

# WASHINGTON SENTINEL.

NO 30

WASHINGTON CITY, D. C., SATURDAY, JANUARY 21, 1899

VOL. XXVI.

Washington Sentinel.

Published and Edited by  
**LOUIS SCHADE.**  
Fred Schade, Business Manager  
APPEARS EVERY SATURDAY.

TERMS  
\$3 per year for single copy sent by  
mail to subscribers, payable in advance.

RATES OF ADVERTISING:  
First insertion, one inch, \$1.50; second  
insertion, 75 cents. Liberal deductions  
made for annual advertisements. Special  
notices 25 cents a line.

Advertisements to insure insertion  
should be handed in not later than 12  
o'clock noon on Thursday.

Office: No. 804 E Street, N. W.,  
Washington, D. C.

Sample copies mailed upon applica-  
tion. Address LOUIS SCHADE, Wash-  
ington, D. C.

Tabulating the Cost.

The figures in Senator Caffery's  
able analysis of "the cost of em-  
pire" are so interesting and im-  
portant that they are well worth  
tabulating.

Mr. Caffery first compared our  
normal budget with the first "im-  
perial" budget:

Expenditures for fiscal year 1897.....	\$36,000,000
Secretary Gage's estimate for the next fiscal year.....	641,000,000
Imperial increase.....	\$275,000,000

After thus showing that at the  
very outset the burdens of Federal  
taxation would be nearly doubled  
on the showing of our imperialist  
Secretary of the Treasury, Mr.  
Caffery went on to itemize the  
annual cost of the Philippines  
alone:

Pay, maintenance and trans- portation of Philippine garrison.....	\$75,000,000
Ditto for extra naval force, according to department estimates.....	75,750,000
Annual charge for enlarging navy (Secretary of Navy's estimate.....)	12,500,000
Pensions due to tropical diseases.....	5,000,000
Fortifications, harbor im- provements, &c.....	10,000,000
Maintaining a civil govern- ment.....	3,000,000
Civilizing the Philippine estimated on a basis of one- third what we spend in that way upon the Indians)	100,000,000
Total annual cost.....	\$221,350,000

Subtracting the highest possible  
figure for revenues to be got from  
the Philippines from the lowest  
figure for revenue we lose by taking  
them inside our tariff wall, Senator  
Caffery showed that we would have  
a net annual loss of revenue of  
\$47,000,000.

Thus, said he, "there would still  
be left over \$200,000,000 a year of  
imperial expenditures raised by  
new taxation from the American  
people.

"If you capitalize \$200,000,000 at  
3 per cent, it represents an addition  
to our national debt of nearly  
\$6,700,000,000. And that is three  
times as large as the total amount  
of the great Civil War debt of the  
United States.

"Is the imperial game worth the  
candle? The total trade of the  
Philippines is about \$30,000,000 a  
year. If we get it all and pay  
\$200,000,000 a year for the privi-  
lege, is it a good bargain?"

Senator Caffery's figures are  
most conservative. His questions  
are therefore in the nature of  
"posers."

The Democratic Attitude.

The Democrats in both the Sen-  
ate and the House are practically  
unanimously opposed to the  
annexation and permanent govern-  
ment of the Philippines by the  
United States.

They stand by our Declaration  
of Independence. They abide by  
the Constitution. They respect  
the traditional policy of the Re-  
public. They are satisfied that  
the control of this continent and  
the domination of this hemisphere  
are enough to keep us occupied  
and to satisfy any reasonable  
ambition for glory. They believe  
contrary to Mr. McKinley, that  
we have unsolved home problems  
of sufficient gravity to tax our wis-  
dom for years to come. They do  
not believe in the "assimilation"  
of 8,000,000 mongrels and savages  
10,000 miles away. They do not  
favor a permanent annual expendi-  
ture of \$200,000,000 to support a  
graft of imperialism upon the Re-  
public.

This position, shared in common  
by Cleveland and Bryan and by  
nearly all the Democrats in Con-  
gress, is creditable to their good  
sense and their patriotism. If only  
party interest were considered the  
Democratic leaders would permit  
the President's absurd and abomi-  
nable imperial colonial policy to

be adopted with simply a protest.  
This would give them an issue for  
1900 that would put all differences  
on other questions out of sight and  
sweep the Republicans from power  
with the force of a whirlwind.

