AUSTRIA'S EMPEROR, THE MASSES AND THE CLASSES.

His Action in Dissolving Hungary's National Diet the Other Day Not Regarded by "Ex-Attache" as a Piece of Tyranny.

Emperor Francis Joseph's action in dissolving Hungary's national Diet must not be regarded as a piece of tyranny, and the dispatches from Pesth which denounce the step as an attempt on the part of the aged monarch to stifle Hungarian liberty are altogether misleading. The venerable sovereign has no intention whatsoever of ruling without the people. On the contrary, he desires to increase the extent of their voice in the affairs of the nation. Confronted by demands made by the parliamentary majority of the Magyar legislature, which he considered as contrary to the letter and to the spirit of the constitution which he had sworn on June 8, 1867, to observe—demands that he regarded as unjust to more than half of the population of the kingdom of Hungary and as constituting a peril alike to nation and to throne—he has announced his determination of appealing to the whole of his subjects comprised in the Transleithan portion of his dominions. He declined to regard the parliament at Pesth as representing the true sentiments and wishes of the population of the Magyar kingdom in its entirety, in view of the fact that legislative representation is virtually monopolized by 5.25 per cent of the population of Hungary proper, leaving the millions of Croatia and Slavonia with practically no voice at all in the government; and he proclaimed his resolve to grant universal suffrage. Inasmuch as the Hungarians constitute about one-third of the population of Hungary, they objected to this extension of the franchise, and both houses of the Parliament at Budapest pronounced themselves by overwhelming majorities against the scheme. Emperor Francis Joseph declined to yield to their views on the question of franchise, dissolved both houses by imperial decree on Monday last, as he was entitled to do by the terms of the constitution, and is now by means of a proclamation ordering a general election throughout the length and breadth of the land on a basis of universal suffrage. He believes that a Parliament elected thus would represent the views of the nation as a whole, instead of merely a noisy minority thereof. In one word, his present action must be construed as a referendum to the entire people on the demands made upon him by a mere political faction at Pesth. It is an appeal by the Nestor of European sovereigns to the democracy against what can only be described as an oligarchy. And that is why the aristocracy, once the bulwark of his throne, is now found arrayed against it.

Before going any further, it may be well to set forth briefly why Francis Joseph was justified in declining to look upon the Parliament which he dissolved last Monday as representative of the views of the people of the Transleithan moiety of his dual empire. To begin with, the population of the entire kingdom comprises about 19,000,000, and of these less than 7,000,000 are Hungarians. The suffrage has hitherto been restricted almost entirely to these Hungarians, but only to those of them possessed of certain property qualifications. Thus, 1,267,000 are landowners, with at least two acres of land each. Yet more than half of these, or 51.1 per cent, have no vote. Thanks to this, the number of electors is, as I have pointed out above, less than 6 per cent of the population, as compared with 28 per cent in France, while in England one-sixth of the population are parliamentary electors. Of course, universal suffrage will change this condition of affairs in Hungary and will break the legislative monopoly which the rich classes of Magyars have enjoyed until now. In fact, the next House of Representatives at Pesth, elected on a basis of universal suffrage, bids fair to show a very large party, if not a majority, of non-Magyars, added to which there will be a considerable representation of the petty Hungarian landowners, peasants and agricultural and urban laboring masses. Naturally this prospect is gall and wormwood to the Hungarian nobles, small and great alike, who cannot bear the idea that a laborer or peasant should have the same right to vote as the squire or the great landlord. In fact, the Magyar aristocratic classes are so determined to prevent the loss of the virtual monopoly of legislative power which they have enjoyed until now that they are prepared to go any length, short of actual revolution, to prevent it. That, however, their obstruction and animosity will ever develop into an organized armed rebellion, as in 1848, need not, I am convinced, be really feared. For whereas sixty years ago old Kossuth and his fellow patriots championed the cause of the people against the crown, it is the sovereign who today is championing the cause of the downtrodden masses of the kingdom of Hungary against the territorial aristocracy and rich bourgeoisie, arrayed, strange to say, under the leadership of old Kossuth's son Francis. In 1848 and 1849 classes and masses were united in Hungary against Austria and the dynasty. To-day they are lined up one against the other, with the masses in overwhelming majority and strong in the support of the crown. The classes, therefore, cannot afford to go to the length of civil war. They would be crushed.

