

FASHIONS



Greatly redeeming the scant unfinished look of many of the close, unadorned dress sleeves is the large bertha, cape collar, or epaulette in some form which protrudes beyond the shoulder.

All the shades of purple, mauve, violet, pearly, wisteria and hyacinth are in marked favor, both here and in Paris and London.

Many of the English walking hats and turbans from Paris and London are made of the beautiful, lustrous silk straw—light as a feather in quality, but most effective and stylish upon the head, and exceedingly comfortable as well.

Black and white effects are largely in evidence this spring, both in utility costumes and headwear, and in elaborate evening toilets in which silks, broads, net, laces, chiffon, and very handsome jet garnitures are united.

Very ladylike and elegant do the modest-looking toques, turbans, and English walking hats appear after the reign of the appalling hats of the winter.

Colored fabrics, such as bengaline, Victoria rays, faille, etc., armures, tulle, and other fancy weaves, are contesting for favor with French and English cashmeres, Henriettes, Fayettees, and equally pliable soft-falling materials.

French mohair retains all its acquired popularity for certain uses in the world of fashion; and among other spring materials are found some novel and pretty varieties in serge, armure, basket, trelis, and whip-cord weaves in many stylish patterns, and also in very handsome colorings.

There are several drawbacks to the latest style of dress skirts.

The shelves and counters of importing and retail houses are piled high with light, beautiful woollens for spring dresses.

The newest stuffs are very light in weight, almost like the bunnings, etamines and canvas goods of the summer, but they are fine all-wool goods, and therefore much warmer than one would imagine.

There are many changes in weaving and in colors. The newest stuffs are very light in weight, almost like the bunnings, etamines and canvas goods of the summer, but they are fine all-wool goods, and therefore much warmer than one would imagine.

There are many changes in weaving and in colors. The newest stuffs are very light in weight, almost like the bunnings, etamines and canvas goods of the summer, but they are fine all-wool goods, and therefore much warmer than one would imagine.

There are many changes in weaving and in colors. The newest stuffs are very light in weight, almost like the bunnings, etamines and canvas goods of the summer, but they are fine all-wool goods, and therefore much warmer than one would imagine.

There are many changes in weaving and in colors. The newest stuffs are very light in weight, almost like the bunnings, etamines and canvas goods of the summer, but they are fine all-wool goods, and therefore much warmer than one would imagine.

There are many changes in weaving and in colors. The newest stuffs are very light in weight, almost like the bunnings, etamines and canvas goods of the summer, but they are fine all-wool goods, and therefore much warmer than one would imagine.

There are many changes in weaving and in colors. The newest stuffs are very light in weight, almost like the bunnings, etamines and canvas goods of the summer, but they are fine all-wool goods, and therefore much warmer than one would imagine.

There are many changes in weaving and in colors. The newest stuffs are very light in weight, almost like the bunnings, etamines and canvas goods of the summer, but they are fine all-wool goods, and therefore much warmer than one would imagine.

There are many changes in weaving and in colors. The newest stuffs are very light in weight, almost like the bunnings, etamines and canvas goods of the summer, but they are fine all-wool goods, and therefore much warmer than one would imagine.

There are many changes in weaving and in colors. The newest stuffs are very light in weight, almost like the bunnings, etamines and canvas goods of the summer, but they are fine all-wool goods, and therefore much warmer than one would imagine.

There are many changes in weaving and in colors. The newest stuffs are very light in weight, almost like the bunnings, etamines and canvas goods of the summer, but they are fine all-wool goods, and therefore much warmer than one would imagine.

There are many changes in weaving and in colors. The newest stuffs are very light in weight, almost like the bunnings, etamines and canvas goods of the summer, but they are fine all-wool goods, and therefore much warmer than one would imagine.

There are many changes in weaving and in colors. The newest stuffs are very light in weight, almost like the bunnings, etamines and canvas goods of the summer, but they are fine all-wool goods, and therefore much warmer than one would imagine.

There are many changes in weaving and in colors. The newest stuffs are very light in weight, almost like the bunnings, etamines and canvas goods of the summer, but they are fine all-wool goods, and therefore much warmer than one would imagine.

There are many changes in weaving and in colors. The newest stuffs are very light in weight, almost like the bunnings, etamines and canvas goods of the summer, but they are fine all-wool goods, and therefore much warmer than one would imagine.

ing them, although not a few of their most fashionable patrons have decidedly refused to relinquish the possession of a gown that gently gives evidence of its luxurious lining in its wear.

