Moderator.

9. Art. 7 is as follows:

"The Federal Council shall have the power of opening and maintaining a friendly correspondence with the highest assemblies of other religious denominations for the purpose of promoting union and concert of action on general or common interests."

Now this is one of the powers of the General Assembly specified in the Constitution, and we respectfully ask, Has the Assembly any authority or right to relegate this, or any of its constitutional functions, to any other ecclesiastical assembly? Aside from the question of constitutionality, could not correspondence on matters pertaining to "union and concert of action on matters of common interest," so far as the Presbyterian Church is concerned—for example, the union of the Northern and Southern Churches, or concert of action in regard to educational or religious work among the Negroes—be conducted far more satisfactorily directly by the General Assembly than indirectly by the proposed Federal Council?

10. Art. 8 is as follows:

"All differences which may arise among the federated

bodies, or any of them (that is as we understand it, all differences that may arise in any of the federated bodies), within the jurisdiction of the Federal Council, shall be determined by such executive agencies as may be created by the Federal Council, with the right of appeal to the Federal Council for final ajudication."

A clause in Art. 6 provides that additional "authority may be conferred on it by the federated bodies."

It is here proposed to confer *judicial power* on "an ecclesiastical assembly" unknown to our Constitution; an assembly, moreover, not based on the fundamental principles of Presbyterian Church government—*proportionate representation* and *confessional unity*. The powers of the General Assembly are specified in Chapter XII, Sec. 7, of the Form of Government, and the specification does not contain the slightest basis for a claim that the Assembly has any constitutional authority to do what is here proposed.

The only limitation of the sweeping language of the proposed grant of judicial power is in the words "within the jurisdiction of the Federal Council." It might therefore have been expected that so important a matter as the scope of the jurisdiction of the Council would have been distinctly defined in the Plan, and yet this is not even attempted. In case, then, "differences arise among the federated bodies, or any of them," and the issue should be raised in a particular case, whether the "difference" was "within the jurisdiction of the Federal Council," how is the question to be decided? Presumably by the Federal Council. In the Walnut Street, Louisville, church case the Supreme Court of the United States decided that in ecclesiastical matters the civil courts should accept as valid and final the claim of the highest judicatory of any Church to jurisdiction. As the proposed Federal Council would be a judicial tribunal before which the General Assembly might appear, or might be summoned to appear, as a party, would not the Federal Council be regarded as the higher judicatory? And in case the Council claimed jurisdiction, and the issue should be taken to the civil courts, would not the claim be accepted as valid and final?

An ecclesiastical Council, constituted and empowered as proposed, would undoubtedly be a novelty in the history of Presbyterianism. The question at issue, therefore, is, Is the necessity for a special organization to promote the objects mentioned so urgent, and the advantages of the plan proposed so evident, and the objections to it so inconsiderable, and the power of the General Assembly so unquestionable, that the Assembly would be justified in making an unprecedented experiment in Presbyterian church government?

It may be proper to add that disapproval of the Plan proposed should not be regarded as any reflection on the purpose or the wisdom of the brethren who formulated it. The difficulty is in the problem they attempted to solve. The Plan submitted is, probably, the least objectionable possibly attainable. It does not follow that it should therefore be adopted. The result is rather to be regarded as demonstrating that a "Federation" of Churches, at least of "Churches holding the Presbyterian system," is impracticable.

PRINCETON, N. J.

OUR WASHINGTON LETTER.

BY JANET JENNINGS.

