

clusion before the heat of summer had set in. Let Gen. Miles be careful how he plays into the hands of the ring that wants a big army.

Great complaint is made by the Minneapolis Times, because the supreme court of the United States sustains the Mississippi constitution which was intended to disfranchise negroes. "There is no blinking the fact, in the face of this decision," says the Times, "that the United States supreme court is in sympathy with the purpose of the Mississippi supreme court to disfranchise the negro race." But the Times is strangely blind to the drift of things if it has just discovered the tendency to undo the democratic work of the republican party of Lincoln. In Mississippi, Louisiana, and elsewhere in the south, negroes are openly disfranchised; in the District of Columbia, all the inhabitants are disfranchised so as to disfranchise the negroes without seeming to discriminate; Hawaii has been annexed, slave code and all, under circumstances that clearly imply an intention to disfranchise most of the inhabitants. These are but beginnings. For some time a property qualification of the suffrage has been urged; how long is it likely to be, when once the American people become used to a large disfranchised class, before property qualifications will be introduced and extended until the dangerous working class, white as well as black, is denied the right of suffrage? The drift is plain enough. But a few organs of public opinion, like the Minneapolis Times, if they speak out boldly can turn it back. The most dangerous sentiment abroad to-day is the supposition that the republican party of the present is the same republican party that freed the slave and made him a citizen. They are as unlike as are this year's weeds and last year's crop.

The republican party is so enormously good in every detail, so immaculate in all its impulses no less than in all its actions, that we hesi-

tate to call attention to any delinquency. But the disposition which it shows to charge the democrats in congress with having voted last spring against war supplies, because they voted against the republican method of raising war supplies, is altogether too much like common-lying to be allowed to pass unrebuked. The motive of the democrats in voting against the republican method was so apparent that only a liar could charge them with voting against war supplies, and only an ignoramus or a fool could believe that they did anything of the kind. The Congressional Record speaks too plainly upon that subject. It shows that what they voted against was the republican plan of issuing unnecessary bonds and of placing the burden of the war taxes upon the poor and middling classes and allowing the rich to escape. One of the best statisticians of the country, Thomas G. Shearman, has estimated that the republican method of raising war taxes, which the democrats voted against, placed only ten per cent. upon the owners of accumulated wealth, 30 per cent. upon persons who own some accumulated wealth but are chiefly dependent upon their industrial activity for their incomes, and 60 per cent. upon those who have no accumulated wealth and are obliged to do daily work for their daily bread. It was against this discrimination that the democrats in congress voted. The Congressional Record proves it.

In some sort of legal contest in Canada, the particulars and nature of which are not important to the present purpose, it was contended on one side and denied on the other that the right to vote is natural and inalienable. In support of the denial of this contention it was argued that the right to vote is a mere privilege, which has been secured point by point. Of the soundness of this as a technical legal argument, we make no question. It isn't worth while. For law, as has been so often said,

is only a species of force except as it gives expression to natural justice. But as one of the principles which go back of law, giving to it its vitality, the contention that the voting right is a mere privilege is bosh. Men have not been fighting tyranny all these generations for mere privileges. By assailing tyranny they have denied that tyrants are entitled to any privileges, either to keep or to confer. What men have been fighting for and what tyrants have been forced to yield point by point are not gracious privileges, but natural rights. The so-called elective franchise is one of these rights. Some members of the community have secured it, while others have not; but none the less it is a natural right. To those who have it, it is a natural right secured; to those who have it not, it is a natural right still denied.

The reason that the elective franchise so-called is a natural right may be easily explained. There are only two methods of government—by common consent and by superior force. One or both of these is natural. Human nature revolts at the idea of government by superior force. The only natural method, then, must be by common consent. But it is absurd to call that a government by common consent which denies to any one of mature years and sane mind, who has not forfeited social rights by crimes against society, an equal participation in the process of ascertaining the common will. So far from being a government by common consent, such a government would be essentially one by superior force. It follows that such equal participation is a natural right. To deny this conclusion is to assert that government rests at last upon superior force and not upon common consent.

Something entirely unique in the way of a book of bible studies has been prepared by the Rev. James B. Converse, of Morristown, Tenn. Mr. Converse is the author of two or three