

WASHINGTON SENTINEL.

VOL. XXVIII.

WASHINGTON CITY, D. C., SATURDAY MAY 25, 1901

NO 47

Washington Sentinel,
Published and Edited by
LOUIS SCHADE.
APPEARS EVERY SATURDAY.



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

Advertisements to insure insertion
should be handed in not later than 12
o'clock noon on Thursday.
Office: No. 600 F Street, N. W.,
Washington, D. C.
Sample copies mailed upon applica-
tion. Address LOUIS SCHADE, Wash-
ington D. C.

CATHOLICS

Engaged in Liquor Business Barred
From Knights of Columbus.

In the early part of last week the
following despatch was given pub-
licly:

"Saloon keepers or any persons dealing
in any manner with the manufacture or
sale of intoxicating liquors are to be
expelled from the Knights of Columbus
through the enforcement of a rule that
has long been allowed to remain a dead
letter.

Daniel Colwell, national secretary of
the Knights, said in an interview that
three years ago the Order voted to
exclude liquor dealers, but as subordi-
nate lodges recently have paid little heed
to the law the matter is to be taken up
by the national board of directors,
which will meet at New Haven in July.
It is found that liquor dealers are still
members of the order, all such will be
expelled and the offending councils
disciplined.

Later on the following appeared
in the Boston Republic:

Regarding the dispatch from Water-
bury, Connecticut, which stated that
liquor dealers cannot remain in the
order of the Knights of Columbus,
Supreme Knight Edward L. Hearn said
that there was no truth in the story.
"I don't know how it happened that
such a statement originated from Water-
bury. Since reading it I have been
trying to think of some prominent knight
who resides there, but have been unable
to do so.

"No, it is not true that every liquor
dealer must get out of the order. Nei-
ther is it true that the district deputies
have been instructed to forward the
lists of liquor dealers who have joined
since June 1, 1898. If any such in-
structions had been issued I think I'd
know about it.

"We have been regulating the admis-
sion of liquor dealers into the order and
they have been organized. I have no
reason to think that these laws are not
being lived up to.

"Our restrictions applied to those
liquor dealers whose application for
membership came after June, 1898, and
we have no official knowledge of any
liquor dealer applying for membership
since that date.

"I do not think it is the policy of the
Knights of Columbus to authorize to
make any such statement. It is attributed
to Secretary Colwell."

From Supreme Knight Hearn's
communication, then, it appears
that saloon keepers who joined
previous to June 1, '98, will not be
expelled, and that since that date
they have been debarred from ap-
plying.

When the above items appeared
in print curiosity was aroused to
know how far this action of the
Knights of Columbus (which is a
Catholic organization) reflected the
attitude of the Church towards those
engaged in the liquor busi-
ness.

Among those familiar with the
policy of the Church on this ques-
tion considerable surprise was ex-
pressed. That Church has always
commended to its membership the
practice of temperance in all
things—Prudence, Justice, Forti-
tude and Temperance are its Car-
dinal Virtues. Total abstinence
has been advocated by some of its
clergymen. Only last week an
entire congregation in Wilkes-
barre, Pa., was pledged to abstain
entirely from the use of intoxicat-
ing liquors, but no one who took
this pledge believed, and certainly
the clergyman whose work for a
year had been directed towards
this end did not proclaim, observa-
nce of it to be an article of faith
in the Church.

It was known too that the Plenary
Council of Baltimore had recom-
mended its communicants so
employed to withdraw there-
from as early as possible. So far
as known, however, that council
has never threatened with expul-
sion from the Church those who
refused to obey, or determined to
refuse admission to its pale there-
after to liquor sellers. And to this
day the recommendation has re-
mained simply a suggestion with
never an attempt to go farther or
to give it any other significance.

Regarding the sale of liquor, as
we understand it, the policy of the
Catholic Church has always been
to recognize and uphold the laws
governing the traffic laid down by
States or municipalities. Where-
ever licensed, it has held the busi-
ness to be a legal one, and where-
ever forbidden it has recognized it
as illegal. At all times and places

it has counselled its members to
obey the laws, rarely—and then
only in the case of individuals—
undertaking to assist in their mak-
ing.

