

that are to take part in the international naval review in New York harbor this week. In connection therewith the present Christopher Columbus, otherwise and more generally known as the duke of Veragua, is in Washington with his wife and daughter, as official guests of the United States. Today the duke and his party were formally received by President and Mrs. Cleveland, and on Wednesday they will go to New York with President Cleveland and his cabinet, where they will enjoy the honor of being the only foreigners aboard of the U. S. S. Dolphin, on which the President and cabinet will perform their part of the official ceremonies at the review.

### ARIZONA RELICS.

There are a good many natural curiosities to be seen in Arizona; indeed, in places the country seems to be a vast museum of the antique and unusual in nature, this not only as to geological features but in many places as to the flora and fauna also. It is not generally known hereabout but is given out as a fact that one of the most curious and interesting formations in rock in the world is to be seen a short distance east of the stage road between Tucson and Oracle, and stands on a knoll several feet above the surrounding sand-hills. When first seen, we are told, the effect is startling, and the mind has to get over a shock before the peculiar object can be comprehended. It is a most perfect representation of a camel, and is formed of one piece of granite. This curiosity is of colossal size, but perfectly proportioned. It is about sixty feet high, and is very white and smooth. There are very few fissures on the surface, and they strangely are in the proper places to form features. The only real projection from the surface is exactly placed for an eyebrow. The two humps are plainly to be seen, and the neck is curved beautifully.

The trouble is that we could not prove that the figure came from the hand of nature, which is usually more hap-hazard in its manner of doing things than to put wrinkles and eyebrows in their proper places. Perhaps some of the first discoverers of the Sphinx in modern times attributed its authorship to an upheaval of the earth's crust, but everybody in this age knows better. As medical man has been traced to Arizona and his methods and implements discovered therein profusion, why should we say that every curious formation bearing the image of some beast or other thing was not his work a thousand years or more ago?

### OUIDA ON CRIME.

In the *Literary Digest* of the 22nd, Ouida has an article entitled "Poor Abel!" which is remarkable for the manner in which indirectness of method can accomplish directness of purpose. The article is written in what appears at a superficial glance to be an iconoclastic vein, but a closer inspection reveals the fact that it is one of the choicest and most incisive pieces of sarcasm with which the reading public has lately been presented. The object is to cast discredit upon the greatly abused practice in and out

of court of attributing wilfully criminal acts to insanity, and to dispel somewhat the sympathy which too many feel or affect to feel for convicted criminals. What could be more delicately forcible than this:

Alas! poor Abel! I remember in my childhood crying over a drawing of him lying on the turf with his long hair soaked in blood, whilst the lambs bleated by the altar and the dark-browed Cain slunk away in the background between the trunks of the trees, ashamed, afraid and already weighed down with remorse. But Cain now is never ashamed or afraid; as for remorse, Lombroso and the physiologists will prove that he could not have done other than he did, given his cranial formation; and who, ah, who will weep, in the nursery or out of it, for Abel?

Referring to the wonder often expressed at the continuance and increase of violent and brutal misdeeds, disfiguring what by itself is called the age of civilization, Ouida says these crimes are a natural, pardonable and logical result of our changed attitude toward "poor Abel." Cain being the favorite actor on our stage, it is of course reasonable that his is the career most eagerly desired. "We still sometimes hang him," she says, "garrote him, imprison him, or otherwise set our brand upon him, but we do it at all times reluctantly, and the time is not distant when we shall cease to do it at all." Sympathy with the aggrieved is declared to have given place to sympathy for the aggressor.

Here is another pugent paragraph:

"Is this an innate revolt against the artificial bonds of modern life which renders modern society so inclined to take Cain to its bosom and fling quicklime contemptuously on the slain body of Abel? Or is it due to the tendency, so gravely marked in modern times, to side with the strongest, to disregard the law? Is it not, perhaps, beyond all, inspired by the essentially modern feeling, that the man who has failed is imbecile beyond pity? And Abel, whatever form he takes, is, of course, an utter failure in the modern view of human existence. He is a person who did not succeed in making his virtues pay. Of what use were a blameless career, a sympathetic character, a tender heart? He stood in the path of a stronger man. A divine judge and a primitive people might avenge him and weep for him; but the modern world kicks him into a neglected grave, whilst it buys photographs of Cain and sends him bouquets and bottles of brandy. It is needless to wonder why Cain is constantly reappearing in modern times; he is the popular character. He cannot appear in any costume or any drama without obtaining more or less a large following, and, however hideous his crime, he will never be without his partisans and supporters.

The defense of insanity as it is commonly practiced is strongly assailed. The gifted writer thinks that the only time to spare a criminal upon that plea is when he is the victim of long, uncontrollable, utterly distraught madness, the signs of which those who run can read. Here we are compelled to differ somewhat, this seeming to be rather the other extreme of the case than the safe medium, ground on which we should endeavor to stand in dealing with crime. But she is persistent on this point, and will not relax a jot or tittle of her vehemence in denouncing the practice. "That in-

sanity more or less proven by specialists," she says, "should save such a brute as the youth who killed his mother, or the tramp who shot the young girl at Chislehurst, is a great injury to the world at large. If the wire-drawing of specialists and the jargon of craniology be permitted to come into court, every assassin will escape. To allow the plea of irresponsibility is practically to inform Cain that the more atrocious, fantastic, and horrible be his crime, the more certain will physicians and physiologists come to his rescue and keep him clear of the scaffold." That is what might properly be conceded as a rather clever statement of the case from that side of it; perhaps, however, it ought to be elevated to the dignity of an argument.

The saving clause called in French *circumstances attenuantes* comes in for a blow and then the writer pays her respects to the French scandal, in which the wealthy embezzler is sympathized with and the plundered peasant forgotten, and concludes with a reference to Ulster, Ireland. It all shows that Ouida is a logician and a mistress of that intellectual wand which Richelieu declared was more potent than the sword.

### THE RELIGIOUS CONGRESS

It appears that the archbishop of Canterbury at the annual meeting of the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel has expressed himself to the effect that the English clergy must refuse to take part in the religious congress proposed to be held in Chicago as a feature of the World's Fair. The reason he gives for his refusal is that his church cannot be represented at that gathering without the tacit admission that non-Christian religious systems have as much claim on the faith of mankind as has Christianity.

This is singular. The archbishop, in other words, says he cannot go to Chicago and discuss religious questions with a Jew, a Mohammedan or a Buddhist, because his doing so would imply an admission on his part that either of those gentlemen has as much right to his faith as he has to his. Were this position correct, it would seem that all missionary efforts, all endeavors to evangelize the world by means of friendly discussions and discourses ought to cease. But this conclusion, naturally following though it does from his argument, even the archbishop would reject as absurd.

In connection with this it is worth while remembering what the Catholic Archbishop Ireland said at the dedication of the Fair grounds in relation to the subject. Truth, he said in substance, will never suffer from being placed in juxtaposition with error. There certainly seems to be more force of truth and more manliness in this utterance than in that of the English prelate, which might easily be construed as an admission that Christianity as represented by the Church of England would possibly be defeated in a universal religious contest. And it is truly to be hoped that other Protestant bodies will not follow the example set by the Canterbury prelate.

Great results may be expected from the religious congress at the Fair. The