

THE GREAT SCANDINAVIAN PARADOX.

Norway and Sweden Appear To Be More Firmly United Now Than They Were Before Their Recent Separation.

Paradoxical though it may appear, Sweden and Norway, now that the Act of Union has been repealed and the separation accomplished between these two nations, so long known as the Sister Kingdoms, are to-day more united than at any time in course of the last hundred years. The present union is no longer compulsory, but purely voluntary on both sides, based entirely upon a community of interests and upon a realization of the necessity of making common cause against danger from without. In the treaty of Karlstad, by which the dissolution of the Act of Union was brought about, no specific clause appears—at any rate in that part of the agreement given out to the public—which binds the two nations to act together in the presence of any peril of foreign invasion threatening either of them. But the entire tenor of the treaty, as published, bears the impress of the existence of an understanding on the part of both Sweden and Norway with regard to this very matter, and there is every reason to believe the report current in diplomatic circles to the effect that there are some secret paragraphs covering just this point, which have been purposely withheld from the people, in order to avoid anything that might be construed in the light of an act of hostility against the one great power which, above all others, constitutes a danger to the independence of both kingdoms. That great power is Russia. She is the sole peril. From no other foreign government have they anything to fear. And that is why the treaty of Karlstad remains silent about the arrangements which have been made with a view to foreign invasion, since these arrangements could be aimed only at Russia, which might easily find therein a cause for offence.

That the danger is a real and present one, far more so than the general public for one moment imagines, may be gathered from the fact that for some weeks past the Czar, who officially describes himself among his titles as "Successor to the Throne of Norway," has been rapidly pouring troops into Finland beyond any apparent requirement even of the admittedly troubled state of that province, which borders, as every one knows, on Norway. Moreover, Russia has remained ominously silent throughout the latest phases of those differences between Sweden and Norway, now happily settled by the treaty of Karlstad—differences which she did much to promote. Indeed, for the last seventy-five years the efforts of Russian statecraft and of Muscovite diplomacy have been directed toward the fostering of trouble between the two kingdoms, and no one can form any idea of the amount of money which has been spent by the Department of Foreign Affairs at St. Petersburg in maintaining a huge horde of agents in Norway whose one duty it was to promote Norwegian ill will against Sweden. They insidiously pointed out how much better off Norway would be as a republic under the protection and suzerainty of Russia than as a dependency—that is the way in which they put it—of Sweden, and week after week newspapers printed at St. Petersburg, with Russian money, were scattered broadcast throughout Norway urging the people to rise against "Swedish tyranny," and assuring them of the good will and the friendship of the Czar. Quite a series of the articles of this kind were signed by Bjornsen, the Norwegian poet and author, who was a resident at the time on the banks of the Neva, and whose statesmanship and political sagacity were in no sense commensurate with his patriotism and literary genius. How much importance Russia attaches to fostering antagonism between Norway and Sweden may be gathered from the fact that she detached M. Zinovieff from his position at the head of the Asiatic division of the Foreign Department at St. Petersburg, where he had in his hands all the threads of Muscovite diplomacy and intrigue all over Asia, to take up the apparently subordinate and insignificant post of Minister Plenipotentiary at Stockholm, whence, of course, he directed the operations of all the secret agents in Norway.

The unfortunate policy adopted by Russia toward Finland since the accession of the present Czar served, however, to open the eyes, if not of the bulk of the people, at any rate of the leading men of Norway, to the value of Muscovite pledges of autonomy to the nations ill advised enough to accept her offers of protection and suzerainty. There is a large Norwegian and Swedish population in Finland, and there is a good deal of maritime trade between the grand duchy and Norway. The sympathies of the Norwegians and Swedes in Finland could not but be with the Finns in the latter's struggle to retain that self-government which had been so solemnly promised to them; and as they made no secret of their sentiments they came in for much of the severity and oppression shown by the Muscovite authorities in the grand duchy. This has contributed in no small measure to modify the views of the Norwegians with regard to Russia, which they have now learned to fear quite as much as do the Swedes.