If evil has come from over indul-
gence in liquor the impression is
general that the Church holds that
responsibility therefor rests with
the drinker, not the sellers. The
latter do not stand on the street
corners and pull men into their
places. If a man enters and drinks
the act is a voluntary one on his
part and he should assume the
consequences of it.

The position of intolerance as-
sumed, then, by the Knights of
Columbus towards saloon keepers
and others is inexplicable from the
well known attitude and policy of
the Church itself. Of course, no
one will dispute the right of a soci-
ety to prescribe qualifications for
membership. But when it says
that Catholics only shall be admit-
ted, and then bars from its ranks,
because they are engaged in the
manufacture or sale of liquors, men
whom the Church itself acknowl-
edges to be Catholics, it certainly
exposes itself to the imputation of
inconsistency, in a way assumes
the role of censor towards the
Church, and justifies one in asking
whether the organization is an ad-
junct of the Catholic Church or
the Prohibition Party.

The Knights of Columbus is a
growing organization, founded, we
presume, for good purposes, and
capable of good. If it is intended,
however, to limit its membership
to Catholics, as we understand it,
it would seem reasonable and proper
to require qualifications for en-
trance such as the Church demands
of its communicants. But to re-
fuse admission to a class whom the
Church gladly receives, to say the
least, is a reflection upon the char-
acter of the latter's membership.

The SENTINEL will not be under-
stood as holding the Church re-
sponsible for this discrimination.
Its policy is too well defined to ad-
mit of misconception. It does
think, however, that a body claim-
ing to be Catholic is unworthy of
the name when it displays such a
spirit of intolerance and unchari-
tableness towards so large and
reputable a number of their fellow
church-men.

If there are objectionable per-
sons among brewers, distillers and
others connected with the manu-
facture and sale of liquors, with
whom affiliation is undesirable,
their exclusion could be secured
in other ways than by this whole-
sale and unjust denunciation of a
business—a denunciation which
finds no parallel in the history and
traditions and teachings of the
parent body.

"Hauling Down the Flag" in Honor

After a nine months' sojourn in
Peking the American troops last
Wednesday, says the New York
World, "hailed down the flag"
and departed, leaving a small legat-
ion guard behind. And instead
of fierce denunciations of "the im-
pious hands" that dare to "haul
down the flag" there are only ex-
pressions of pride and satisfaction.

Alter Mr. McKinley had repaired
his initial blunder in announcing
an aggressive policy in China—
and he speedily reversed himself—
his Chinese policy has been flaw-
less. It has been patterned closely
upon Washington's ideal of a for-
eign policy—"setting an example
of an exalted justice and benevo-
lence."

With the cordial co-opera-
tion of Gen. Chaffee and his
officers and men, Mr. McKinley
has made the Chinese feel that
their suspicion and hatred of for-
eigners ought not to include the
people of the Great Republic.
While the soldiers of the other
civilized powers have been looting,
burning, abandoning themselves
to gross and bloody appetites, the
soldiers of the Republic have been
conducting themselves like gentle-
men and men. While the govern-
ments of the other civilized pow-
ers have been going through
China's pockets like so many high-
waymen, the Administration of the
Republic has been protesting
against outlawry and doing all in
its power to shame and persuade
the others to a course of decency
and civilization.

MME. RIGO, formerly Mme. de
Riquet, Princess de Chimay, be-
fore that Miss Clara Ward, of
Detroit, the beautiful and eccentric
young American girl who de-
serted her husband, Prince de
Chimay, for a gypsy musician,
whom she had met in Europe, was
declared a spendthrift and incap-
able of managing her property in
the Probate Court at Chicago last
Wednesday.

MR. BRYAN'S

Utterances Are Comforting to Re-
publicans.