In all this Austria remains a passive spectator. Although a feeble attempt has been made by Count Apponyi and his fellow Nationalists to represent the course adopted by the Emperor as an attempt on the part of Austria to deprive Hungary of her rights, it has failed to find any echo. The quarrel is a purely Transleithan affair. Of course, the Austrians have their sympathies, and, whereas the aristocracy are inclined to favor their fellow nobles in Hungary and to condemn Francis Joseph for resorting to universal suffrage, the masses in Austria look forward to a victory of the democracy in the Magyar kingdom. And victory is virtually certain. Whether the means adopted by the Emperor in proclaiming universal suffrage are strictly constitutional is a question about which there will always be a diversity of opinion.

The Nationalists hold that Parliament alone had the right to extend the suffrage by means of a law; which, of course, it would never under any circumstances have enacted. On the other hand, the Emperor starts out from the principle that the whole of the government was originally vested in the crown, that the political prerogatives of the people and its admission to a voice in the affairs of the country are concessions by the crown and have been accepted as such, and that this being the case the crown has a perfect right still further to increase the privileges of the people in the way of parliamentary government, no matter how much class opposition there may be to the royal gift. Inasmuch, however, as every parliament once elected represents the national will, as expressed at that moment, and its acts become law when they receive the sanction of the crown, it is difficult to see how any serious issue can be raised as to the legality of the next legislature at Budapest, especially as its existence will rest on much broader foundations than any of its predecessors, namely, the will of the whole people, as expressed by universal suffrage.

How long suffering, patient and liberal Francis Joseph has been in his dealings with the Hungarian "Nationalists," as they somewhat misleadingly style themselves, may be seen by the report published by one of their leaders, Count Andrassy, of his final interviews with the monarch just prior to the dissolution of Parliament on Monday last. The Emperor offered the legislative majority the task of forming a Cabinet, declaring that he would give to the latter, as regards the internal affairs of the kingdom, an entirely free hand. But he declined all concessions of a military character and insisted upon the acceptance of the commercial treaty with Germany which had been negotiated by the crown for both moieties of the dual empire. The Nationalists would only agree to conclude a separate commercial treaty with Germany as an independent state, and solely upon the basis of an independent customs tariff. The Nationalists also made a sine qua non of the grant of their demands on the subject of the army. Realizing that this meant nothing more or less than a repeal of the union of the dual empire, the old Kaiser suggested that the matter should be referred to a new Parliament, elected on a basis of universal suffrage. To the grant of any extension of the franchise the Nationalists showed themselves even still more opposed, and it was then that the Emperor, finding that there was nothing to be done with the Nationalists, with whom he had been negotiating for two years, dissolved Parliament, and made up his mind to proclaim universal suffrage by a decree, and thus appeal to the people against the Nationalists.

It is possible that Francis Joseph might even have been willing to yield in economic matters. But he would not tolerate the attitude of the Nationalists with regard to the army. According to the terms of the constitution of 1867, sanctioned by the Magyar Parliament, the absolute command and control of the Austro-Hungarian army was confirmed in him, legislative rights being limited to the approval or rejection of army credits and to the annual vote for the enrolment of recruits. The organization and direction of the Austro-Hungarian army were left wholly within the discretion of the monarch. It must thoroughly be understood that there is no separate Hungarian army, and never has been since its destruction by the Turks at Mohachs in 1526. When the term of Austro-Hungarian army is used it means that the regular army is the army of the dual empire as a whole, composed partly of Austrian troops and partly of Hungarian soldiers, also of Slovacs, Croats, Bosnians, etc., all united into one compact force under one central organization, headed by the Emperor as generalissimo. It may be added that many of the commanding generals and superior officers are Magyars, Croats or Slovacs. Besides this, there is a purely Hungarian militia, or honved, of no military account, in spite of the immense sums of money uselessly squandered upon it by the Hungarian Cabinet, to which it is subject. What the Nationalists demand is that all the Hungarian troops of the regular army should be banded into a separate and purely Hungarian force, commanded exclusively by Hungarian officers, flying the Hungarian colors, and directed not by the Emperor, but by the Hungarian Cabinet. This, of course, the Emperor cannot and will not grant. Any such concession would constitute a violation of the terms of the constitution of 1867, and would, moreover, not merely impair but virtually destroy for years to come Austria-Hungary's strength as a military power, by entirely disorganizing the imperial army. This would in itself constitute a grave danger to the existence of the dual empire, and the sovereign holds that he would be faithless in his obligations to the nation and to his dynasty were he, by disrupting the army, to render the dual empire defenceless.