More than ever is this fear justified at the present juncture. Russia, compelled to renounce the hope of naval, military and political ascendancy in the Far East, and to abandon, for probably half a century to come, every expectation she has had of securing an ice-free port on the Pacific for her trade and commerce, will now be forced, whether she likes it or not, to seek an outlet to the ocean elsewhere, through the Persian Gulf, through the Bosphorus or through one of the Norwegian harbors on the Atlantic. The treaty between England and Japan virtually bars Russia's way to the Persian Gulf, while it is hopeless to expect that the clauses of the Black Sea treaty closing the Dardanelles to ships of war will ever be abrogated, save in the altogether inconceivable eventuality of a Muscovite victory over all armed coalition of the majority of European powers. The energies of a colossal nation must inevitably follow the line of least resistance, and it is certain that that line is in the direction of the Atlantic, and that if the Russian Leviathan is forced to seek a breathing hole—a window upon the outer world and an access to the open sea—it will be nowhere but on the northern coast of Norway.

Russia has on several occasions in the nineteenth century been on the point of invading Norway. When Czar Alexander I acquired the grand duchy of Finland, he found that it was bound by a treaty, some five hundred years old, with Norway, which designated Lyngstuen as the end of the boundary line between the two countries, and this treaty was confirmed in 1826 by the St. Petersburg government, whose plenipotentiaries offered no objection to its provisions. Before Emperor Nicholas I had been very long on the throne he made the discovery that all the bays and fjords on the Russian side of the frontier line on the Atlantic are encumbered with ice from early in October until June, while those on the Norwegian side are virtually ice free. He likewise ascertained that although the Lyngstuen referred to in the treaty of the thirteenth century between Norway and Finland, is on the Arctic Ocean, there was another

Lyngstuen in Norway, near Tromsø—the latter being within thirty miles of the Russian border line and of the place designated as the railroad of the trunk railroad of Finland. In consequence thereof he put forward the altogether extravagant pretension that the Lyngstuen mentioned in the Norwegian-Finnish Treaty, and which had been confirmed in 1826 by his government, was the place of that name in Norway and not the one on the Arctic Ocean. This claim, if allowed, would have given Russia no less than five fjords and ice-free harbors on the Atlantic—namely, Varanger, Tana, Lena, Forsanger and Alta—as well as the towns of Varlo, Hammerfest and Tromsø. Of course, it was denied by the King of Sweden and Norway. But the matter was in no way abandoned, and it was then that the policy was instituted by the St. Petersburg government of flooding Norway with a large army of secret agents, who in the guise of innocent tourists were to promote the ill will of the population against Sweden and to foster friendship for Russia. In some cases their enthusiasm got the better of their discretion, and thus we find in 1840 Count Ungern-Sternberg, of Russia, who claims descent from one of the Biblical three wise men of the East, asserting openly at Tromsø that the place belonged to the Czar. Twelve years afterward the Russians apparently came to the conclusion that the time was ripe for enforcing their pretensions, and with this object in view suddenly decided to abrogate an agreement which had been in existence for a hundred years previously, permitting the nomadic Lapplanders of Sweden, Norway and Finland to cross their respective frontiers without let or hindrance in order to obtain food for their reindeer. The wealth of the Lapps consists mainly in their herds of reindeer, and their nomadic existence is due to the necessity of grazing their cattle, which renders them, of course, indifferent to political frontiers. Russia actually went to the length of pouring troops into Finland on that occasion, with the object of resisting any attempt of the Swedish and Norwegian Lapps to cross the border, and resolved to treat any trespass on Finnish territory as a casus belli. Fortunately for Norway and Sweden, the Crimean War broke out just about that time, and Emperor Nicholas found it necessary to withdraw his troops from Finland for use elsewhere. So acute, however, had been the danger which Norway had incurred of Russian invasion that in 1855 the King of Sweden negotiated a treaty with France, and more especially with England, whereby these two powers pledged themselves to maintain with their armies and navies, if necessary the integrity of the kingdoms of Sweden and Norway. The object of the treaty, as stated in Article II thereof, was to "resist the pretensions or aggressions of Russia," and in return for this promise of protection Norway and Sweden engaged in Article II "not to cede or to exchange with Russia nor to permit her to occupy any part of the territory belonging to the Crown of Sweden and Norway, nor to cede to Russia any right of pasturage, of fishery, or of any nature whatsoever, either on the said territory or upon the coasts of Sweden and Norway." This treaty, drawn up and devised by Lord Palmerston, was announced in the speech from the throne delivered in Parliament by the late Queen Victoria on January 31, 1856, and, although little has been heard of it until a few weeks ago, many, indeed, having forgotten or ignored its existence, it still remains in force. The Convention of Karlstad makes it thoroughly clear that treaties made by the King of