But the Democrats in Congress  
are right in standing firmly against  
this wild scheme of imperialism  
now, so that the nation shall not  
be committed to it. "Our country  
first" is a good motto.

A Colonial Cabinet

The commission which the Pres-  
ident is to send to the Philippines  
is not intended—so it appears—to  
gather and submit information as  
to the desirability of attempting  
the annexation and "benevolent  
assimilation" of this Malay pan-  
demium.

There would have been sense in  
such an inquiry six months ago.  
But the commission now appointed  
—without the advice and consent  
of the Senate—is designed by the  
President to act "as a sort of ad-  
visory board, a local cabinet as it  
were, to live in the Philippines and  
counsel him as to each new step in  
colonial development."

This is beautifully imperial and  
imperialism beautiful. Having as-  
sumed the ratification of the treaty  
before the Senate has acted upon  
it, and having in his proclamation  
to the inhabitants of the Philip-  
pines practically declared war  
against them without the authority  
of Congress, Mr. McKinley is now  
to send a sort of kitchen cabinet  
there as his personal representa-  
tives in the development of his  
colonial policy.

Fortunately Congress is in ses-  
sion, and is unlikely to wait for  
the report of any commission, per-  
sonal or otherwise, before making  
known its purpose, as the repre-  
sentative of the people, not to go  
into any scheme of colonial ex-  
pansion in the Malay archipelago  
—not to follow a war for freedom  
with a war of conquest—not to set  
up a "benevolent" despotism in  
the Philippines.

Mr. McKinley is either dilatory  
or premature.

North Carolina and the Negro.

A bill has been introduced into  
the North Carolina Legislature to  
disfranchise the negro. The Dem-  
ocrats have a big majority, and  
the bill will doubtless be passed.  
It is modeled after the Louisiana  
law.

The committee having the meas-  
ure in charge recently announced  
that it would give the negro lead-  
ers a hearing. Two responded—  
the Rev. R. H. W. Leak, of Ral-  
eigh, and Prof. Crosby. Leak said  
he would be satisfied with anything  
the Legislature might do in the  
matter. "In the South," he de-  
clared, "negroes are allowed to  
work and earn money together  
with whites, but not to spend it  
together; while in the North they  
are not allowed to make money  
together. I like better the condi-  
tions here."

Prof. Crosby is principal of one  
of the seven State Normal schools.  
He said there were 125,000 negro  
voters in North Carolina, of whom  
only 25,000 were qualified to form  
an opinion as to suffrage. "I re-  
gard this solid black vote," he  
asserted, "as a great menace to  
our Government. The negroes  
need, in fact, to be saved from  
themselves."

"You want to disfranchise  
enough negroes to make it cer-  
tain that good government will  
prevail. Do that and stop. Do  
not go to the extent of persecution."

Policy of the Democratic Party.

The attempts of prominent Dem-  
ocrats to define a policy for their  
party in the next national cam-  
paign have attracted some atten-  
tion during the last few weeks. In  
several public addresses Mr. Bryan  
has defended the silver doctrine of  
the platform of 1896, saying that  
it will surely continue to be the  
chief tenet of the party. The offer  
of some who left the party in 1896  
to return upon condition that sil-  
ver shall be dropped and the first  
place be given to a fight against  
trust combinations will not, he  
says, be accepted. If he has his  
way the platform will oppose what  
he calls militarism, the creation  
and maintenance of a standing  
army of 100,000 men, and any pol-  
icy concerning the Philippines  
which does not provide for the in-  
dependence of the Filipinos. It is  
reported that his views were ap-  
proved at a recent meeting of the  
Ways and Means Committee of  
the National Democratic Committee,  
and that the most influential mem-  
bers of the National Committee  
have decided that he should be  
nominated again upon the old sil-  
ver platform, enlarged by the ad-  
ditions which he suggests.

Claude A. Swanson,  
of the Ways and Means Commit-  
tee, an expert in public finance,  
contributes an estimate of the "cost  
of empire" that reaches by differ-  
ent methods the impressive con-  
clusions so ably presented by Sen-  
ator Caffery. He says that after a  
most careful examination he is  
satisfied that that policy prevails  
and we annex and permanently  
hold the Philippine Islands Federal  
taxation will be increased by at  
least \$200,000,000 per year. Many  
persons estimate a much higher in-  
crease. Mr. Edward Atkinson,  
the eminent economist and statisti-  
cian, places the annual deficit  
under existing tax laws, if the im-  
perial programme is to be pursued,  
at \$178,000,000.