In the course of a speech deliv-
ered at Nevada, Mo., and ostenta-
tiously reprinted and paraded by
the Republican newspapers, Mr.
William Jennings Bryan is re-
ported to have said:

For Democratic principles we had
a hard fight in 1896, a harder one in 1900,
and I believe the hardest fight is to come
in 1904 to keep those principles to the
front. Being unable to win in an open
fight, the reformers resort to fraud
and deceit. Were they to prepare a
platform and submit it to a primary
voice of the Democracy, they would
scarcely carry a precinct in the United
States, but they work in the dark and
are backed by the great Democratic
daily newspapers and all the corporate
interests of the country. They are be-
coming formidable. The trusts have
more power in the party today than they
have had at any time since 1896. The
men who went out of the party in 1896
are now shouting harmony and trying
to wreck the Democratic party from
within.

It is easy to see, says the *Courier*
Journal, why the Republican
newspapers are delighted by such
an utterance and why they herald
it broadcast—they feel that as long
as Mr. Bryan continues to be ac-
cepted as the spokesman for Dem-
ocracy they have a sure thing of
it—but the extract, quoted above,
furnishes Democrats themselves
food for thought.

Let us take it apart and examine
it, point by point, with the purpose
of ascertaining precisely what it
means and portends, and whether,
if it be heeded by any considerable
body of the party, it would lead us
to "we" made a hard fight in
1896 "for Democratic principles"—
that is, the Chicago platform—
"a harder one in 1900"—that is,
the Kansas City platform—and if
"the hardest fight is to come in
1904, to keep those principles to
the front"—we are given to under-
stand that nothing will satisfy Mr.
Bryan, except the continued re-
surrection of what he calls "Demo-
cratic principles," that is, two
times beaten and discredited plat-
forms—to the end of time, or, as
long as he lives.

He is to be the sole judge and
arbitrator. Disobedience to the law
he lays down is treason. The dis-
cussion of other policies is "fraud
and deceit." But, whom can Mr.
Bryan mean by "they" who "work
in the dark," and are "backed by
the great Democratic daily news-
papers," loosely labeled the "re-
organizers?" In a general way he
describes them as "the men who
went out of the party in 1896," and
against whom he levels the accusa-
tion that they "are now shouting
harmony and trying to wreck the
Democratic party from within."

This is extraordinary language
—most extraordinary. Scarcely
one of those "who went out of the
party in 1896," remain; upon the
scene of political activity, certainly
none of the prime movers. But,
suppose they did remain upon the
scene? Was it "fraud and de-
ceit" in them to help elect Carter
Harrison Mayor of Chicago, Tom
Johnson Mayor of Cleveland, and
Rolla Wells Mayor of St. Louis?
Mr. Bryan seems to think so, for
he deplores at least the election of
Rolla Wells with its rescue of St.
Louis from the grip of a corrupt
Republican Ring. If it be "wreck-
ing the Democratic party from
within," to beat the Republicans
and to achieve Democratic victo-
ries, what may it be to encounter
successive Democratic defeats,
with no other compensation than
Mr. Bryan's assurance that
"though beaten, we were right,"
and that "all will yet be well,"
cold comfort to the myriads who
did not wholly agree with him and
followed him for the sake of party
regularity, and to a receding not
to a rising vote.

But, according to Mr. Bryan's
dictum, "the trusts have more
power in the party today than they
have had any time since 1896,"
which is merely to say that to differ
with him is to bring upon one the
ascription of having sold out to
the trusts, and that unless a public
man, or a daily newspaper wears
the chalk mark of his approval, it
is a secret enemy of Democracy,
working "in the dark" and im-
pliedly for pay "to wreck the Dem-
ocratic party from within."

These are serious charges. If
they be true they imply a greater
degree of turpitude in human na-
ture than we have commonly at-
tributed to it; because who but the
basest wretch would call himself a
Democrat and vote and work with
the Democrats having the secret
purpose to "wreck the Democratic
party?" Such a man, or news-
paper, must be the direst villain
alive; yet, Mr. Bryan hurls the
charge indiscriminately at all who
venture to question the infallibility
of the two last Democratic plat-

forms and refuse further blindly to
follow a plan of campaign leading
as they conscientiously believe to
perpetual defeat.

Are we then so poorly off, and
is the future so hopeless? Must a
great party three years in advance
of its next National Convention
suspend all effort to strengthen its
lines, deny itself any and every
opportunity to take advantage of
such circumstance as may come to
it, and submit itself unreservedly
and absolutely to the word as it
issues from Mr. Bryan's tongue,
or pen?