Sweden in his capacity as monarch of both countries remain binding upon each, the only change made being that the one country can no longer be held responsible for the fulfillment of obligations incumbent upon the other country with which it was formerly united by law. Some twelve or fourteen years afterward, when Russia again showed signs of proposing to invade Norway, availing herself of the everlasting Lapplander graving difficulty as a pretext of offence, encouraged probably by the waning health and fortunes of Napoleon III and by the temporary retirement of Queen Victoria from the active direction of the foreign policy of England, the late King Charles of Sweden appealed to old Emperor William for intervention in his behalf. Emperor William dispatched one of his most trusted and capable officers, the late John Jay's son-in-law, General von Schwelwitz, to Norway, Sweden and Finland, for the purpose of making a personal investigation of the stories to the effect that Russia was preparing for a military descent upon Norway. The general, whose widow and son are now in this country, the guests of the venerable Mrs. John Jay, in

New-York, discovered that the statements were only too well founded, and on the strength of his reports Emperor William dispatched him, with a strongly worded letter, to his nephew, the Czar, which had the effect of causing Russia to suspend for a second time the preparations which she was making for the invasion of Norway. It remains to be seen whether Russia will make a third attempt to secure a slice of Norwegian territory sufficiently large to assure her of the possession of a warm water port on the Atlantic, again using the Lapp grazing rights as a pretext. Would England in that case go to the length of declaring war upon Russia to preserve the integrity of Norway? She could not count upon the assistance of France, since the latter is Russia's ally. Great Britain's offensive and defensive alliance with Japan only concerns Asia, and it is more than probable that Germany would side with Russia in any conflict with England. There are plenty of people even in Great Britain who are of the opinion that Russia is entitled to an outlet on the Atlantic, who take the ground that the Russian govern-

ment is powerless to resist popular and economic pressure in this direction, and that it would be a mistake to involve not only England but likewise other of the great powers of Europe in all the horrors of war for the sake of a small strip of territory and an Atlantic harbor in one of the most remote and out of the way places of Europe.

In conclusion it may be stated that although the people of Norway are imbued with most democratic sentiments, differing in this respect from the Swedes, among whom the aristocratic element predominates, yet the leading men of Christianity are virtually decided in favor of electing Prince Charles of Denmark, the son-in-law of King Edward, as King. They are inclined thereto by the belief that England will be more determined to maintain, even, at the cost of war, the terms of its treaty of 1855, if one of its princesses occupies the throne of Norway and another that of Sweden. Then, too, they believe that a monarchy would afford a more stable government, while there is a sentimental reason, moreover, that Norway has until now been able to boast of the oldest monarchical government in Europe. EX-ATTACHE.

RAILWAY RATE PROBLEM.

Suggestions for Solution Found in Conditions in Germany.

Hugo Richard Meyer, assistant professor of political economy in the University of Chicago, has written a book entitled "Government Regulation of Railway Rates," published by the MacMillan Company. Taking up in detail the conditions in Germany, where the railroads have been under governmental control for a quarter of a century, Mr. Meyer reveals many of the obstacles which hamper the government in its endeavor to regulate rates in a manner acceptable to the various parts of the German empire. The natural difficulties of the task are heightened by the constant pressure exerted upon the government by conflicting interests—on one side those whose business would be seriously affected by any reduction in the rates, and on the other side those who are hampered in the development of their resources by an almost prohibitive freight tariff.

The system of tapering rates—that is, rates decreasing proportionately as the length of the haul increases—which is universally in effect where the railroads are in private hands, is not applied in Prussia to such an extent as to make a free interchange of materials between different points in that empire possible. As a result of this the industries in any particular locality are to a great extent protected from the competition of other like industries in other parts of the country. Instead of the rates being so arranged as to afford the empire as a whole the greatest amount of prosperity, each separate district must be regarded as a unit and when any changes in the rates are proposed, with a view to promoting the general welfare, a vigorous protest is raised by those who would be affected thereby.