The Secretary of the Treasury  
himself estimates a deficiency of  
revenue for the fiscal year ending  
June 30, 1899, of \$112,000,000, and  
for the following fiscal year a  
deficiency of \$30,000,000. In  
making these estimates he antici-  
pates a great increase of revenue  
from customs duties. That antici-  
pation cannot be realized. Last  
year customs duties yielded \$149,-  
000,000. This was \$27,000,000  
less than they yielded the year  
before. Receipts from customs  
have been steadily decreasing  
every year under the Dingley  
tariff. Yet, contrary to this actual  
experience, Secretary Gage esti-  
mates that customs receipts will  
increase to \$195,000,000 next year  
and to \$205,000,000 the year after.

Even if receipts from customs  
were not sure to be decreased by  
the annexation of the Spanish Is-  
lands, there is no reason to expect  
that the present tariff, with its high  
prohibitory rates, will yield over  
\$150,000,000 a year. But the im-  
perial policy must result in a great  
loss of revenue from customs  
duties. The revenue derived last  
year from duties on sugar and to-  
bacco amounted to \$62,000,000.  
With Cuba, Porto Rico, Hawaii  
and the Philippines annexed this  
revenue is lost, and in the next two  
years this will make a difference in  
the Secretary of the Treasury's  
estimated receipts of \$164,000,000.

Add to this loss of \$164,000,000  
the deduction of \$100,000,000 of  
overestimated revenue for the next  
two years, which experience shows  
us will not be collected, for the  
Secretary's estimates are certainly  
\$50,000,000 a year too high for the  
fiscal years 1899 and 1900, and we  
have a total of \$264,000,000 of es-  
timated receipts for those coming  
two years which the Treasury will  
not get. Add this to the Secre-  
tary's own admitted deficit of  
\$124,000,000 for the two years and  
we are confronted with an aggre-  
gate deficiency for those years of  
\$388,000,000, or \$183,000,000 for  
each year. That is a little in ex-  
cess of the yearly deficiency esti-  
mated by Mr. Atkinson.

Mr. Swanson is satisfied, how-  
ever, that the actual yearly defi-  
ciency of revenue under present  
tax laws and with the imperial  
policy prevailing will be much  
larger than this. The Secretary  
of the Treasury estimates a de-  
crease of expenditures for pensions.  
The Spanish war pensioners have  
to be provided for, and the perma-  
nent conquest and garrisoning of  
the Philippines must still further  
lengthen the pension roll. There  
must be a large increase of pay-  
ments for pensions instead of a de-  
crease. He is not prepared to es-  
timate the increase, but it will  
probably run up to \$10,000,000 or  
more a year for the next ten years.

The Secretary's estimates in-  
clude no items for public buildings  
in the new possessions, no expendi-  
tures for fortifications, for river  
and harbor improvements in them;  
none for building roads and provid-  
ing means of transportation in any  
of the islands, which will be indis-  
pensable as a military measure;  
none for building schools and provid-  
ing for the education and civiliza-  
tion of the 9,000,000 of practi-  
cally "untutored savages" who are  
to become our wards in the Philip-  
pines. But all these things will  
surely require large expenditures.  
And when they are all included in  
the reckoning the yearly deficiency  
of revenue, on our present fiscal  
basis, cannot be less than \$200,-  
000,000.

To meet that deficit Federal  
taxes must be increased by about  
50 per cent. Our new possessions  
cannot possibly yield this amount  
of revenue. Spain never collected  
over \$13,000,000 in a year by tax-  
ation from the Filipinos, and the  
United States cannot possibly col-  
lect as much. Spanish taxes and  
the cruel methods of their collec-  
tion would never be tolerated by  
our Government. The Spanish  
export duties, for instance, were  
very heavy. Under our Constitu-

tion there can be no duties levied  
on exports. Even under the exor-  
bitant and tyrannical tax laws of  
Spain the revenues raised from the  
Philippines never yielded the  
Spanish treasury a net surplus of  
more than \$300,000 in a year. We  
cannot collect half as much reve-  
nue as Spain collected, and the  
burden of the enormously in-  
creased expenditure imposed on  
us by the acquisition of the islands  
must be borne by ourselves.

