

general anticipation, to discuss a new tariff bill, which probably will be introduced into the House tomorrow by Mr. Dingley. There is a marked difference between the opening of this special session and of that which was held four years ago, when Mr. Cleveland took office. In 1893 the special session was called to do just what the people, on the day after election the preceding November, did not expect—to repeal the silver purchasing clause of an existing law. But the special session of 1897 is to deal with the very question which the people, on the day after last November's election, expected would be given precedence over everything else. And it appears to be President McKinley's determination to have tariff the only subject considered, so far as he is concerned.

The new tariff bill, as prepared by Republican members of the House ways and means committee, who have been working on the measure for three months, declares in its title the main purposes of the measure with a frankness that is not always characteristic of financial laws. It is headed "an act to provide revenue for the government and to protect the industries of the United States." The latter is a much stronger declaration than has been customary in tariff bills; and it is a formal announcement, if the bill gets through, of protection as a national rather than a party policy. It is anticipated that if the law is substantially as the bill now framed it will increase the government revenue seventy millions per year more than it is at present. The President and Republican leaders hope to get the new law enacted in time to bring it in operation by July 1st of this year, and to show its effects from the opening of the first financial year under the new administration. How far they will be able to do this remains to be seen.

The bill makes some very important changes, yet none that may be considered radical. It is in line with the McKinley law of 1890, yet contains modifications of the latter, and such as to characterize it as a moderate protection measure. From the text of the bill it appears that the high protectionist theory has been permitted to dominate in no instance. There is nothing that favors of prohibitory tariff. As a whole it is a modification of the law of 1890, as in only a few schedules is the average rate of duty as high as it was in the McKinley law. The wool schedule is one of the most notable of these. Yet it may be said that the aim of the bill, from the standpoint of its constructors, is to assist natural causes, so far as any act of Congress may do, in preserving, within the limits of reason, the American market for American farmers, producers and manufacturers.

Moderate protection, based chiefly on the difference between the cost of domestic and foreign labor, has been held in view throughout, so that now the committee believe they have a measure which will fix such rates of duty as will permit neither the foreign producer nor the home producer to take the market and keep it to the exclusion of the other, and at the same time will make the difference between the wages of labor abroad and in this country the revenue producing factor, and get enough revenue that way to prevent any deficit. When-

ever there has been any doubt upon a question between foreign and home labor, however, the doubt has not been resolved in favor of the foreigner. As an example of the moderate protection idea, it may be cited that the cotton schedule of the Wilson-Gorman law has been left untouched. The free list of that law, however, has had taken from it wool, coal and lumber, and a few other articles, which are fixed at the old rates of duty. There was much dispute between the wool growers and the wool manufacturers, and as these could not agree on a compromise, the McKinley rates were restored, and if the conflicting interests settle on anything it will be adopted. In this wool schedule a very important industry of this State is affected.

Another vital industry of this State is influenced by the bill, namely, beet sugar production. The policy of the bill is to encourage the beet sugar growing business among the farmers of the United States, and it is claimed that the rise of this industry will destroy the monopoly now made possible by existing conditions. A further industry in Utah is affected in the tariff on lead ores, which it is proposed to increase. Several of these features, notably the last named, are already made the subject of attack, and there will be a lively contest over any proposed reduction from the present rates in the new bill.

In one important particular the new measure is made very elastic. This is in the extensive reciprocity list; and the discrimination permitted under this heading is such as to allow the President to make almost every modification that circumstances may call for. In this the moderate protectionists have accomplished their most effective work.

Here, then, is the general outline, from the administration's standpoint, of the bill that the special session of Congress is expected to deal with, and when it has done that, is expected to adjourn. Of course there will be efforts at other legislation, but all of these may be looked upon as antagonistic to the expressed wish of the administration. And with this situation to face, the Congress now convened in special session is called to make its record as to whether or not it will be a blessing to the country. May its choice be for the good.

#### REV. ABBOTT ON THE BIBLE.

Christian ministers at the present time seem to be under the necessity of resorting to all kinds of eccentricities in order to draw audiences and gain popularity. Is it an effort to conceal by attractive display the intrinsic worthlessness of the goods? One minister is reported as advocating the introduction of seventeenth century costumes; another illustrates his sermons on the deadly effects of nicotine by killing cats in full view of the worshippers; others introduce equally startling features in the pulpit. Among clergymen who have succeeded in bringing the public eye on them is Rev. Lyman Abbott, but his success is mainly due to his views of the authorship of the Biblical books. He commenced by announcing that the

Book of Jonah is to be understood as a satirical fiction and, when taken to task by the religious press, followed this statement up by others equally "scientific" regarding other portions of the Bible.

Among the dispatches appears a synopsis of a recent sermon preached by Mr. Abbott and giving his views on this subject. One point he makes is this, that much of the Old Testament is nothing but a collection of traditions and fables, somewhat on the lines of *Æsop's fables*. His argument is that when we find in Genesis some accounts of the creation, of the flood, of the tower of Babel, and so on, and then discover Assyrian tablets older than Genesis; when we further know that the Hebrews at one time lived in Assyria, the conclusion is logical that the Hebrew account of these events is borrowed from the Assyrian traditions, and consequently no more authentic.

Now, whether this reasoning is "scientific" or not, it is certainly not convincing. It begs the whole question by presupposing that Genesis was written after the captivity. A more probable view is that the history of the events referred to had been handed down from the progenitors of our race to the various branches of the human family, and that the discrepancies in the accounts depend on the changes made by the oral transmission, some truth being preserved in each of the different versions, and Moses recording only that which he knew to be absolutely true. The Assyrian tablets furnish one of the strongest proofs of the authenticity of Genesis.

Mr. Abbott's treatment of his subject is well illustrated in the argument he builds on the history of Samuel. He says according to the law only a priest had access to the part of the Temple known as the holy of holies, but Samuel used this part as a bedroom. Hence the law is plainly disregarded, he says. Now this is a subject anyone can investigate. In the third chapter of I Samuel the place will be found where this matter is mentioned. But it is not stated that young Samuel slept in the holy of holies. As an attendant upon Eli he reposed somewhere near him in the Temple. What is told in the book of Samuel is that the voice of the Lord came to him "ere the lamp of God went out in the temple of the Lord, where the ark of God was, and [ere] Samuel was laid down to sleep." But how can that be construed into the statement that the holy of holies was Samuel's bedroom?

Another objection is made to the Prophet Isaias, because this seer predicts (chap. 45) the deliverance of the people through the hands of Cyrus. This, the reverend gentleman thinks, could not be done by anyone a hundred years before that ruler was born. To which it is a sufficient reply, that there are many predictions in these ancient writings almost equally plain as this one, some of which are being fulfilled in our very day. It is true enough that in this instance even the name of the deliverer is being mentioned, but suppose that this was necessary for the accomplishment of the plans of the Almighty. There are historical grounds for the statement that the Prophets of God in the captivity