If Mr. Bryan meant not this, he
means nothing. If he does not
mean it, he exposes himself to the
suspicion of having lost his reason;
because, not merely is the Demo-
cratic party not a one man party,
but the implications he raises as
to newspapers and individuals are
not true and cannot be made good.

There are millions of Democrats
who, although not of his way of
thinking, have yet followed him
through two disastrous Presidenc-
ial campaigns, hoping against
hope, but brave and loyal to the
end. There are hundreds of thou-
sands who could not follow him in
1896, who yet accepted his candi-
dacy in 1900, because they were
Democrats, and not Republicans,
and believed him an honest man.
On the line of those disastrous
campaigns these will follow him
no further than their judgment
conceives to be wise and prudent.
Nor should he ask, or expect them
to do so. He has had his inning
and has failed. He should yield
the bat to other hands and give
the game a chance. It comes with
bill grace for one who has been
given his way, and made such poor
accounting, to denounce discus-
sion as treason and to stigmatize
all who do not agree with him as
traitors; and, in view of this, the
rank and file of the party may well
ask themselves whether they may
not have in 1904 to reckon with a
dog in the manger and, being ad-
vised in advance, whether they
will not prepare to cut their sticks
accordingly.

Gen. Fitz John Porter.

A brilliant military leader with
all the honors due a brave soldier
was the climax of the career of
Gen. Porter, which at one time was
blasted by his being court mar-
tialled and cashiered from the
army. Gen. Porter died last Tues-
day.

Major Gen. Pope made a dis-
graceful failure of his Virginia
campaign of the summer of 1862.
To shield himself and his coterie
of officers he attributed his misfor-
tunes to Porter, charging him with
cowardice and deliberate disobe-
dience of orders. At the time
feeling was high between the vol-
unteer officers and the "West
Pointers." Porter was a West
Pointer. In face of his splendid
record in the Mexican war, in face
of his gallantry and skill up to
Aug. 29, 1862, in face of clear
proofs that he was not guilty of
Pope's charge, in face of the fact
that evidence was offered to the
court showing that Porter's troops
were engaged with the enemy at
the very moment when Gen. Pope
was ordering him to take up an-
other position, in face of the fact
that he saved Pope's army from
destruction on Aug. 31 and was
one of the heroes of Antietam, the
court martial found him guilty,
almost sentenced him to be shot,
did sentence him to disgraceful
dismissal from the army and to the
civil disabilities of a convict.

A partisan battle raged round
Porter, and for twenty years he
was as odious to the American
people as Dreyfus is to the French
people today. In the *North Amer-
ican Review* for December, 1888,
Gen. Grant published under the
title "An Undeserved Stigma" a
complete retraction of and apology
for his own denunciations of Porter
and declared that he was abso-
lutely innocent. The official re-
action had begun in 1879, when a
board of army officers appointed
to review the case reported the
proof of the crime against Porter.
But even with Gen. Grant on Por-
ter's side the popular reaction was
so slow that not until 1886 was
Porter officially vindicated by Con-
gress.

And at the present day many
thousands who believed the origi-
nal falsehoods and prejudiced
statements, indorsed as they were
by so many eminent men, speak
of Porter as a traitor.

Like England's hideous injustice
to her Admiral Byng, shot because
popular clamor demanded it; like
France's injustice to Dreyfus, this
tragic wrong to a man than whom
the Republic never had a braver
or more faithful servant teaches
sundry lessons, whereof one is the
lolly and hypocrisy of interna-
tional pharisaism.

INVENTION'S

Rapid strides in the Past Hundred
Years.

By Patrick O'Farrell.

The century just closed stands
out pre-eminently as the century
of invention, and the year 1900 as
the banner year in the Patent
Office.

The inventive genius developed
in the United States within barely
a generation may be ascribed to
the originality of the American
people, coupled with the stimulus
of great financial rewards guaran-
teed by favorable legislation.