From what sources shall we  
raise \$200,000,000 a year more  
Federal revenue? The Supreme  
Court has ruled out a tax on in-  
comes. Whiskey cannot be taxed  
any higher, for it were it would  
produce less revenue. Tobacco  
cannot be taxed higher without  
impairing the industry. Higher  
tariff rates would yield still less  
revenue. If the tax on beer were  
increased it would not bring more  
revenue, but less.

The deficiency of our imperi-  
al balance sheet can only be met by  
new bond issues, adding \$200,000,-  
000 a year to our national interest-  
bearing debt, or by heavy special  
license taxes on every conceivable  
vacation of the people.

Mr. Swanson is confident that  
when the people understand the  
heavy burden that will be imposed  
upon them by the new imperial  
policy they will be bitterly  
opposed to it.

Eagan Must Pay the Penalty.

Eagan must face a court martial.  
The friendship of Alger will not  
save him. The withdrawal of his  
indecent language will have no  
bearing on the case. The Presi-  
dent cannot refuse to order his  
arrestment. His offense was so  
flagrant that no apology can atone  
for it. His defamation of General  
Miles was malicious and premed-  
itated. He wrote out his coarse  
insults, and furnished the repre-  
sentatives of the press with ad-  
vance copies of his testimony. It  
was his purpose to give them the  
widest circulation.

Eagan's punishment should be  
in keeping with his offense. Noth-  
ing short of his dishonorable  
dismissal from the army will an-  
swer. He has disgraced the uni-  
form he wears, has brought dis-  
credit upon the army, and grossly  
assailed his superior officer, thus  
putting himself beyond the pale  
of sympathy or consideration.

The attack upon General Miles  
is the natural sequence of the treat-  
ment accorded the commanding  
general of the army by the War  
Department. Eagan was no  
doubt encouraged by Alger's at-  
tempts to humiliate Miles and  
discredit his authority during the  
Cuban campaign. But he went  
too far. The immunity that he  
enjoyed under Alger will not pro-  
tect him now.

The matter is in the hands of  
the President, and regard for the  
good name of the army, respect for  
its commanding general and the de-  
mands of an outraged public has  
compelled him to order a court  
martial for Eagan without delay.

Senator Chandler,

whose love for the Boston and  
Maine Railroad is exactly oppo-  
site to the love which Damon bore  
Pythias, has scored a point against  
that road by securing the publica-  
tion of the names of all the persons  
to whom free passes have been  
granted. Mr. Chandler started  
the trouble by making a formal  
complaint against the road last  
summer, and compelled the Inter-  
state Commerce Commission to  
bring his charges to a trial. At  
this hearing the railroad company  
submitted a list of the persons to  
whom passes had been issued, but  
the list remained buried in the  
archives of the commission until  
Senator Chandler secured the pas-  
sage of a resolution directing that  
it be sent to the Senate. So now  
the list appears in Public Docu-  
ment No. 63.

It is a list occupying page after  
page of small type and Mr. Chan-  
dler's heart is doubtless happy be-  
cause, among the beneficiaries of  
the railroad's courtesy are the  
Governor of New Hampshire and  
nearly all of the other officials of  
the State, while the Railroad Com-  
missioners, not only of New Hamp-  
shire, but of all the other New  
England States, are equally well  
provided. The members of the  
railroad committee of the Massa-  
chusetts Legislature are all pro-  
vided with annuals, while clerks  
of corporations, hotel-keepers, and  
all sorts and conditions of men are  
to be found on the list.

Prohibition Laws from the Early  
Ages Down.

BY G. THOMANN.

"As long as he on earth shall live,  
So long I make no prohibition;  
While man's desires and passions stir,  
He cannot choose but err."  
—Goethe's Faust.

Prohibition was first tested in the  
Garden of Eden—and failed. The fall  
of man and his free agency were the  
results. All the imperfections of our  
moral nature are, according to the  
Scripture, consequences of this first  
failure of prohibition; for had not Eve  
plucked and eaten the forbidden fruit  
man would be perfect. As it is, we are  
foredoomed to sin and suffer for sinning,  
but we are free agents.

The term prohibition is not, of course,  
used here in connection with drink,  
although many eminent writers would  
have us believe that the forbidden fruit  
was of an inebriating quality. In prin-  
ciple there is no difference between  
"Thou shalt not eat this" and "Thou  
shalt not drink that." It is sufficient-  
ly significant that a biblical view of  
the matter—and that is the view which  
good Christians as our prohibi-  
tionists are, should take—all human  
misery began with the first failure of  
man to submit to prohibition. And it  
is still more significant that the man  
whom the Creator selected as the  
propagator of his species after the  
deluge, first exhibited the defects of his  
moral nature by drinking to intoxication.