Throughout the entire controversy between the Emperor and the Nationalists he has adhered to the terms of the constitution, kept all his pledges, and shown a patience and a breadth of view beyond all praise—the fruits of an experience of more than half a century of active sovereignty. The Nationalists, on the other hand, have again and again broken their promises to him, shifted their ground and submitted new and more nearly impossible demands than those they had clamored for before. That is why popular sympathy ought to be with Francis Joseph in this country. Imbued with fervent patriotism, with a lofty sense of his duty toward his people, and the most complete selfishness, he is championing to-day the cause of the masses against the classes, and that not alone in Hungary, but also in Austria, to which he has resolved to extend a universally equal suffrage. He realizes that he is the father of the whole people, rather than of any particular caste thereof, and, finding that the classes have failed him in his attempts to govern through them, and have stood in the way of his doing his duty to his country, he is appealing to the masses.

EX-ATTACHE.

THE MOTOR, A NEW FACTOR IN ELECTIONS.

Never before has the motor car played such a large part in electioneering. In many cases 90 per cent or more of the electorate recorded their votes in the recent contest, the distant voter hitherto unpolled by either side being brought in by cars and "made to do his duty." Some most amusing incidents have been created by the use of the motor when it has been employed to take yokels to the polling booths.

—(The Sphere.

PARIS ART NOTES.

What May Be Seen at First Exhibition of Water Color Society.

Paris, February 13.

Among the dozen or so of art shows now open, none give evidence of such originality, vigorous impulse or talent as the first exhibition of the International Society of Peinture à l'Eau of water colors and gouaches—at the Gallery of Modern Artists in the Rue de Caumartin. There are only 140 numbers in the catalogue, but this maiden effort of the society gives prominence to foreign painters and marks a pleasing and invigorating departure from beaten paths. The features of the exhibits are strong individualism and diversity of temperament. The president of the new society, M. Gaston La Touche, presents five water color drawings which exemplify more forcibly, perhaps, than any of his well known works the harmony of tones, the brilliancy, the luminous play of light and the vibrating atmospheric effects in which he is unequalled. "The Moonrise Over the Port of Genoa," "The Venetian Fête," and, above all, the "Perfume of the Rose," a monkey squatting on a table, toying with a huge red rose, bathed in light, with a background of the delicate pearl hued, closely drawn blinds of a window, through the slits of which come the rays of a midday sun—is a masterpiece in water color art.

Our countryman, Mr. Walter Gay, for the first time exhibits in water color. Mr. Gay, ever faithful to his "interiors," shows that his dexterity with his new medium is up to his standard in oil. The "Breakfast is Finished" and the "Window" are delightful bits of atmospheric study and coloring. The vivid contrasts in gouaches, executed with remarkable brilliancy by M. Ferdinand Luigini, have the aspect of pastels. In his large water color, "L'Atelier de Brodeuses"—a well lighted, spacious room, in which are seated about twenty sewing girls in perhaps too aggressively radiant gowns—M. Lucien Simon shows that he has not lost the secret of his remarkable technique. M. Stacquet, president of the Royal Belgian Water Color Society, exhibits some views of the "Gilded Houses at Bruges," with a boldness of outline and harmonious reflections of gold upon dark stone, that are keenly appreciated by the French critics. The dancing girls of M. Auburtin—transparent white raiments, skilfully draped, scantily concealing flesh tones, and the whole set forth upon green herbage backgrounds—and the same artist's clever landscapes, supply movement and vivacity to the show. The new society includes among its members, besides those already mentioned, Messrs. John Sargent, Brangwyn, Charles Conder, Franz Charlet, Charles Bartlett, Albert Ludovici, Jakob Smits, Brabazon, Bottini and a few others.

The annual Salon of Women Painters and Sculptors is, as usual, radiant with roses, rhododendrons, lilies, tulips and every imaginable variety of botanic combination. Women and flowers are always appropriately associated together. The works show neither more nor less talent than in bygone years, and once more exemplify the truism that there is no sex in art, and that to group women together in a separate show, besides being illogical, is really detrimental to their own artistic aspirations.