The American patent system,
which had its birth one hundred
years ago, has witnessed a wizard-
like transformation in mechanical
appliances, in the utilization of na-
ture's forces, and in all the conven-
iences and accessories of life. It
we consider the stride from the
primitive plow, with which the an-
cients tilled the soil, to the mar-
velous farm implements of today;
from the burnt brick libraries of
Babylon and Nineveh to the superb
treasures in movable types and
sumptuous binding that stand
piled tier on tier in our magnificent
Congressional Library and many
other extensive libraries through-
out the country, we may truly
realize how the world has pro-
gressed. Yet the most wonderful
part of this advancement has been
made within the period just men-
tioned.

During that time we have had
the discovery of the telegraph, the
electric light, and all the various
uses of electricity. Within the
same period we have seen the evo-
lution of the printing press from
the clumsy hand lever contrivance
of Franklin's time, to the marvel-
ous Hoe machine which prints and
folds 75,000 copies of a complete
eight page paper in an hour. In
that time the locomotive engine,
the steamboat and the luxurious
sleeping car have supplanted the
primitive modes of travel which
preceded them, and we have ad-
vanced from the old spinning
wheel to the wonderful weaving
looms and knitting machines of
the present day.

Besides all these we have had
the discovery of the telephone,
which conveys the human voice,
in conversation, hundreds of miles;
the phonograph, which records
the sound of the voice and repeats
its tones at the will of the operator;
the sewing machine and the type-
writer, which revolutionized meth-
ods in important branches of busi-
ness, and even the convenient little
lucifer match which replaced the
flint and friction. Let any man
try to imagine the condition of life
and society if these patented dis-
coveries had never been made, and
he will measurably appreciate the
benefits of the system that inspired
them.

The first patent law was enacted
April 10, 1790, and under it the
Secretary of State, the Secretary
of War and the Attorney General
were the tribunal to determine the
question of granting a patent. It
was not until July 16 of that year
that the first patent was issued,
which was to Samuel Hopkins for
a new method of making pot and
pearl ashes. Since that date more
than 700,000 patents, besides thou-
sands of trademarks, prints and
labels, have been granted. Under
the law of 1790, which remained in
force until February 19, 1793,
only 57 patents were issued, and
the latter date a new act effecting
some modifications was passed,
which stood until 1836, when the
great law that really created the
American patent system and
marked an epoch was enacted.

Under the old English system a
patent was simply a grant from the
Crown, and the patent was not
even prima facie evidence of nov-
elty, so that the inventor had to
maintain his rights as best he could
in the courts. The American laws,
previous to 1836, were afflicted
with similar defects, but under the
new acts of that year the Patent
Office was given quasi judicial
as well as executive functions, the
patent being adjudicated upon in
advance, and possessing, as soon
as granted, the attributes of a pat-
ent which, under the old system,
had been tested by expensive liti-
gation. Thus the patent acquires
an immediate commercial value,
and thus, under the stimulating
effect of fostering laws and large
profits, inventive genius has been
developed and great results have
been achieved.

From three patents in 1790 there
was a growth of 700,000 patents in
January, 1901, and where one hun-
dred years ago Franklin, a man of
science, was content to leave the
printing press as he found it, and

as Gutenberg had left it three hun-
dred years before, the last hundred
years had seen it advanced to one
of the most marvelous mechanisms
in the age of wonders. And where
a century ago the workman and
the artisan were satisfied to jog
along with such crude implements
and methods as were at hand, to-
day he is alert and thoughtful,
looking to the attainment of better
instrumentalities and a higher
plane of action.

Much Hange on Austria's Aged
Emperor's Life.