THE new no-name silver party is interesting. It quite fills the void left by the passing of Congress. It sprung with mushroom growth into existence, and in twenty-four hours had not only nominated its candidate for President of the United States, but was fully prepared to line up for the fray of 1896. It is now in quest of a name, and, to be sure, there is much in a name, tho a rose by any other would smell as sweet. But the new party desires a name which shall be more than sounding brass and tinkling cymbal—a name expressive of euphony, in power and leadership. In the meantime it accepts the temporary title of Bimetallist, or Bimetallic Party. Joseph C. Sibley, honored by the new party as its choice for President of the United States, was elected to the Fifty-third Congress as a Democrat from the Twenty-sixth Republican District of Pennsylvania (tho a resident of the Twenty-seventh District), by a combination of Democrats, Populists and Prohibitionists—a mixed support that would unsettle almost any man. He is a farmer, and a manufacturer of lubricating oils. Between the two he has made a large fortune, tho, undoubtedly, owing more of his financial success to the oil business. Mr. Sibley is a man just turned forty-five; but his tall, slender figure and beardless face give him a much younger appearance, and he would readily pass for thirty-five. He is suave and courteous and smiling, and his speech in the House on the bond issue, in which he so bitterly attacked the President, caused general surprise, coming from a proverbially mild-mannered man. With considerable ability, unquestioned force and dash, and possessed of large wealth, he is regarded by his followers as an ideal candidate and leader of the new party. It is unnecessary to add that Mr. Sibley is a radical free silver man on the 16 to 1 ratio. But he has no use for the International Monetary Conference, which he says is merely a Trojan horse intended to deceive with glittering promises on the eve of a Presidential campaign. The candidate of the new party is a good talker. He declares his highest ambition is to return to his farm (he was not re-elected) and bury himself in agriculture, but that from a sense of duty he has accepted the nomination for President of the United States, and will be the candidate to the end that the new party is in earnest and will make an aggressive campaign; that league clubs will be formed in every hamlet and city, prominent speakers will preach the doctrine of bimetallism from the stump, and he himself will remain in the field—unless, and here is the alternative frankly proposed—unless one of the other parties shall nominate an unqualified bimetallist for President on a bimetallic platform. Mr. Sibley is not particular whether it is the Republican or Democratic Party which comes to the rescue; but whichever party embraces bimetallism as the sovereign issue, to that party will be cheerfully given, perhaps one might say donated, the new organization. When this is accomplished the purpose of the new party will have been achieved. Then Mr. Sibley throws out a little advice, which indicated a slight, but very perceptible leaning toward the Republican Party, notwithstanding he has trained with the Democratic House all winter. Perhaps, however, it is this fact which now causes something of reaction when he says: "If the Republicans have any hope of winning, they had better start out with Teller or Cameron. No straddle-bugs need apply. Whoever may be the man, he will have to meet the measure. There can be no fooling with a good platform in 1896." Besides the compliment to Senator Teller and Senator Cameron in the implied belief that either would lead the Republicans to victory, or at any rate would do to start out with, Mr. Sibley is again impartial, declaring that both parties are full of influential men ready to march under his bimetallic banner, and before this advancing host, politicians and statesmen in Congress and the White House will be like "mere straws in an ice gorge of the Susquehanna."

On the other hand, the level headed silver men have no faith in the new party. One and all declare it has no element of strength sufficient for permanency, but is a sensational movement. Senator Stewart is the only silver Senator who indorses the new party, and he is erratic, not to say daft, on the silver question. He is bitterly opposed to the International Monetary Conference. But his argument, so far as the ground that the United States is great enough to straighten out her own monetary affairs and set the standard for other nations, is not without force in its ring of genuine Americanism. Many who favor the Conference admit the weight of Senator Stewart's argument, but recognize existing conditions which make the Conference the only direct way possible at present to reach the desired end, if indeed by the outcome their hopes in that direction are realized.

George S. Boutwell, President Grant's Secretary of the Treasury, said a few days ago: "Before two years have passed, silver will control this country." Mr. Boutwell, as well known, is far from being a free silver man. Out of politics, therefore, with no political ambitions involved, Mr. Boutwell has watched the situation as a disinterested student from the financier's point of view. Both his spoken and written opinions, expressed above a year ago, forcibly predicted the present condition of affairs, even to a prophecy of the Treasury crisis, barely averted by the recent bond syndicate. The ex-Secretary of the Treasury does not hold the tariff responsible, except indirectly, in a small way, but dates the beginning of financial stress back to the resumption of specie payment, followed by a financial policy, gradually but inevitably leading up to the recent crisis now tided over by temporary relief, but leaving the condition of the Treasury still cause for anxiety and doubt, and subject to another bond issue.

The surprising development and resistless advance of silver in both Houses of Congress during the last month of the session, would seem to bear out Mr. Boutwell's statement as regards the silver power in the near future. It was plain enough to all parties that the summary defeat of the first currency measure, known as the Carlisle bill, gave a tremendous impetus to silver; and from that moment the strength of the white metal men throughout Congress became aggressively apparent. When the appointments to the Conference were made, it was no surprise that five out of six were free coinage men, and the sixth a bimetallist.

The selection of the House Members lacked much of the interest attached to the Senate appointments, for several reasons. Representative Hitt, of Illinois, the Republican, favors bimetallism providing it is obtained by international efforts. The two Democrats, Representative Crisp, of Georgia, and Representative Culberson, of Texas, tho called conservative free silver men, are Southern men, and the South is pronounced for free silver. They were all chosen in open House, and with no attempt to favor the selection of a gold man, tho there was the impression that Mr. Hitt represented that side. But it is now very well known that he will stand for bimetallism in the Conference. Mr. Hitt is sixty-one years old, and has served in the House fourteen years. His official life began as First Secretary of Legation at Paris, during which he was for seven years *Chargé d'Affaires*, or Acting Minister. Afterward he was Assistant Secretary of State, and a year later entered Congress, where he has been a leading member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House and part of the time its chairman. Aside from the monetary qualifications, Mr. Hitt's knowledge of foreign affairs, experience abroad and personal intercourse with diplomats make him an accomplished and valuable member of the Conference. Representative Culberson is sixty-five, and has served in the House twenty years. Under Democratic rule Mr. Culberson has been Chairman of the Judiciary Committee. Representative Crisp has just turned fifty. He has been a member of the House twelve years, and Speaker for the past four years. Both Mr. Culberson and Mr. Crisp were in the Confederate Army. They are able, fair-minded men.