The new double cashmere is slightly rough on the under side and glossy on the surface. It is quite heavy enough for the present season, which single cashmere is not unless well lined and worn above warm underskirts.

India cashmere being alike on both sides, it is eminently soft, and in black is somewhat dull, but this all-wool variety is everlasting wear and makes up very handsomely no matter how simply trimmed.

Another variety of soft flexible India fabric is covered with the sticky hairs, like an improved camel's hair, but many women object to it on this account.

There are very many women in fashionable life who do not intend to elect the entirely plain straight coat-sleeve for this season at least.

Many of the English walking hats and turbans from Paris and London are made of the beautiful, lustrous silk straw—light as a feather in quality, but most effective and stylish upon the head, and exceedingly comfortable as well.

Black and white effects are largely in evidence this spring, both in utility costumes and headwear, and in elaborate evening toilets in which silks, broads, net, laces, chiffon, and very handsome jet garnitures are united.

Very ladylike and elegant do the modest-looking toques, turbans, and English walking hats appear after the reign of the appalling hats of the winter.

Colored fabrics, such as bengaline, Victoria rays, faille, etc., armures, tulle, and other fancy weaves, are contesting for favor with French and English cashmeres, Henriettes, Fayettees, and equally pliable soft-falling materials.

French mohair retains all its acquired popularity for certain uses in the world of fashion; and among other spring materials are found some novel and pretty varieties in serge, armure, basket, trelis, and whip-cord weaves in many stylish patterns, and also in very handsome colorings.

There are several drawbacks to the latest style of dress skirts.

The shelves and counters of importing and retail houses are piled high with light, beautiful woollens for spring dresses.

The newest stuffs are very light in weight, almost like the bunnings, etamines and canvas goods of the summer, but they are fine all-wool goods, and therefore much warmer than one would imagine.

There are many changes in weaving and in colors. The newest stuffs are very light in weight, almost like the bunnings, etamines and canvas goods of the summer, but they are fine all-wool goods, and therefore much warmer than one would imagine.

There are many changes in weaving and in colors. The newest stuffs are very light in weight, almost like the bunnings, etamines and canvas goods of the summer, but they are fine all-wool goods, and therefore much warmer than one would imagine.

There are many changes in weaving and in colors. The newest stuffs are very light in weight, almost like the bunnings, etamines and canvas goods of the summer, but they are fine all-wool goods, and therefore much warmer than one would imagine.

There are many changes in weaving and in colors. The newest stuffs are very light in weight, almost like the bunnings, etamines and canvas goods of the summer, but they are fine all-wool goods, and therefore much warmer than one would imagine.

There are many changes in weaving and in colors. The newest stuffs are very light in weight, almost like the bunnings, etamines and canvas goods of the summer, but they are fine all-wool goods, and therefore much warmer than one would imagine.

There are many changes in weaving and in colors. The newest stuffs are very light in weight, almost like the bunnings, etamines and canvas goods of the summer, but they are fine all-wool goods, and therefore much warmer than one would imagine.

There are many changes in weaving and in colors. The newest stuffs are very light in weight, almost like the bunnings, etamines and canvas goods of the summer, but they are fine all-wool goods, and therefore much warmer than one would imagine.

There are many changes in weaving and in colors. The newest stuffs are very light in weight, almost like the bunnings, etamines and canvas goods of the summer, but they are fine all-wool goods, and therefore much warmer than one would imagine.

There are many changes in weaving and in colors. The newest stuffs are very light in weight, almost like the bunnings, etamines and canvas goods of the summer, but they are fine all-wool goods, and therefore much warmer than one would imagine.

There are many changes in weaving and in colors. The newest stuffs are very light in weight, almost like the bunnings, etamines and canvas goods of the summer, but they are fine all-wool goods, and therefore much warmer than one would imagine.

There are many changes in weaving and in colors. The newest stuffs are very light in weight, almost like the bunnings, etamines and canvas goods of the summer, but they are fine all-wool goods, and therefore much warmer than one would imagine.

There are many changes in weaving and in colors. The newest stuffs are very light in weight, almost like the bunnings, etamines and canvas goods of the summer, but they are fine all-wool goods, and therefore much warmer than one would imagine.

