

responsible leadership, either of the majority or minority, while the heads of the executive department, who might inform the House of the true state and bearings of a measure under consideration, and give some choice and direction to the course of affairs, are excluded from taking any part in the proceedings,—where such an army of legislators without leaders are so engaged, is it wonderful that they accomplish nothing for the country, whatever they do for themselves? And is it surprising that the versatile Washington correspondents of the newspapers, for lack of something better to do, should exercise their exuberant fancy in weaving such baseless fabrications as the news that Mrs. Stanton had written to Miss Cleveland in deprecation of low-necked dresses, and that Miss Cleveland in return had prescribed to her visitors the limit of *decolleté*-ness?

THE organization of Knights of Labour may be said to be the first appearance of political socialism on this continent. Hitherto, while Paris has been in flames, while Carthage has been the scene of a murderous insurrection, while country after country in Europe has been filled, as Belgium is filled now, with confusion and violence, this Continent has been saved by the diffusion of wealth or the hope of wealth, the popular character of its institutions, and the faith of the people in liberty. A period of American history now past witnessed a number of socialistic experiments, on a small scale, between thirty and forty of them, perhaps, in all; but they were non-political and perfectly harmless. They were little Utopias, some economical, some religious, the creations of benevolent enthusiasts or theological dreamers. All failed and perished, except those which, like the Shaker communities and that at Oneida, were both religious and celibate. The celibacy was found essential to their economical existence. Those in which marriage was permitted, and which had children to maintain, spent more than they made by their industry; thus proving that even with a community formed of picked enthusiasts, and under chosen leaders, Socialism has no motive to industry which can supply the place of private property. Not one of these communities ever had the slightest idea of changing the general constitution of society by force, or by political power; they, in fact, for the most part secluded themselves from politics, and they trusted for the propagation of their system solely to missionary effort, or to example. More recently we have had the Trade Unions, which have used political power, though not in a systematic way; but the objects of the Trade Unions have not been socialistic: they have been commercial merely, and confined to the wages question, or other questions incident to the special relation between the wage-earning class and its employers. The objects of the organization of Knights of Labour, though far from being so revolutionary in their character, or set forth in such violent language, as those of the extreme socialists of Europe, are, nevertheless, distinctly socialistic. To check the growth of private fortunes, to prevent any one, if possible, from eating bread except "in the sweat of his face," and to change the social standard and the existing relations between classes, are purposes avowed in the platform of the association. It seeks to abolish public contracts and speculation in land. It also declares war against the authorization of banks, and seeks to compel the Government to issue, "direct to the people" the necessary quantity of paper money which is to be legal tender for all debts. The determination to use political power for the realization of these aims is wrapped up in language somewhat ambiguous as well as grandiloquent; the association is described as "something more than a political party"; but the injunction is clear that "all members shall assist in nominating and supporting with their votes only such candidates as will pledge their support to these measures, regardless of party." Secrecy and obedience are the rules of the Order, as they are those of the Society of Jesus, and of other aggressive associations. The brotherhood can hardly fail in its progress to draw into it the elements of European socialism introduced by immigrants, which lie scattered at Chicago and in other great cities, and abundant experience has shown into what sort of hands secret associations, with aggressive and propagandist objects, are apt to fall. The industrial horizon is already reddened by the flames of industrial war, kindled in many places and trades at once, both in the United States and in Canada, and attended by serious violence in the United States, though by a less degree of it here. Upon us too, at last, the beginning of troubles has apparently come. So far the police and military seem to have done their duty in reasserting order, and confining the conflict to the commercial sphere. It is possible that the enormous extent of the association may prove its weakness, and that the present danger may thus pass away. Mr. Powderly's cry of alarm and agony seems to betoken something of that kind.