Owing to conflicting interests it has been found inadvisable to lower the rates on grain transported from one part of the empire to another, but in order to meet foreign competition a substantial decrease was made in the charges on export grain. As a result, since 1885, Germany has afforded the curious spectacle of exporting each year from its eastern provinces to Norway, Sweden and England several hundred thousand tons of bounty fed wheat and rye, while importing at the same time into Prussia, over a protected tariff of 45 marks a ton, nearly three million tons of wheat and rye grown in Russia and North and South America.

The building of canals in Germany is a development of the government's anxiety to solve the perplexing problem of reducing freight rates in a manner acceptable to the different parts of the country, the responsibility being thereby shifted from the government to the private persons carrying on navigation on the canals and rivers. If conditions in Germany are any criterion it would



AFTER THE EARTHQUAKE. HOW THE STARVING PEOPLE ARE FED AT MONTELEONE.

There is, naturally, much terrible distress in the various towns and villages in Calabria, where the earthquake did the most damage. Prompt measures, however, were taken by the authorities to supply the destitute inhabitants with food. Our illustration shows the gardeners at Monteleone distributing bread at the gates of the Prefecture. The loaves are being handed through the bars of the railing, in order that there may be no rush by the crowd.

—(The Graphic.)

POWER OF THE DIRT TRUST.

Charles F. Murphy's Friends Rent Piers Cheaply from the City While Other People Have to Pay Heavy Prices.

one-half to one-tenth what a pier was worth as judged by the prices charged for adjoining wharves. After Seth Low was elected Mayor in 1901 the Tammany Dock Board, realizing that its last chance had come, feathered the nests of some of its members just about as thickly as it was possible. On December 21, 1901, for example, the board leased the dumping privileges and the pier at West 96th-st. for thirty years at \$3,600 a year to John J. Murphy, president of the New-York Contracting and Trucking Company. John J. Murphy is the brother of Charley, and his dummy.

This pier has been a veritable gold mine for the Murphys. It is a half mile away from any other pier, and it is estimated that the profits obtained from it average \$80,000 a year. Of this the city gets only \$3,600. Like piers rent for three to four times as much.

Another illustration of how useless it is for outsiders to try to compete with the New-York Contracting Company, or the "Dirt Trust," is afforded by the way the Tammany boss got the hold of the lucrative dumping privileges at the foot of West 35th-st. for \$2,000, while M. H. Healy, an anti-Tammany man, had to pay \$18,000 for privileges much inferior at the foot of West 30th-st. Murphy made this grab with the help of the present Dock Commissioner in the latter part of last year, and he got the entire south side of the big 35th-st. pier, the rental of which is valued at \$15,000. Mr. Murphy now pays less than one-seventh of this figure. Yet this is not all. The Tammany chief also got 500 feet of space along the river front south of 25th-st. for \$2,200 a year, although it is estimated to be worth \$16,000. The New-York Central for its three piers and 567.8 feet of bulkhead at the foot of 31st, 32d and 33d sts. pays \$61,100. In proportion to what he gets Mr. Murphy pays about one-fifth the rental which the railroad company does.

PINCHING A RIVAL.

To appreciate on the other hand how the Tammany Dock Department can pinch a rival of the "Dirt Trust" one should compare the Healy 30th-st. lease with the Murphy 35th-st. lease. Healy got only 100 feet on the north side of a pier, but he had to pay \$18,000 for it. Yet even this punishment of his competitor did not seem to satisfy Murphy, for Corporation Counsel John J. Delany began proceedings to oust Healy. When it is possible the Tammany boss works things so that he does not have to pay a cent to the city for a pier, but instead turns a balance

into his own pocket. In March of this year Controller Groul learned that the New-York Contracting and Trucking Company had collected from the city \$5,055.79 for dumping ashes at its pier at 70th-st. for a period of little more than a month, ending January 31, 1904. The annual rental which the Murphy firm paid for the pier was only \$4,800. At another time the "Dirt Trust" got from public dumping at the West 70th-st. pier in one week as much as it paid the city in a year for its lease.