There are many changes in weaving and in colors. The newest stuffs are very light in weight, almost like the bunnings, etamines and canvas goods of the summer, but they are fine all-wool goods, and therefore much warmer than one would imagine.

There are many changes in weaving and in colors. The newest stuffs are very light in weight, almost like the bunnings, etamines and canvas goods of the summer, but they are fine all-wool goods, and therefore much warmer than one would imagine.

There are many changes in weaving and in colors. The newest stuffs are very light in weight, almost like the bunnings, etamines and canvas goods of the summer, but they are fine all-wool goods, and therefore much warmer than one would imagine.

There are many changes in weaving and in colors. The newest stuffs are very light in weight, almost like the bunnings, etamines and canvas goods of the summer, but they are fine all-wool goods, and therefore much warmer than one would imagine.

There are many changes in weaving and in colors. The newest stuffs are very light in weight, almost like the bunnings, etamines and canvas goods of the summer, but they are fine all-wool goods, and therefore much warmer than one would imagine.

There are many changes in weaving and in colors. The newest stuffs are very light in weight, almost like the bunnings, etamines and canvas goods of the summer, but they are fine all-wool goods, and therefore much warmer than one would imagine.

IN RELIGION'S REALM.

EXPRESSIONS FROM VARIOUS RELIGIOUS NEWSPAPERS.

The Religious Thought of the Day as Expressed in the Secular Press.

"It seems in some quarters to be considered a formidable objection to Christianity," says the "Living Church" (P. E.) of Chicago, "that a great number of men do not believe in it."

"The preaching of St. Paul was to the Greeks foolishness," to the philosophers of Athens he was a babbling "Spermologos"; that is, a superficial gatherer of odds and ends, preaching an incoherent patchwork scheme.

"The preaching of St. Paul was to the Greeks foolishness," to the philosophers of Athens he was a babbling "Spermologos"; that is, a superficial gatherer of odds and ends, preaching an incoherent patchwork scheme.

"The preaching of St. Paul was to the Greeks foolishness," to the philosophers of Athens he was a babbling "Spermologos"; that is, a superficial gatherer of odds and ends, preaching an incoherent patchwork scheme.

"The preaching of St. Paul was to the Greeks foolishness," to the philosophers of Athens he was a babbling "Spermologos"; that is, a superficial gatherer of odds and ends, preaching an incoherent patchwork scheme.

"The preaching of St. Paul was to the Greeks foolishness," to the philosophers of Athens he was a babbling "Spermologos"; that is, a superficial gatherer of odds and ends, preaching an incoherent patchwork scheme.

"The preaching of St. Paul was to the Greeks foolishness," to the philosophers of Athens he was a babbling "Spermologos"; that is, a superficial gatherer of odds and ends, preaching an incoherent patchwork scheme.

"The preaching of St. Paul was to the Greeks foolishness," to the philosophers of Athens he was a babbling "Spermologos"; that is, a superficial gatherer of odds and ends, preaching an incoherent patchwork scheme.

"The preaching of St. Paul was to the Greeks foolishness," to the philosophers of Athens he was a babbling "Spermologos"; that is, a superficial gatherer of odds and ends, preaching an incoherent patchwork scheme.

"The preaching of St. Paul was to the Greeks foolishness," to the philosophers of Athens he was a babbling "Spermologos"; that is, a superficial gatherer of odds and ends, preaching an incoherent patchwork scheme.

"The preaching of St. Paul was to the Greeks foolishness," to the philosophers of Athens he was a babbling "Spermologos"; that is, a superficial gatherer of odds and ends, preaching an incoherent patchwork scheme.

"The preaching of St. Paul was to the Greeks foolishness," to the philosophers of Athens he was a babbling "Spermologos"; that is, a superficial gatherer of odds and ends, preaching an incoherent patchwork scheme.

"The preaching of St. Paul was to the Greeks foolishness," to the philosophers of Athens he was a babbling "Spermologos"; that is, a superficial gatherer of odds and ends, preaching an incoherent patchwork scheme.

"The preaching of St. Paul was to the Greeks foolishness," to the philosophers of Athens he was a babbling "Spermologos"; that is, a superficial gatherer of odds and ends, preaching an incoherent patchwork scheme.