In the Senate the appointments were made behind closed doors, in what is termed legislative session, which is quite as secret as Executive session. It now turns out that this secret session was at the request of the gold advocates, who, whatever the motive, insisted upon such secrecy, refusing to commit themselves by "talking in public." Undoubtedly they knew before going in that the vote of the Senate would give the silver men all they asked. And it did—practically without dissent, tho one or two gold Senators went through the form of a feeble protest against the unconditional surrender to the silver men. The three Senate members of the Conference, Senator Teller, Republican, from Colorado, Senator Jones, of Arkansas, and Senator Daniel, of Virginia, Democrats, are all free coinage men. Senator Daniel is the youngest, and is perhaps a trifle more conservative than the other two. He is fifty-three, and regarded as a fine orator, having distinguished himself in that line in the House, where he served two years before entering the Senate, eight years ago.

Senator Daniel is also a ready writer. Senator Jones is fifty-six, and was eight years in the House before entering the Senate, where he has been for ten years. He has been pronounced in favor of free coinage, and during the past session kept steadily to the front with free coinage measures, pressing them with a courage and persistence which gold men declared worthy of a better cause, and finally forcing the vote which placed the Senate on record. All this was in the face of the President's messages, thereby absolutely refusing to support the financial policy of the Administration of his own party. Senator Teller is sixty-five, but looks ten years younger. With the exception of the four years' break in President Arthur's Cabinet as Secretary of the Interior, Senator Teller has been in the Senate nearly twenty years, beginning with the admission of Colorado into the Union. He is a man of marked ability, great earnestness and strength of character, and is easily the leader of the Congressional contingent of the Conference. The Colorado Senator has made an absorbing study of the silver question, devoting almost his whole thought and time to it for fifteen years, until he declares himself that he has no thought or time for anything else, and is scarcely fit for anything else. Senator Teller is one of the calm, strong, broad men of the Senate, as a speaker always forceful, and often impressive. Tho a serious man, he is not without a sense of quiet humor, as the following will show. He was, of course, opposed to the Administration bond syndicate, and this feeling was so intense in the Senate that even the word bond in the Chaplain's prayer had special significance. Chaplain Milburn expects to be re elected, and no doubt will be; but as an assurance of the future he had been looking to his fences by making a little canvass of the Senate. One day soon after his prayer was longer and more fervent than usual, and among other blessings asked for was that the country might be united in the "bonds of peace." Senator Teller, who up to that moment had not seemed particularly interested in Chaplain Milburn's prayer, at once responded in a low tone, as he turned to the Senator at his side: "That settles it. I'll not vote for any man who is in favor of bonds." Among measures passed by the late Congress were the Acts authorizing the appointment of women on School Boards in the District of Columbia; throwing open a part of the grounds south of the White House for children's public playgrounds; and by general agreement relegating Congressional eulogies from delivery on the floor to the printed pages of the *Record*. They are three small things, apparently, carrying no big appropriations, but for good results are sure to grow into importance, and will be heard from later on.

Strange to say, while women are serving on school boards in nearly half the States in the Union, Washington, whose public-school system is second to none, has taken no steps to place women in these positions, which they are so eminently qualified to fill. Now that the National Legislature has authorized such appointments, it appears there never was any law against them. Congressional action is one of cautious limit to two appointments, which indicates the experimental plan of beginning in a small way first. The appointments are to be made by the Commissioners who constitute the Sub District, government, under Congress. There are an unusual number of women in Washington who possess the leisure, together with special fitness for these places, but so far, there has been no "rush for office," and few applications filed. Among prominent women in this connection is Mrs. Helen A. Cook, wife of John F. Cook, Superintendent of the Colored Schools for twenty years past. Mrs. Cook is best known, however, for herself, as she is President of the National League of Colored Women, represented by her at the National Council of Women, an organization which became a member of the Council during its recent Triennial sessions. Mrs. Miranda Tulloch, for many years Treasurer of the Garfield Hospital Association, is also named as one who would be an excellent appointment. Mrs. Tulloch and Mrs. Cook are representative women, property owners, public spirited, and widely known throughout the District. Congress specified no date for making the appointments, and the Commissioners are not inclined to any promptness, giving as a reason for delay press of other matters, which it seems will prevent the consideration of women on the School Board just at present.

On the first of July seventeen acres of beautiful lawn, south of the White House, will be turned over to the children of Washington. This idea of a national playground originated with Senator Gorman, a statesman with a good deal of sentiment who, when a boy, played ball in the President's "back yard." The Maryland Senator, it may be said, entered public life as a page in the Senate; and probably there is not a page in the Senate at this time who does not expect to be a Senator some day. The national playground will be a free-for-all pleasure spot—without regard to race or color, previous or present condition, rich or poor, and includes all ages under eighteen for girls and under twenty-one for boys. It will be subject to such rules and regulations as the Superintendent of Public Buildings and Grounds may prescribe, and for the present, at least while the genial Col. John M. Wilson is Superintendent, the playground will be in good hands. Therefore, Washington children may count on that free, but properly controlled out-of-door life, which cannot fail to make them healthier, happier, and, as a result, better young people, both in thought and action.