Alderman Gaffney, who is Murphy's right hand, and whose stubborn fight against the granting of certain franchises has caused talk that he was after the contracts behind them, is the general manager of the "Dirt Trust." In explaining how the Murphy company ran up one bill against the city he said:

"Woodbury wanted us to help him out when the snow removals tied everything up. We had plenty of business at the 70th-st. pier, but as he wanted us to help him we let him dump ashes and snow at the pier."

Another example of the Dock Department's partiality toward the "Dirt Trust" is afforded by its lease of one half the pier at the foot of East 31st-st. For this half Murphy pays \$900. The other half rents for \$3,000 a year.

The "Dirt Trust" now has five piers at such low rentals and in such strategic places on the waterfront that it has practically shut out all opposition. In fact, many of its competitors have even been forced to use the "trust's" piers, and have had to turn over a part of their profits to the Tammany boss.

a similar pier was rented to Hencken & Co. for \$2,000. By means of a Tammany ally, the Union Ice Company, which was also merged later in the Ice Trust, obtained in November, 1898, the bulkhead in the North River between piers 54 and 55 at a rental of \$1,600 a year. An adjoining bulkhead, however, was rented for \$3,925.

FAVORS FOR FRIENDS.

Murphy's allies in Tammany Hall have also been treated with marked favoritism by the Dock Department. Daniel McMahon, for example, one of the Tammany triumvirate which succeeded the Croker regime and who for a time ruled with Hafsen and Murphy, has made much of his large fortune by paying "cut rates" for docking facilities. In the last month of the Van Wyck administration the Dock Department leased to McMahon a pier at the foot of West 54th-st. for \$1,785 a year, although the adjoining pier rented for \$3,500. The McMahon pier nets a profit of about \$10,000 a year. McMahon also got the bulkhead between 55th and 56th sts. for \$300 a year for three years, or less than a dollar a day. Under the Strong administration this bulkhead was leased for \$2,750 a year.

In contrast with the paltry sums paid by Tammany favorites for piers the rental charged some of the steamship lines seem enormous. Although, of course, most of the piers rented to the big lines are superior to those in the control of the "Dirt Trust" and the various other Tammany corporations, yet their rental is all out of proportion to that paid by the Murphy crowd. The Allan State Line, for example, which is threatening to go to Boston, was asked to pay \$42,000 for the southern half of a new Chelsea pier at West 22d-st. At the present time it leases one-half of a pier for \$40,000 a year. For the new Chelsea pier the Dock Department will take nothing less than \$84,000 each. The Cunard Line now pays \$40,850 for a half pier and \$70,230 for a full pier in the Gansevoort Market section, and the White Star Line near by pays \$85,375 for each of its two full piers.

While the Dock Department has been so solicitous about giving its favorites as much of the waterfront as possible for the least possible rental, it has forgotten the welfare of the general public almost entirely. It has leased so much of the city's pier property to private corporations and Tammany contractors that almost all of the old public piers have been closed. As a result, according to McDougall Hawkes, the Commissioner of Docks under Mayor Low, the cost of living in this city has been greatly increased.

The reason why Mr. Hawkes makes such a

Continued on fourth page.

Dr. Lyon's  
PERFECT  
Tooth Powder  
Cleanses and beautifies the  
teeth and purifies the breath.  
Used by people of refinement  
for over a quarter of a century.  
Very convenient for tourists.  
PREPARED BY  
J. W. Lyon, D.D.S.

appear from the observations of Mr. Meyer that the cries of conflicting interests which are responsible for the conflicting interests of rival producing centres, markets and distributing points, as it is the problem of the adjustment of the conflicting interests of the public and the railways. This is shown conclusively in the experience of the United States where it has not infrequently been easier to effect a compromise between the conflicting interests of competing railways than to reconcile conflicting interests of rival producing centres, markets and distributing points. It is shown even more conclusively by the experience of those countries which have replaced the railway company by the State—that is, have gone over to the State ownership or State regulation of railways. The invariable result in these cases has been the transfer from the field of business to the field of politics the perplexing questions of trade rivalry and jealousy precipitated by the annihilation of distance by means of the railway. Under government ownership or direction the sectional conflicts precipitated by discussion of railway development have oftentimes been so fierce that it has become necessary partially to paralyze the railways for the purpose of preventing them from developing new producing regions, new markets and distributing points.