Prohibition and its failure are, then,  
as old as mankind. Intemperance, and  
the law against it are of nearly equal  
antiquity.

That intemperance must have pre-  
vailed to a great extent among the  
ancient Hebrews is sufficiently clear  
from the story the Bible tells us of Lot  
and others, and from the fact that Moses  
thought it necessary to promulgate  
restrictive laws against inebriety.

The Egyptians were strongly addicted  
to the use of wine and beer, and intem-  
perance was common with both sexes.  
At the time of the Pharaohs laws were  
enacted against drinking excesses, and  
it was then the custom to place a skele-  
ton and funeral dirges upon the festive  
board whenever the revelers threat-  
ened to transgress the ordinary  
limits of hilarity.

In the year 2300 B. C., the Chinese  
Emperor Yute banished the inventor of  
rice wine from his realm, and prohibited  
the use of that intoxicant, but without  
success. Grape wine, which was known  
in China as early as 1122 B. C., was also  
prohibited in subsequent centuries,  
partly for economic, partly for political  
reasons—the approval of a lack of cereals  
being at the bottom of the former,  
the fear of revolution at the root of  
the latter. This prohibition, accom-  
panied by the destruction of all vine-  
yards, drove the Chinese people back  
to the use of the stronger rice wine and  
of opium.

Drunkenness was not unknown either  
in ancient Greece or in ancient Rome.  
Lycurgus imagined that he could curb  
the desires of his Spartans by exhibiting  
to them, on fixed days of the year, a  
number of intoxicated islanders, who  
had been made drunk to excess by his  
order. His efforts seem to have been  
put forth in vain, however. In Athens,  
according to the laws of Draco and of  
Solon, death was the punishment of  
those who walked the public streets in  
a state of intoxication. Unlike our  
hypersensitiveness of temperance pro-  
victives, who hold intoxication to be an  
excuse for crime, Pittacus of Mytilene  
caused a double measure of punishment  
to be inflicted for all crimes committed  
under the influence of intoxicants. Plato  
forbade the use of wine by minors under  
eighteen years of age, but granted all  
possible latitude to men of forty years  
of age, to whom he recommended fre-  
quent indulgence, encouraging them to  
abandon themselves to the joys of the  
banquet, to invite Bacchus to partake,  
and bring with him that divine liquor  
which he gave to man as a panacea with  
which to restore the vivacity of youth,  
sweeten the austerity of age, dispel its  
sorrows and mollify its harshness.

The drinking bouts of the ancient  
Romans excelled those of the  
Greeks. That must have been thought  
of drunkenness during the reign of  
Tiberius may be inferred from the fact  
that this emperor, surnamed Bibericus  
(the bibber), appointed Pison Prefect of  
Rome for having passed two days and  
nights with him at the drinking board,  
witnessing the feats of inglorious Novel-  
lus Torquatus, who was surnamed  
Tricongius from his ability to swallow  
three congii (about three quarts) of wine  
in one draught. Long before the reign  
of Tiberius the summary laws had been  
enacted, but they failed to check the evil.

The Gauls were no more distinguished  
for sobriety than their neighbors. A  
radical measure, not unlike that ad-  
vocated by our prohibitionists, was carried  
out under Domitian (in the year 92),  
when the ruler ordered all the vineyards  
in Gaul to be destroyed. Beer then  
again took the place of wine.

The most striking illustration of the  
perniciousness of prohibition is that  
which the history of the Mahometans  
offers. The rigidly faithful observed  
the injunction of Mahomet with refer-  
ence to wine, but their cravings for a  
stimulant led them to the excessive use  
of opium—incomparably more destruc-  
tive of moral and physical well-being  
than the strongest and worst liquors.  
While the faithful obey the prohibitory  
law from religious motives, the un-  
believers ignore it, and resort to innum-  
erable devices by which to evade the  
interdictory decree; and those who  
drink intoxicants must necessarily  
drink them solitarily and in secrecy.  
Morewood, in reviewing the secret  
drinking habits of the followers of  
Mahomet, says: "Where the influence  
of Mahometans has rendered the use  
of intoxicating liquors objectionable  
and penal, this prohibition has tended  
to render men artful and hypocritical.  
Although abstinence from inebriation

is at all times commendable, yet, when  
carried to a complete deprivation, it has  
a contrary effect."