C. I. B.

FREDERICK SAMUEL TALLMADGE MEMORIAL WINDOW.

Just set in position in historic old St. Mark's Church, 2d-ave. and 10th-st. Presented by the Society of the Sons of the Revolution. Mr. Tallmadge was the society's president for twenty years. Heinigke and Bowen made the window.

TO LEARN

FRENCH, GERMAN, SPANISH or ITALIAN

so as to speak it, to understand it, to read it, to write it, there is but one best way.

You must hear it spoken correctly, over and over, till your ear knows it.

You must see it printed correctly till your eye knows it.

You must talk it and write it.

All this can be done best by the

LANGUAGE-PHONE METHOD

With this method you buy a professor outright. You own him. He speaks as you choose, slowly or quickly, when you choose, night or day; for a few minutes or hours at a time.

Any one can learn a foreign language who hears it spoken often enough; and by this method you can hear it as often as you like.

The method has been recommended by well known members of the faculties of the following universities and colleges:—YALE, COLUMBIA, CHICAGO, BROWN, HARVARD, PENNSYLVANIA, BOSTON, PRINCETON, CORNELL, SYRACUSE, MINNESOTA, JOHNS HOPKINS, VIRGINIA, COLORADO, MICHIGAN, FORDHAM, MANHATTAN, DE LA SALLE, ST. JOSEPH'S, ST. FRANCIS XAVIER.

It has been used by nearly nine hundred thousand students, and its use is growing constantly.

We simply ask you to investigate this marvellous system. Mail Free Inquiry Coupon, which will bring you booklet, explanatory literature and fac-simile letters from men who know which will tell you of the great merit of our system; also our special offer to Tribune readers.

Please mail to me full particulars concerning your Phone Language Method of Acquiring French, German, Spanish or Italian. Tribune.

NAME .....

POST OFFICE .....

STATE .....

THE LANGUAGE-PHONE METHOD,

1106F Metropolis Building, 16th st. and Broadway, N. Y.

UNWITTINGLY TEACHING THEIR CHILDREN TO LIKE BEER.

Sending Little Ones to Saloons a Grave Fault of New-York Parents—New Law Needed to Stop the Harmful Practice.

She was a black eyed little Hebrew girl, perhaps seven years old, clad in a torn dress and a pair of shoes several sizes too big for her; and she came out of a liquor store, carrying a brimming pail of beer. The policeman on the corner glanced at her casually, and then resumed his peaceful abstracted contemplation of the most distant vistas. The reporter, who was passing, stepped into the saloon. Five or six men were lolling over the bar, half drunk, and one of them was just finishing a story which it is to be hoped the girl, who must have heard it, was too young to understand. There was a baby boy in the saloon. He could not have been more than three, and a large youth in the corner had him between his knees. The large youth was smoking a cigarette and between whiffs he would take it out and put it to the baby's lips, adjuring the little one to "Draw hard now, Sammy! That's it!"

When the reporter came out, the girl with the beer was still on the pavement, talking to some other children, two small girls and a very small boy. "Gimme a drink," the boy was begging. The little beer buyer hesitated. "It's for supper," she demurred. "My father'll hit me if some of it's gone." But she lifted the pail, and they took drinks from the edge of it, all four of them, by turns.

It is not only on the lower East Side that one may see this kind of thing. There, where the Jews predominate, one finds it less often than one will in some other of New-York's tenement districts. Drunkenness is not a Jewish evil, and also Jews are more careful of their children than some of the other foreign born people. Further up, all around Tompkins Square, where the German immigrants congregate, or over on the West Side, where there is a saloon every other door, children are frequently sent to "rush the growler."

They do not always go into the saloon. "I have often," one district visitor told the reporter, "seen a child outside a saloon with a bucket and a nickel, afraid to go in, and the first man who came along would be stopped with 'Please, mister, won't you get some beer for me?' And the man would probably do it. Did the saloonkeeper understand? Why, of course. Generally there would be a knot of children, and the one with the bucket would give them each a drink from it before going home. I'm laughing," she added; "sometimes it does look funny, but it is not a good thing to see."

STUNTS THEIR GROWTH.