In a message lately sent by the President to Congress, respecting the request of the Chinese Government that a candid and friendly consideration

be given to the question of indemnity for injuries inflicted on Chinese subjects in the outrages at Rock Springs, the President seems unfortunately to have adopted to some extent the views of Mr. Evarts and Mr. James G. Blaine. When the Chinese Minister at Washington asked for satisfaction for the murder and pillage committed in an anti-Chinese riot at Denver, Colorado, in 1880, Mr. Evarts, the then Secretary of State, pointed out to him that the United States were powerless in the matter, inasmuch as Colorado was a sovereign State, and the arrest and punishment of the guilty parties concerned the State authorities exclusively; and as to indemnity, he said, that "he knew of no national obligation . . . which rendered it incumbent on the Government of the United States to make indemnity to the Chinese residents of Denver who suffered losses from the operations of the mob." Afterwards, when the complaint was renewed, Mr. Blaine being Secretary, this statesman dismissed the Minister with the characteristic observation that he (the Minister) "would perceive that in no part of the Treaty is there any provision reciprocal with regard to subjects of China resident in the United States." But the President does, however, go a little—a very little—way in the direction of justice, when, in his Message, he tells Congress that this is a matter for their "benevolent consideration." For, considering that the United States Government, in 1858, demanded, and obtained prompt payment of, a money indemnity from China for injuries inflicted on Americans in a riot at Canton, this contra claim would seem to be something more than one for benevolent consideration. Although the Chinese Minister may diplomatically have put it on that footing, it is really a matter of impartial justice. The Chinese residents in the States are, it is true, entitled to no greater protection from outrage than other unnaturalized aliens: if in a riot Chinese are killed, the Chinese Government would have no better claim for indemnity than would the British if the victims were Irishmen. But if the United States people should declare a crusade to drive every Irishman into the sea, as part of them have the Chinese, the case would be somewhat different, especially if, moreover, the right of the Irish to live in the States had been specifically guaranteed by treaty, and further, if the British Government had been obliged to indemnify Americans for lives lost in a riot at Dublin; and this is practically the position China and the States stand in. The treaty between them would appear to give the Chinese, as a strange people, a special claim to the protection of the Government against what is nothing but race hatred; and, at all events, if the amount involved were much larger than what it can now be, it would hardly pay to risk incurring the displeasure and resentment of an important foreign power, or to endanger the national reputation in the eyes of the world, by insisting too punctiliously on legal right. The opportunity is a good one to manifest the American disposition to do what is right, whether legally bound to do so or not; and the question now put to the American people, whether the Eastern sense of justice shall be shown to be superior to the Western, is an appeal which ought to be answered at once, and emphatically.

MR. CLEVELAND'S Message to Congress has been followed by a Memorandum from the Secretary of State, which has had the effect of stopping the consideration of a demagogic anti-Chinese measure, known as the Morrow Bill. In his communication, Mr. Bayard declared this to be a violation of the treaty with China; and the Chinese Minister having informed the State Department that if any supplementary anti-Chinese legislation should be enacted, the Chinese legation may be left vacant, at Mr. Bayard's advice—or, properly, Mr. Cleveland's—the Bill has been practically dropped. The end aimed at by it will, however, now it is thought be sought to be attained by a bill for the abrogation of the present treaty with China; although as to the desirability of this there is a difference of opinion among the Western people most concerned. For while the *San Francisco Post* insists upon the breaking off of all commercial relations with China, on the ground that America is apparently doing a losing business with the Chinese, and while a Stockton (Cal.) mob have been trying to get everybody there to vote for the abrogation, it appears that three-fourths of the flour produced—and largely by white labour—in this very place, Stockton, is shipped to China, and would be without a market if the treaty were abrogated.

AN incident that occurred at Her Majesty's Theatre in London the other night affords a curious indication of that "softening" of the English people which the success of Mr. Parnell's movement, among other things, gives too much reason to believe is going on. In Parliament, quack philanthropists are bringing forward all sorts of schemes for making the rich pay ransom to the poor; and the poor are getting accustomed, through this philanthropic talk, to the idea of being helped like children. They are