The Germans were hard drinkers at  
all times. The first glimpse history  
affords us of them reveals continuous  
drinking bouts. Nor is there a lack  
of laws against intemperance with them.  
The first restrictive liquor law is prob-  
ably that of the Sævi, directed against  
the importation of wine. After vine  
culture had been introduced by the  
Roman legions into the Rhineland,  
intemperance grew apace; but no  
(81), intemperance grew apace; but no  
(81), intemperance grew apace; but no

laws seem to have been enacted against  
the matter—and that is the view which  
good Christians as our prohibi-  
tionists are, should take—all human  
misery began with the first failure of  
man to submit to prohibition. And it  
is still more significant that the man  
whom the Creator selected as the  
propagator of his species after the  
deluge, first exhibited the defects of his  
moral nature by drinking to intoxication.

Prohibition and its failure are, then,  
as old as mankind. Intemperance, and  
the law against it are of nearly equal  
antiquity.

That intemperance must have pre-  
vailed to a great extent among the  
ancient Hebrews is sufficiently clear  
from the story the Bible tells us of Lot  
and others, and from the fact that Moses  
thought it necessary to promulgate  
restrictive laws against inebriety.

The Egyptians were strongly addicted  
to the use of wine and beer, and intem-  
perance was common with both sexes.  
At the time of the Pharaohs laws were  
enacted against drinking excesses, and  
it was then the custom to place a skele-  
ton and funeral dirges upon the festive  
board whenever the revelers threat-  
ened to transgress the ordinary  
limits of hilarity.

In the year 2300 B. C., the Chinese  
Emperor Yute banished the inventor of  
rice wine from his realm, and prohibited  
the use of that intoxicant, but without  
success. Grape wine, which was known  
in China as early as 1122 B. C., was also  
prohibited in subsequent centuries,  
partly for economic, partly for political  
reasons—the approval of a lack of cereals  
being at the bottom of the former,  
the fear of revolution at the root of  
the latter. This prohibition, accom-  
panied by the destruction of all vine-  
yards, drove the Chinese people back  
to the use of the stronger rice wine and  
of opium.

Drunkenness was not unknown either  
in ancient Greece or in ancient Rome.  
Lycurgus imagined that he could curb  
the desires of his Spartans by exhibiting  
to them, on fixed days of the year, a  
number of intoxicated islanders, who  
had been made drunk to excess by his  
order. His efforts seem to have been  
put forth in vain, however. In Athens,  
according to the laws of Draco and of  
Solon, death was the punishment of  
those who walked the public streets in  
a state of intoxication. Unlike our  
hypersensitiveness of temperance pro-  
victives, who hold intoxication to be an  
excuse for crime, Pittacus of Mytilene  
caused a double measure of punishment  
to be inflicted for all crimes committed  
under the influence of intoxicants. Plato  
forbade the use of wine by minors under  
eighteen years of age, but granted all  
possible latitude to men of forty years  
of age, to whom he recommended fre-  
quent indulgence, encouraging them to  
abandon themselves to the joys of the  
banquet, to invite Bacchus to partake,  
and bring with him that divine liquor  
which he gave to man as a panacea with  
which to restore the vivacity of youth,  
sweeten the austerity of age, dispel its  
sorrows and mollify its harshness.

The drinking bouts of the ancient  
Romans excelled those of the  
Greeks. That must have been thought  
of drunkenness during the reign of  
Tiberius may be inferred from the fact  
that this emperor, surnamed Bibericus  
(the bibber), appointed Pison Prefect of  
Rome for having passed two days and  
nights with him at the drinking board,  
witnessing the feats of inglorious Novel-  
lus Torquatus, who was surnamed  
Tricongius from his ability to swallow  
three congii (about three quarts) of wine  
in one draught. Long before the reign  
of Tiberius the summary laws had been  
enacted, but they failed to check the evil.

The Gauls were no more distinguished  
for sobriety than their neighbors. A  
radical measure, not unlike that ad-  
vocated by our prohibitionists, was carried  
out under Domitian (in the year 92),  
when the ruler ordered all the vineyards  
in Gaul to be destroyed. Beer then  
again took the place of wine.