"The preaching of St. Paul was to the Greeks foolishness," to the philosophers of Athens he was a babbling "Spermologos"; that is, a superficial gatherer of odds and ends, preaching an incoherent patchwork scheme.

"The preaching of St. Paul was to the Greeks foolishness," to the philosophers of Athens he was a babbling "Spermologos"; that is, a superficial gatherer of odds and ends, preaching an incoherent patchwork scheme.

"The preaching of St. Paul was to the Greeks foolishness," to the philosophers of Athens he was a babbling "Spermologos"; that is, a superficial gatherer of odds and ends, preaching an incoherent patchwork scheme.

"The preaching of St. Paul was to the Greeks foolishness," to the philosophers of Athens he was a babbling "Spermologos"; that is, a superficial gatherer of odds and ends, preaching an incoherent patchwork scheme.

"The preaching of St. Paul was to the Greeks foolishness," to the philosophers of Athens he was a babbling "Spermologos"; that is, a superficial gatherer of odds and ends, preaching an incoherent patchwork scheme.

"The preaching of St. Paul was to the Greeks foolishness," to the philosophers of Athens he was a babbling "Spermologos"; that is, a superficial gatherer of odds and ends, preaching an incoherent patchwork scheme.

"The preaching of St. Paul was to the Greeks foolishness," to the philosophers of Athens he was a babbling "Spermologos"; that is, a superficial gatherer of odds and ends, preaching an incoherent patchwork scheme.

"The preaching of St. Paul was to the Greeks foolishness," to the philosophers of Athens he was a babbling "Spermologos"; that is, a superficial gatherer of odds and ends, preaching an incoherent patchwork scheme.

"The preaching of St. Paul was to the Greeks foolishness," to the philosophers of Athens he was a babbling "Spermologos"; that is, a superficial gatherer of odds and ends, preaching an incoherent patchwork scheme.

"The preaching of St. Paul was to the Greeks foolishness," to the philosophers of Athens he was a babbling "Spermologos"; that is, a superficial gatherer of odds and ends, preaching an incoherent patchwork scheme.

"The preaching of St. Paul was to the Greeks foolishness," to the philosophers of Athens he was a babbling "Spermologos"; that is, a superficial gatherer of odds and ends, preaching an incoherent patchwork scheme.

"The preaching of St. Paul was to the Greeks foolishness," to the philosophers of Athens he was a babbling "Spermologos"; that is, a superficial gatherer of odds and ends, preaching an incoherent patchwork scheme.

"The preaching of St. Paul was to the Greeks foolishness," to the philosophers of Athens he was a babbling "Spermologos"; that is, a superficial gatherer of odds and ends, preaching an incoherent patchwork scheme.

"The preaching of St. Paul was to the Greeks foolishness," to the philosophers of Athens he was a babbling "Spermologos"; that is, a superficial gatherer of odds and ends, preaching an incoherent patchwork scheme.

"The preaching of St. Paul was to the Greeks foolishness," to the philosophers of Athens he was a babbling "Spermologos"; that is, a superficial gatherer of odds and ends, preaching an incoherent patchwork scheme.

"The preaching of St. Paul was to the Greeks foolishness," to the philosophers of Athens he was a babbling "Spermologos"; that is, a superficial gatherer of odds and ends, preaching an incoherent patchwork scheme.

"The preaching of St. Paul was to the Greeks foolishness," to the philosophers of Athens he was a babbling "Spermologos"; that is, a superficial gatherer of odds and ends, preaching an incoherent patchwork scheme.

"The preaching of St. Paul was to the Greeks foolishness," to the philosophers of Athens he was a babbling "Spermologos"; that is, a superficial gatherer of odds and ends, preaching an incoherent patchwork scheme.

"The preaching of St. Paul was to the Greeks foolishness," to the philosophers of Athens he was a babbling "Spermologos"; that is, a superficial gatherer of odds and ends, preaching an incoherent patchwork scheme.

"The preaching of St. Paul was to the Greeks foolishness," to the philosophers of Athens he was a babbling "Spermologos"; that is, a superficial gatherer of odds and ends, preaching an incoherent patchwork scheme.

"The preaching of St. Paul was to the Greeks foolishness," to the philosophers of Athens he was a babbling "Spermologos"; that is, a superficial gatherer of odds and ends, preaching an incoherent patchwork scheme.