Puritanism is out of date, but yet the average American does not like the thought of a child, particularly a girl child, going to a saloon and learning to tipple beer on the street. Also there is the physical result from this. The manager of a downtown day nursery told the reporter that for a long time she was much troubled about one of her boys because he did not grow. He was thirteen, and no bigger than a child of seven. He never had any appetite, either, for the midday dinner at the nursery. Finally another child, who came from the same tenement house, offered an explanation.

"Otto drinks so much beer at home, he ain't never hungry," she told the nurse, who was ladling out their hot soup.

"Otto, do you drink beer?" the nurse asked.

"Yes, of course I do. But I ain't no drunkard," said young Otto, ready to fight at the notion of the appropriateness of his beer diet being questioned.

This boy may never have been inside a saloon. It may have been only in his home that he had it. That the law cannot touch, but children do learn to drink through being sent for the stuff, and that the law can and does endeavor to prevent. One reason why the law has imperfectly succeeded might be deduced from something the reporter saw and heard in 6th-st. the other day.

A small girl was coming along the pavement with a pail of beer. Two men passed her, well dressed Americans, with keen faces, and one of them remarked to the other, "The saloonkeeper who sold that beer to that child ought to be found and prosecuted." "Oh, well, it's none of our affair," the other man answered. "No," the first one agreed; and they went on their way.

Now, as to the law in this matter, there appears to a lay mind to be enough and to spare, but a recent case seems to show that there is something wrong with it. There are three ways of getting at a man accused of selling liquor to minors. He can be arraigned under the Penal Code of the State of New-York, or under the Liquor Tax law, or under the city charter. There are two sections in the Penal Code, either of which would do. One makes it a misdemeanor to sell or give away any spirituous liquors (tobacco in any form is also barred) to a child under eighteen years old. The other makes it a misdemeanor to admit a child under sixteen to a liquor saloon. Then there is a section of the code under which the parents could be hauled up, the one relating to improper guardianship. "A beautiful section," Justice Olmsted remarked to the reporter one day; "it covers so many things." The language of the Liquor Tax law is plain and direct: "No person shall sell, deliver or give away, or cause or permit to be sold, delivered or given away, any liquors to any minor under the age of eighteen, nor to such minor for any other person."

NEW LAW NEEDED.

But it is characteristic of the law that if there is a weak section in it that section comes to the top. This is what happened in the case of the People vs. Hartstein, about Justice Gildersleeve's decision, on which so much was said. The saloonkeeper Hartstein was brought before City Magistrate Wahle, charged with selling beer to a little girl. It was proved that the child's brother-in-law sent her for it, giving her a ticket for it, and telling Hartstein beforehand that she was coming. The man was held for trial in the Court of Special Sessions under Section 290 of the Penal Code, the one relating to the sale of liquor to minors. The magistrate gave it as his opinion that as the child acted as messenger the beer was sold to her brother-in-law and not to her, which was in line with the Court of Appeals decision in a cigarette case last December; but as the Court of Special Sessions had laid down a contrary doctrine the magistrate felt constrained to hold Hartstein for trial. Hartstein's lawyer, however, had him taken before the Supreme Court on a writ of habeas corpus, and Justice Gildersleeve, concurring in the view of Magistrate Wahle, discharged him.

Justice Gildersleeve told the reporter that he thought a new law was needed. "There was nothing to do but discharge Hartstein," he said, "according to Section 290 of the Penal Code, under which he was held. The child's brother-in-law sent her with a ticket for the beer (it was Saturday, and he was too good a Hebrew to pay money for it that day), and the beer was sold to him through her; it was not sold to her. But the practice of sending children to saloons should be condemned. We need a new law, a simple and direct one, and one broad enough to cover the matter."

"The legislature never did anything in a straight and simple way when it could be done circuitously," Magistrate Wahle said to the reporter, speaking of the liquor-selling to minors statutes. "You don't learn that till you try to administer the law. There are as many laws on a point as there are opinions concerning it, and the usual way is to begin with the oldest and work down. The intent of the law in this matter is to keep the child from drinking spirituous liquors."

WHISKEY FOR A BABY.

"Not to protect it from the saloon atmosphere and what it must see and hear there?"