"Under government ownership of railways in Prussia, the most enlightened and most independent bureaucratic government the world has known, the State Railways Department has endeavored to make railway rates that will permit the surplus grain, timber and beet sugar of eastern Germany to move by rail to the markets of the mining and manufacturing regions along the Rhine, there to compete with the grain, sugar and beet sugar produced in western, southwestern and central Germany."

Under private ownership of railways, Mr. Meyer says, river and canal transportation in Germany had promised to go the way of the stage coach, as in the United States. Yet at the present day Germany, with its agriculture, its manufactures and its trade, rests upon the waterways, not upon the railways, the rights of government made rates have not been reduced to the subordinate position of feeders to the river and canal boats.

In Russia there is the same paralysis of the railways through trade jealousies, with the resulting recourse to transportation by river. Upon the opening of the Siberian railway in 1896 the landed interests of Western Russia paid rates for the wheat raised upon the cheap lands of Siberia. The government accordingly placed a prohibitive charge upon the carriage of this wheat so that it has been impossible adequately to develop the enormous Siberian wheat resources. Wheat is exported from Siberia only in years of serious crop failure in the countries to which ordinarily supply western Europe. The effect of this is, of course, to raise the price of breadstuffs to the laboring classes of the Russian Empire, in the interests of the landed proprietors.

In Australia the same jealousies are apparent, and each colony refuses to co-operate with its neighbors in the promotion of trade and industry. The two most important colonies, Victoria and New South Wales, use railroads of different gauge and raise materially the rates on freight sent from one colony to the other. New South Wales refuses to connect its railway lines in the southwestern part of the colony with the Victorian lines lest trade be diverted from Sydney to Melbourne. As a result of his investigations Mr. Meyer feels that the carriers are best qualified to adjust the matter of rates in such a way as to meet the necessities of commerce, subject only to the prohibitions that their charges shall not be unjust or unreasonable and that they shall not unduly discriminate so as to give undue preference or advantage to persons or traffic similarly circumstanced.

MILLION SOAP BUBBLES AN HOUR.

Big Machine Makes as Many in a Day as There Are Children in United States.

If each boy and girl in the United States should make a bubble some day, the combined number would hardly exceed that produced every day this summer at the Lewis and Clark Exposition by a big machine on exhibition in the Palace of Manufactures, Liberal Arts and Varied Industries.

The soap bubble machine is a double decked contrivance, consisting of two beautifully decorated porcelain bowls of suds, one above the other, surmounted by a plaster fairy. The suds is made very strong. The bubbles are produced by forcing air into the soapy water. A constant flow of air is maintained through pipes, and the bubbles constantly rise and fall in the basins, making a most beautiful effect.

The capacity of the bubble fountain, which is the largest ever made, is 17,000 bubbles a minute. This means 1,068,000 an hour, or 5,040,000 during a nine hour working day. Three-fourths of a pound of soap is sufficient to supply the fountain for two days, making a total of 19,008,000 bubbles.

The bubble fountain is maintained to advertise a well known brand of soap. It is, perhaps, the most interesting advertisement in the Manufactures, Liberal Arts and Varied Industries Building at the exposition, where manufacturers of almost every known commodity have exhibited their wares.—(Washington Post.)

HOW HE KNEW.

It was a beautiful day, without a single cloud in the sky. The man who was buying some food in a delicatessen store remarked on the weather. "Yes, it's fine, but it's going to rain," replied the dealer.

"Impossible," said the customer. "I'll bet you a fiver," said the dealer, "that it rains before the day is over, although I hate to take your money."

The money was put up and the customer went away chuckling.

Before night the rain was falling in torrents. The man who lost the bet stopped at the delicatessen store to see the winner.

"How did you know it was going to rain?" he demanded of the storekeeper. The latter chuckled.

"See that ice chest?" he asked, pointing to a big box in the corner. The customer saw the ice box. It was sweating big drops of water.

"That chest," said the storekeeper, "is my barometer. When there is rain in the air it begins to sweat; when rain is imminent it sheds those big drops you see now. I've had it over two years and it never yet prophesied falsely." "Never too late to learn," sighed the customer, "but sometimes a little knowledge comes high."—(Chicago Inter-Ocean.)