"The preaching of St. Paul was to the Greeks foolishness," to the philosophers of Athens he was a babbling "Spermologos"; that is, a superficial gatherer of odds and ends, preaching an incoherent patchwork scheme.

"The preaching of St. Paul was to the Greeks foolishness," to the philosophers of Athens he was a babbling "Spermologos"; that is, a superficial gatherer of odds and ends, preaching an incoherent patchwork scheme.

"The preaching of St. Paul was to the Greeks foolishness," to the philosophers of Athens he was a babbling "Spermologos"; that is, a superficial gatherer of odds and ends, preaching an incoherent patchwork scheme.

"The preaching of St. Paul was to the Greeks foolishness," to the philosophers of Athens he was a babbling "Spermologos"; that is, a superficial gatherer of odds and ends, preaching an incoherent patchwork scheme.

"The preaching of St. Paul was to the Greeks foolishness," to the philosophers of Athens he was a babbling "Spermologos"; that is, a superficial gatherer of odds and ends, preaching an incoherent patchwork scheme.

"The preaching of St. Paul was to the Greeks foolishness," to the philosophers of Athens he was a babbling "Spermologos"; that is, a superficial gatherer of odds and ends, preaching an incoherent patchwork scheme.

"The preaching of St. Paul was to the Greeks foolishness," to the philosophers of Athens he was a babbling "Spermologos"; that is, a superficial gatherer of odds and ends, preaching an incoherent patchwork scheme.

"The preaching of St. Paul was to the Greeks foolishness," to the philosophers of Athens he was a babbling "Spermologos"; that is, a superficial gatherer of odds and ends, preaching an incoherent patchwork scheme.

"The preaching of St. Paul was to the Greeks foolishness," to the philosophers of Athens he was a babbling "Spermologos"; that is, a superficial gatherer of odds and ends, preaching an incoherent patchwork scheme.

ity, are coming to agree in caring for more than for all the differences that separate them. They agree in their underlying faith—that this is somehow God's world, that it is a world in which it is safe, and only safe, to do right, that its supreme law is good will, that in concrete terms the type of life known as "Christ-like" is the imperative and winning type, to conform to which lifts every soul to a level of being that is God. Here is the consensus of the competent. Here is the common faith of the new century, destined to merge needless and petty denominational lines into a larger unity, as surely as the old provincial and colonial jealousies are already merged in the absorbing and grander life of the nation.

"If we have correctly understood and correctly interpreted the Keswick movement," says the New York "Outlook," "it appears to us that this movement is simply a revival of the Gospel according to John, and according to Paul, and according to Christ himself. All such movements are misinterpreted both by their enemies and by their friends; sometimes by malicious misrepresentation; often by unspiritual misunderstanding; often by unwise advocacy. Such movements are reported by their friends, sometimes in technical language which the uninitiated cannot understand, sometimes with false emphasis, in false proportions, or in false perspective; sometimes by advocates whose enthusiasm is greater than their judgment, and who do not understand how to use the English language. Sometimes, too, the reported facts are distorted with a theology which is unphilosophical and infelicitous. And the living experience misrepresents itself by retaining a philosophy of life which is mechanical and dead. But, making all allowances for these and kindred infelicities incident to all human systems of thought and teaching, the Keswick movement appears to us essentially a revival of the Gospel of faith and hope and love, in a heartfelt reaction against literalism and legalism."

"It is always an advantage to the cause of Christian unity," says the New York "Churchman" (P. E.), "when radicals get their heads fixed with different names strike the same note in prayer and praise on the same day or during the same season. They thus reveal the existence of radical sympathies of which they themselves even may have been hitherto ignorant. In this respect, the narrowness of the church observance of the coming Lent is to be responded to by a series of professedly Lenten services in several New York and Brooklyn congregations who do not profess to follow the Book of Common Prayer, and have no obligation to do so. This fact suggests some reflections. It shows, in the first place, that all prejudices against the Catholic season of self-denial, self-examination, and renewed religious devotion are gradually dying away, and that the barriers which these prejudices rear between different members in the universal church are being removed. This is of itself a most important advance in unanimity and toward unity. It establishes between different religious bodies an essential harmony real, if only partial, in the wide field of religious devotion and worship."