"The State licenses these places," said the magistrate, "and the State cannot consistently imply that they are morally bad and debasing. No, these statutes just aim to shelter the child from the temptation of drink. The parents don't think of that as a temptation, if they think of it at all, for we must remember that we are dealing with people to whom, as a rule, beer is a more natural and everyday proposition than water. They have drunk it all their lives. Whiskey, too. I had a man working for me a few years ago, a husky Irishman, who told me he had fed his baby whiskey ever since it was two months old. He insisted that the youngster throve on it."

Magistrate Wahle said he had had few cases of saloonkeepers charged with selling to children. "Less than a dozen in the seven months I have been a magistrate. After the man Hartstein was discharged District Attorney Jerome wrote to me," he went on, "suggesting that such cases be tried hereafter under the Liquor Tax law, and that will be done. Still, I think an amendment to the Penal Code would be a good thing, if a simple, straight, comprehensive one could be secured, making the penalty of an infraction fall both on the saloonkeeper and the child's parents or guardians. I think the saloonkeepers themselves would like such a law."

But Dr. David Blaustein, of the Educational Alliance, says that what is needed is not more law in the matter. "With the Jewish people you will not see children sent to saloons as in some quarters, so we don't have that evil so much down here," he remarked to the reporter, "yet only the other day, as I was walking, I think it was on Monroe-st., I saw a little girl come out of a saloon with a pail of beer in her hand. Is a new law required? No. Let the enlightened men and women take hold and resolve that every case they see shall be reported and prosecuted, and the present laws will be adequate."

Mrs. D. M. Cory, secretary of the Club for Political Study, told the reporter that she believed a high license would do more good than any other measure. "I can testify that the law against selling liquors to minors is broken," she said, "for I live opposite a saloon, and I have frequently seen children going in at the side door and coming out with pails of beer. Now, I do not believe the large saloons—the more reputable and well conducted places—will admit children; they would not find that sort of business worth while; and a license high enough to drive out the smaller, cheap, on every corner grogshops would protect the children better than any preventive law can do. These 'No Bar' liquor stores are doing a lot of harm, too, and especially the cheap stores, which sell poison instead of beer and whiskey. Why, they offer 'real sherry for $1 50 a gallon' and 'a dozen bottles of beer for 50 cents.' And workingmen drink the stuff and give it to their children. I believe that we ought to have a government censor of liquors. If beer and wines were all pure they would do little harm. A censor to weed out cheap liquors, and a license that would operate to weed out and limit the places where liquers are sold would protect children, and grown people, too."

NO PLACE FOR CHILDREN.

The better class saloonkeepers avow unanimously that they do not want children to come into their places. "You may depend upon it that they do not," said the Editor of "The Wine and Spirit Gazette." "What does it profit them? And no matter how liberal a man may be, he knows very well that a saloon is no spot for a child. Oh, the little cheap saloons may sell to children, but we take no account of those places. The reputable liquor dealers will oppose no law to keep minors out of saloons; but there are measures enough now. The provisions of the Liquor Tax law on that point cover it entirely and leave no doubt about it whatever."

But Superintendent Jenkins of the Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Children does not trust the liquor dealers. This society has been the chief agent in bringing prosecutions against saloonkeepers caught selling liquor to minors. In 1904 it secured 101 convictions, and a number last year. "I think we need a more comprehensive law on the subject," Mr. Jenkins said to the reporter. "You know there is a bill pending now in the legislature. I think we'll get it through if the liquor dealers don't defeat it."

Some of the members of the committee on children's interests of the New-York Teachers' Association avow that laws do not amount to much, because, they say, the city magistrates are reluctant to hold a voter for trial or hurt his feelings in any way. "I've found too many magistrates no good," said one member of the committee, who refused to have her name used. "I might want something of a magistrate any day, and as I don't wish to render our cause any more hopeless with them than it is already I'll remain anonymous, but I tell you I've seen quite a little of city magistrates in the course of helping to enforce, or to try to enforce, the Compulsory Education law, and we get little aid from them. There are thousands of infractions of that law in the space of a year; we bring hundreds of cases before the magistrates, and we are lucky if we get a score of convictions out of all those cases. Not long ago I heard a magistrate discharge a man (and with a slurring remark about education) who was proved to have kept his twelve-year-old daughter out of school for months. Why he should have been discharged I don't know, unless it was because he was a man with a vote. I'm pessimistic," this teacher added, "about law, whether it's to keep children out of saloons or whatever it is. Making laws is easy; the thing is to get them enforced."

BABIES RUSH THE "GROWLER."