The most striking illustration of the  
perniciousness of prohibition is that  
which the history of the Mahometans  
offers. The rigidly faithful observed  
the injunction of Mahomet with refer-  
ence to wine, but their cravings for a  
stimulant led them to the excessive use  
of opium—incomparably more destruc-  
tive of moral and physical well-being  
than the strongest and worst liquors.  
While the faithful obey the prohibitory  
law from religious motives, the un-  
believers ignore it, and resort to innum-  
erable devices by which to evade the  
interdictory decree; and those who  
drink intoxicants must necessarily  
drink them solitarily and in secrecy.  
Morewood, in reviewing the secret  
drinking habits of the followers of  
Mahomet, says: "Where the influence  
of Mahometans has rendered the use  
of intoxicating liquors objectionable  
and penal, this prohibition has tended  
to render men artful and hypocritical.  
Although abstinence from inebriation

OUR FOREIGN NEWS.

Translated and Selected from leading  
European papers for the SENTINEL.

ARE THE PHILIPPINE AND CUBAN  
MARKETS TO BE CLOSED TO  
BRITISH MARKETS?

Consular Journal.

Some little while back it was an-  
nounced that the United States had  
decided to adopt the, or rather "a" policy  
of the open door to their newly acquired  
possession of the Philippines, Cuba and  
Porto Rico. This statement, we are  
sorry to say, is by no means so univer-  
sally accepted as it was when first made.  
According to the first reports, the  
United States was to levy the same  
duties on all produce and manufactures  
imported at the islands named, no  
matter what their source of origin.  
According to this statement, the United  
States manufacturers would be treated  
on no more favorable terms than our-  
selves, for example. Cottons would be  
taxed equally, whether they came from  
Manchester or Boston, hardware would  
be taxed at the same rate, whether it  
had been manufactured in the shops of  
Pittsburg or Birmingham. Under the  
circumstances, therefore, it was hardly  
to be wondered at that the citizens of  
the United States did not accept as  
authoritative such an exposition of policy.

Such a procedure, it was argued, was  
altogether contrary to United States  
procedure in general, and if prosecuted  
would prevent the citizens of the repub-  
lic from reaping that commercial advan-  
tage from the conquest of the Navy and  
Army which was their due. In fact, the  
doubt as to the adoption of this policy  
went further; it rapidly grew into open  
hostility and veiled threats of strenuous  
opposition as to what would happen  
were not American goods admitted into  
the conquered islands on more favor-  
able terms than the produce of other  
nations. We are informed, from an  
authoritative source, that the *senes* or  
*demi semi* official announcement of the  
"open door" policy was but a trial flight  
—a rumor purposely set in motion to  
feel the pulse of the American nation.  
If such be really the case, then there  
can be no longer any doubt as to the  
attitude of the people of the Republic upon  
the matter. They are unanimous upon  
the question—quite ready to develop  
and civilize the new possessions—but  
by means of American manufactures,  
&c. Others even go further and hope  
that the policy, from which we stated  
so much, would be altogether contrary  
to the United States Constitution.  
Whether this is really the case we can-  
not say. But at any rate it would now  
appear as certain that imports from the  
United States will be treated on terms  
much more favorable than our own.

This is disquieting in the extreme,  
for we have large business interests with  
the Philippines, Cuba, and Porto Rico,  
as Sheffield, Birmingham, and Man-  
chester well know. And this alarm, on  
the principle that coming events cast  
their shadows before, has already  
communicated itself to British manu-  
facturers, as will be seen from the  
program of the Association of Manu-  
facturers of Commerce meeting to be held  
in March next. At this important gathering  
a resolution will be moved to the effect  
that a memorial be presented to the  
Prime Minister, praying that Her  
Majesty's Government with the Govern-  
ment of the United States, so that British  
manufacturers will not be subjected to  
differential customs and duties, &c.

The fact that this resolution has been  
drawn up, may be taken as proof positive  
that the United States means to secure  
to itself the biggest share possible of the  
Philippine and Cuban markets. Possibly  
we are taking too gloomy a view of the  
situation. To put the most optimistic  
construction, however, upon the present  
position, the outlook is anything but  
reassuring. We have a considerable  
interest at stake and we stand to be  
treated in the same manner as we have  
been in regard to our trade between  
England and the United States.

ENGLAND AND FRANCE.

Daily Telegraph—London, Jan. 5.

France, if we make the considerable  
exception of Paris and the large towns,  
is probably the most conservative coun-  
try in western Europe. The nation as a  
whole has accepted changes of <