"How mistaken on some points of religion are twelve hundred clergymen of the English Church may be inferred," says the New York "Observer" (Pres.), "from the fact that these high churchmen have united in recommending a return to the old-fashioned worship of the English Church which is not of the children of God, which contains the statement that the Catholic Church is the only abode of the Spirit of God, who, it says, 'does not make His home in any dissenting sect.' This remarkable misstatement is added: 'Sometimes people quarrel with the church and break away from her, and make little shanty churches of their own. We call these people dissenters, and their shanty churches sects.' Those clergymen have not yet learned the A B C of Christianity, which is a system larger than the one book of Anglicans or of Catholics. The Roman Catholic Church is not of that fold. That is a sham church, wherever it is, which fails to illustrate the teaching and spirit of the Master; that is a true church, whatever its particular polity, which holds to the Bible, and by testimony and life interprets Christ to men as Christ taught Himself."

"Two or three of the Congregational and some other papers are not minding their own business in regard to Professor Briggs and our church," observes the "Interior" (Pres.) of Chicago. "For their benefit we will recall that he was expelled four years ago last summer, and ask them how they would look at it and like it if they were in our place. We had a great parliament of religions. The Orientals were here lauding their sacred books literally to the skies—even the Gospels. The Mohammedans were here pointing to a pedestal, and the incense of adulation burned under its bloody hands and demon's eyes. Buddhist and Brahmin and Parsee were here—the latter by a fair shadow of right, for the prophet who created the world was a Jew. A man came on from New York to stand for the Bible, in this great tournament of the sacred books. It was a magnificent opportunity, worthy the effort of a lifetime to any man who was adequate in heart and brain to the occasion. What a splendid speaker he was! He regarded his opportunity. He replied in effect that he did not come to vindicate the Bible, but to exhibit its imperfections—and he proceeded to do so. We were so indignant that for what we said of that speaker some of his friends with much of the same spirit spoke of him as 'the Interior' back at it. What followed? That prince of humbugs and frauds, Vivekananda, rode in triumph all over India proclaiming that the Bible had been repudiated at the parliament by its own champions! That champion was Dr. Briggs. Now, gentlemen, if you force a reason why we have, without compromise, opposed the restoration of that learned gentleman, you have it."

"The fact is that the differences that mostly make sects and denominations have not a longer real existence in religious life, but the want of it," says the "Christian Register" (Unit.) of Boston. "Gather together the saints from all the denominations of America—we mean the men and women of the age—and most vital religious experience and try to discover what they are thinking about, from what sources they derive their life, what the prime articles of their faith are. They are not thinking about the Trinity or everlasting punishment or any other dogma. They do not care to urge upon you the 'What is to be done?' which has hitherto distinguished their church. It is doubtful if many of them would cross the street merely to convert you from your present opinions to theirs. These minor differences concern the shallower minds—and the men of superficial religion. What is to be done? and all the earnest and true-hearted and deeply religious men and women, whose lives go down to the great tap-root of real-

WHAT WAR WOULD COST.

THOUSANDS OF MILLIONS WOULD BE REQUIRED.

Careful Estimates Prepared by Experts—Spain is Already On a War Footing.

Thousands of millions of dollars would be required by both the United States and Spain should these nations become involved in hostilities. "War is the most costly thing in the world," says an eminent authority. At this time it is well to stop and consider just what it means in the way of financial expenditures.

It would cost the United States \$200,000,000 to go to war with Spain, and \$300,000,000 to maintain the war six months.

It would cost Spain a thousand million pesetas—a peseta equals about 20 cents—to go to war with the United States, and fifteen hundred million pesetas to maintain the war six months.

These are conservative estimates, made after talking with those in a position to best judge the cost of a conflict between the two countries. At least the estimates of the cost of a war must be in the most general terms, as all depends upon the scale of preparation, the aggressiveness of the contending parties, and the particular theater of war—whether on land or water. And yet the essential requirements in waging war are readily determined by the familiar military science, and with this goes the experience of our last war, which cost the stupendous sum of three thousand million dollars.

There are veterans in the public service here, such as General Hawley, Chairman of the Senate Committee on Military Affairs; Senator Morrill, who framed the Morrill tariff, which gave the sinews of war in 1861, as well as many army and navy bureau chiefs skilled in the detailed cost of ordnance, equipment, transportation, quartermasters' supplies, and the like. According to General Hawley, the cost of a war with Spain would be \$200,000,000. The basis for the estimate is the cost of the Cuban conflict to the present time. The war budget for 1895-96 was 140,000,000 pesetas regular and 40,000,000 pesetas extraordinary. This has been mounting up ever since, until the cost of the war up to this time is estimated at \$380,000,000, or \$85,000,000 a year. With the increases requisite for a conflict with the United States the cost would be more than double that of holding Cuba, and, by a most conservative estimate, the total of 1,000,000,000 pesetas, or \$200,000,000.