Miss Curry, manager of the Little Missionary Day Nursery on the East Side, has had a pretty thorough experience of tenement children, and has seen a lot of the drink evil. She showed the reporter one heavy eyed little German fellow in the nursery. "That boy is often sent for beer, I know, and given it to drink, too," she said. "It's his father who sends him to the saloon, and his mother tells me that she can't prevent it. But I've mothers, too, who think nothing of having mere babies, just old enough to get through the streets and carry the bucket, go for the family beverage. The other day I went to see a sick woman in 5th-st., and while I was there the woman across the hall came in and asked if Mrs. Schmidt's Harry (who is just six) would go and get some beer for her; she was doing a bit of washing, she said, and her man would be in and want his supper.

"After she had gone out I said to Mrs. Schmidt, 'Now, you aren't going to let that baby go to a saloon and get beer, are you?' She looked at me with the most open eyed surprise. 'Would I refuse a neighbor?' she said. 'When a neighbor iss too busy to go herself for her beer, would I refuse to let my Harry go for her?' Of course, neighborliness is a virtue," Miss Curry added, smiling. "The saloonkeepers," she went on, "are more careful than they used to be, I think, about actually admitting children to their saloons. I have often seen a child stopping at a side door and begging some passerby to go in and get the beer the child had been sent for. But some do go in, and the worst feature is that, whether they go in or not, they are sure to be drinking out of the bucket on the way home. And beer is bad for them. We see the effects of it. The drink evil is the great evil of the East Side, and in my opinion the best cure for it is to teach the women how to cook. Maybe that seems a trivial remedy, but I tell you if I would go to the bottom of things; it would do more to save the children than any law against selling liquor to minors.

"Just think, now. There are many of these men around here who work in the streets, or perhaps down in the manholes; hard, exhausting labor. One of these men gets up in the morning and his wife gives him a cup of bad coffee and a roll, and he eats it, and he wraps up a piece of dry bread and some scraps of unappetizing meat, or something like that, for his luncheon, and off he goes to work. About 10 o'clock he gets hungry; of course, his breakfast was insufficient, and he goes for a pint of beer; 10 cents. Another pint with his luncheon and another in the afternoon—that's 30 cents gone. He comes home to dinner, or supper, rather. He finds the table all dirty, perhaps a litter of old shoes and unwashed dishes on one end of it; and his wife puts down a loaf of bread and some delicatessen stuff on the bare table; and that is his supper.

DRIVES MEN TO DRINK.

"It is housekeeping like that which will make a man so angry that he will, as one of them said to me, 'go out and get drunk for spite.' Or, if he doesn't go out, it is, 'Sammy,' or 'Lizzie,' or whatever the handiest child's name is, 'Go down to the corner and get a bucket of beer.' And the child goes, and the family sit and tipple beer to make up for the bad housekeeping. There is plenty of that sort of housekeeping on the East Side. What we want to do is to go right into those homes, roll up our sleeves, teach the wife to make the table neat with a bit of white oilcloth, show her how to turn 10 cents' worth of meat into an inviting stew, to have a good smell in the rooms when the man comes home. Ten to one he will get so sleepy and contented over the neat table and the good food that he will go to bed without thinking of sending the children for beer or going out himself. Cure the father of wanting his beer, and the children won't be sent to 'rush the growler.' I assure you, I've seen more than one reclamation of a whole family brought about by some cooking lessons."

To go back to the question of laws, Miss Alida Williams, principal of the public school in West 28th-st., made a suggestion which it is to be hoped can be carried out. "I think," she said to the reporter, "that there ought to be a codification of all the laws relating to children; it would make things so much simpler for people who are trying to help them. Perhaps this may be done by the National Children's Bureau, if the bureau becomes a fact. The committee on children's interests of the New-York Association of Teachers, of which I am a member," Miss Williams added, "will do anything it can to help along the passage of laws to stop liquor selling to minors, if more laws are needed. The thought of a child in a liquor saloon is not a pleasant one; though it is a beautiful provision of nature that children are saved by their very ignorance from being harmed by the evil they see and hear, as they would be harmed if they were older. I think the hurt to them is chiefly physical from the beer they learn to tipple. But some of our tenement children are injured by the strong tea and coffee so many of them almost live on, as much as they could be by beer. However, it is certainly not desirable that children should drink beer."