Americans, say many foreign
thinkers with some truth, rarely
apprehend accurately the trend of
Continental politics. They are not
directly interested in them, they
know little of the persons who
guide them, and they have a trick
of missing the points which to all
who observe more closely causes
uneasiness. Just now, for instance,
they fail to perceive why the life
of the Emperor Francis Joseph of
Austria is considered by most
statesmen outside of England of
such supreme importance. They
recognize, it is conceded, that on
his death a difficult time might
arise for Austria, but do not recog-
nize that on its occurrence ambi-
tious may spring up which, un-
less the Kings set themselves reso-
lutely against them, may once
more throw Europe into the melt-
ing pot, and produce a strife which
would put the whole Continent
back for half a century. We have
not much belief in cataclysms,
especially cataclysms which are to
shake Europe out of forms that
have been slowly crystallizing for
many centuries, but as there is no
doubt that these tears are sincere,
and are entertained in France and
Germany as well as Austria, it may
be worth while to state briefly in
what they consist. Briefly, then,
the idea is that should the present
Emperor pass away, or become for
any reason unable to retain his
position as ultimate referee of all
his subjects, the Hapsburg Domi-
nion may be, not broken up as many
Englishmen expect, but parti-
tioned. The attraction for all Ger-
mans of the new Germany, with its
splendid prestige, its commercial
activity, and its vivid Emperor, is,
they say, underrated. The Ger-
mans of Austria feel that they have
an alternative, and rather than lose
their old ascendancy or be gov-
erned by clerically minded states-
men with Slav proclivities, they
may accept it. They may, that is,
invite the German Empire to re-
ceive Bohemia and the German
States of Austria into its fold, prob-
ably on Bavarian terms. Then the
fat would be in the fire. The Ger-
mans would be unable to resist a
temptation so great to become the
strongest people in the world,
Russia would demand "compensa-
tion" in Poland, and the French,
unable to endure an aggrandize-
ment of Germany which would
forever reduce themselves to a
second-rate position, would ally
themselves with the house of Haps-
burg for a great war, which would
end, whatever its result, in a re-
modelled Europe. In all proba-
bility, the house of Hapsburg, as
Prince Bismarck once predicted,
would be thrown violently east-
ward, finding its centre in Buda-
Pesth, France would be still fur-
ther diminished, and Germany and
Russia would be left standing face
to face as the two grand military
empires of the world, one Teu-
tonic, the other Slav, with the
future in their hands.

Exited to America.

Prince Bernard William George
Hermann and his wife, the Prin-
cess, have been exiled to the United
States from Weisbaden by the
youthful Grand Duke William
Ernest of Saxe-Weimar, who re-
cently succeeded his grandfather,
the venerable Grand Duke Charles
Alexander.

The Duke is acting under the
dynastic law, which permits him,
as the head of the house, to send
out of the country members of his
immediate family or kinsmen
under certain circumstances. He
has decided that the Prince and
Princess must live in the United
States, and has made them a rea-
sonable allowance for their main-
tenance, provided they conform to
his wishes.

The Prince and Princess are not
living in the domains of the Duke.
Nevertheless, for various reasons,
they will obey his mandate.

The expulsion of the royal pair
grows out of the fact that the
Prince is, because of his marriage
in London last year to a woman of
low estate, a constant embarrass-
ment to German royalty. The
Princess was the widowed Count-
ess Lucchesini, and her mistone
lies in the fact that she was the
daughter of a Lubbeck hotel keeper
named Brockmueller.

FOREIGN NEWS.

Translated and Selected from leading
European papers for the SENTINEL.

ENGLAND.

The Morgan Leyland "Deal."

London Daily Telegraph, May 1.

Is the whole British Empire to be
bought up or bought out by American
millionaires? This or something like it
is suggested by the purchase of the
Leyland Line of steamers, which may
be regarded as practically effected by
Mr. Pierpont Morgan and his friends.
The shareholders are not likely, any
more than their chairman, to refuse an
offer which means the payment down of
more than the market price of a property
exceptionally subject to depreciation in
capital value, and at the commencement
of another period of depression in freight
returns. It would be idle to blame them
for closing with the bargain. But the
very fact that American syndicates can
buy in our most prosperous interests
upon terms irresistible to ourselves, and
can still see their way to make their
own money, is the really serious matter
for thought in this sensational deal.

After a sweeping *coup de main* by
which one of the most important of our
merchant fleets is about to be transferred
in a mass to Transatlantic ownership,
we may well ask ourselves what position
on the whole field of British commerce
can be considered secure from the
enveloping strategy of the Napoleon of
finance. The organizer of the Steel
Trust must be admitted after his latest
feat in a series of colossal transactions
to have acquired a better claim to the
title of the Bonaparte of trade than any
other figure who has appeared in mod-
ern industry.