General Hawley mentioned the experience which the last war gave in the measure of cost of war, and many other military authorities base their ideas on the practical experience which that conflict afforded to our own people. It was a lesson not only in the assembling of men and supplies, but in the best methods to be followed in raising great sums of money for emergencies.

OUR EXPERIENCE IN 1861. When President Lincoln called on Congress for 400,000 men, he also asked for \$400,000,000. This was at the rate of \$1,000 for every man in the army. His message to Congress stated also that the sum asked was "less than one-twenty-third part of the money value owned by men who seemed ready to vote their whole." This gives another percentage—one-twenty-third—as a basis of calculation for our own people. It was a lesson not only in the assembling of men and supplies, but in the best methods to be followed in raising great sums of money for emergencies.

Secretary Chase, then at the head of the treasury, estimated \$320,000,000 as the sum required to begin the war. This proved to be short of the requirements. The army appropriation bill passed by the extra session of Congress after the firing on Sumter carried \$207,000,000. The naval appropriation bill carried \$56,000,000. These estimates and appropriations were made, it must be remembered, with no conception of what the war was to be, and with an idea that at most it would close within six months. The first estimates of war are usually under rather than over what the cost proves to be.

With this experience at hand, some general idea can be had of the cost of going to war at the present time. The circumstances are much different, and yet this is the only experience of our own in modern warfare from which lessons can be drawn, and if anything the elements of cost are greater now than then. In a war with Spain the conflict would be essentially different from that between the North and South, in that Spain and the United States would be fighting across an ocean instead of hand to hand in one country.

ESSENTIALLY A NAVAL WARFARE. This would make it essentially a naval warfare, and a war on commerce, and to that extent the elements of cost would be different from land war. But with both countries having long lines of coast to protect, with Cuba as a field of land conflict, the element of providing for the cost of land warfare would be hardly less than that of the marine struggle. Prudence would dictate that the scale of preparation would make into account the possibility, even probability, of Spain's forming alliances with European Powers by which her fighting strength on land and sea would be largely augmented.

With these considerations existing, the cost of going to war with Spain at this time could not be estimated far below the cost when the first crash of arms came in 1861. There would not be the need of the vast land force, at first 400,000 and fast increasing, until the armies exceeded the fabled forces of Xerxes, a million men being in the field at one time. But the manning of ships of war and merchantmen, the assembling of sufficient forces at vulnerable points on our seaboard and borders, would require the men drawn from the field. In the rough general estimate of cost at the outset for the first six months a considerable reduction was made from the first cost in 1861, in order to give a wide margin of conservatism in estimates, although

IT IS BELIEVED THE CIRCUMSTANCES OF A CONFLICT WITH SPAIN AND HER ALLIES WOULD JUSTIFY AN ESTIMATE FULLY UP TO THE COST OF OPENING THE CIVIL WAR.

SPAIN ALREADY ON A WAR FOOTING.

As to Spain's first cost of going to war with the United States, it must be borne in mind that Spain is now practically on a war footing, and has been since the Cuban struggle became serious. The war footing of Spain is 183,972 men, and this footing has been reached, if not exceeded, in Cuba alone. The forces there have fluctuated, but the official figures a year ago gave 121,136 men in Cuba. Adding the reserve force in Spain and those in the Philippines and Puerto Rico, the total is fully up to the war footing of Spain. The same is true of Spain's navy, which is and has been on a war footing. This, then, would give her the advantage of having her organization of war in actual operation, whereas the United States would be precipitated from a state of peace into one of war.

Doubleless a war footing of Spain capable of dealing with Cuba would have to be very materially enlarged in dealing with the United States, but at least it would serve as a nucleus—it would save that extraordinary cost of a first start. Up to this time, however, Spain has known no need of a war footing beyond that above given, which, in detail, is as follows: Infantry 132,000, cavalry 17,156, artillery 2,116, engineers 11,027, staff 11,140, hospital corps 483; total, 183,972.

SPAIN