Mr. Pierpont Morgan proposes to
acquire an appreciable percentage of the
total quantity of British shipping by a
stroke of the pen at a cost of £1,750,000.
The sum seems large, relatively to the
old world ideas we have not yet shaken
off. But that is precisely our weakness.
To the promoters of the Billion Dollar
Trust, based upon something like a
capital of £250,000,000, what are a
couple of millions sterling, more or less?
They become drops in the bucket; and
this is the point of view which must
enable us to realize, as we have not yet
done, the enormous measure of the
forces with which we are contending, to
reckon where American competition is
concerned. We are asked, indeed, to
take comfort from the statement that
there is no present intention to interfere
with the British register of the Leyland
vessels, or to withdraw them outright
from the Union Jack. We shall be ex-
ceedingly foolish to be lulled, so far as
our national interests are concerned, by
an argument of that sort. * * *

America has superseded our agriculture,
beaten our coal output, left us far and
away behind in the production of iron
and steel, passed us at last in the total
volume of exports. She has only com-
menced her final onslaught upon our
carrying trade, and with these begin-
nings we may wonder if such things are
done in the green tree what shall be done
in the dry?

London Daily Chronicle, May 1.

Mr. Pierpont Morgan's visit to En-
gland is clearly intended to be nothing
if not sensational. The prime mover in
the famous, and still somewhat mysteri-
ous, deal is Mr. Morgan, and he is ap-
parently buying up a British steamship
line. * * * So far as any contemplated
or possible transfer of British merchant
fleets from our own shores to America
is concerned, there is probably no great
reason for alarm. Even the American
millionaire has his limitations, and we
do not anticipate that the Leyland deal,
if it should be completed, will be fol-
lowed by many more deals of the same
kind. But it is impossible to look with
satisfaction or equanimity on the recent
rapid development of these American
trusts, rings or syndicates, whichever
name may suit them best. Within the
memory of most of us, the millionaire
on whom our forefathers looked with
foreboding has been succeeded by the
multi-millionaire, and he, in his turn, has
given place to the combination of multi-
millionaires, until we have really some
reason to feel nervous over the conceiv-
able developments of unbounded and
cooperative wealth.

The State of Affairs in Pretoria.

Die Post.

An interview with a Boer who re-
cently arrived from Africa in the *Pon-
tobro Castle*—
Very little is known in Pretoria of the
state of the war. In Lord Roberts time
there was much less secrecy, and life
generally was a good deal more pleas-
ant. Officers led an easy life, their wives
came out to visit them, there were picnics
and tennis parties as if the war was over.
Lord Kitchener put an end to all this—
the ladies were sent back to Capetown
and the officers to the front. Strict silence
was kept as to the movements of troops.
Still there was nothing to remind one of
actual war but the long line of white
tents outside the town packed with sick
men, and the enormous graves, in which
often as many as 300 corpses were buried
at the same time (sic).

The attitude of "Tommy" towards
the Boegers left nothing to be desired
—and the soldiers paid for everything
they took; but their purchases are not
extensive as their wages are something
less than a Kaffir's.

The spirit of the army is best illus-
trated by the proceedings at the de-
parture of the New Zealanders. They
had been given so many promises of
dismissal, promises which were not kept
that they became desperate, and Kitch-
ener thought it best to talk to them
personally. At the end of his speech
he said, "Any one who leaves the regi-

ment in order to return to Australia
(sic) is a coward." The colonel's only
reply was, "Forward, quick march!"
and the regiment marched away, and
the English papers were full of the most
glowing descriptions of the admiration
which the New Zealanders feel for
Kitchener.

The Boer women continue to maintain
a most irreconcilable attitude towards
us, in spite of all prohibition they continue
to wear the Transvaal colors. One of
them was had up before Lord Roberts
for so doing; she drew a revolver,
pointed it at him, and asked if she
required a permit for that also. The
noble Lord was much discomposed and
called for help. On the occasion of a
distribution of the Victoria Cross we
were told that some African ladies
would pin the medals on the heroes'
breasts; but when it came to the point
we did not see any ladies at the cere-
mony.

A good story is told of a "Bushman's
Corps." The owner of an hotel at
Piensa's river who was furiously angry
with the Boers, because, as he said