

illustration of the saying that there is but a step from one extreme to another?

A GREAT CITY.

The New York Herald calls attention to the fact that London was a city 1,500 years before the Dutch bought Manhattan island for a song; yet today the great metropolis of the British empire with its six million inhabitants and 688 square miles has scarcely twice the population of New York with its 3,200,000 inhabitants. It is a striking illustration of the growth of this country and an object lesson of the superior wisdom of the builders of its institutions.

At present Paris is the third largest city of the world, measured by population, and Berlin the fourth. Chicago comes close upon Berlin in the number of inhabitants and far surpasses it in area. In other words, of the largest five cities of the world, the United States, notwithstanding her young age among the nations, has already two.

The following data concerning Greater New York are interesting:

The number of men on the city pay roll will be greater than the regular army of the United States, the police contributing nearly 7,000 and the "white winged" street cleaners 4,000.

The population of the city is equal to the combined population of thirteen new states and territories, whose area is three thousand times greater than that of the city and about two-fifths of that of the entire Republic.

A child is born every six minutes in Greater New York, which means about 90,000 a year, and, although the death rate is comparatively low, 70,000 persons die annually, or one about every seven minutes, day and night.

New York is unique in the character of its population. It is the largest Irish city in the world, its 850,000 Irish being twice as numerous as the population of Dublin.

The Germans are the most numerous, though, there being 900,000 of them here. Thus, with the exception of Berlin, New York is the largest German city in the world. The foreign born population numbers 1,250,000, and with its children numbers 2,500,000, or about two-thirds of the city's entire population.

The least creditable record of Greater New York is that there are more than ten saloons to each church.

THE LAWS OF IDAHO.

The statute book of our northern neighbor seems to be in a very much mixed up condition. A few months ago the supreme court of the state rendered a decision invalidating one of the acts passed at the last session of the legislature, on the ground that the manner in which it was passed did not conform to the requirements of the state constitution. This decision necessarily applied to all other acts on the statute book that were not properly passed, and at once an inquiry arose as to which acts, supposed to be in force, were valid and which were not.

Of course such a status was a grand opportunity for lawyers, not only to display their erudition but to plan for the accomplishment of desired ends, laudable or otherwise. So serious was the condition created by the state supreme court decision referred to, that assertions were made to the effect that sittings of the district courts that had been held were invalid, and that their proceedings were ultra vires. It was even questioned whether there

existed a valid law under which a legislature could convene and extricate the state from this extraordinary and deplorable condition in respect to its laws. The "News" understands that the various grave questions and complications connected with the situation are still pending, a final solution of them not having been reached.

On the top of all this comes the announcement that many divorces that have been granted in Idaho are invalid. This assertion is based on a decision rendered by Judge Stewart at Boise yesterday in the divorce case in which Mrs. Flora A. Strode sues her husband, John Strode, a wealthy stockman, for a decree and alimony. Mrs. Strode was a divorced woman before she married the man from whom she now seeks a separation. Judge Stewart holds that the divorce was invalid, and that she was incapable of contracting a lawful marriage with Strode.

The reasons why Mrs. Strode's divorce from her first husband was not valid are said to apply to many other separations of husband and wife by supposedly legal procedure, and it follows that subsequent marriages contracted by the parties are unlawful, and the issue of them illegitimate. How many families may be disrupted, or rendered disruptive by this decision, no one knows.

When complications of the character here described result from carelessness or ignorance on the part of law makers or judges, it is time the people bestirred themselves to secure better and abler men to make and administer the laws. The impression is going abroad that the people of Idaho are suffering the consequences of putting reckless and incompetent men in positions of power and responsibility, and her patriotic citizens, of whom she has many, should exert themselves to correct so grave an evil.

ON ARBITRATION AND LYNCHING.

Miss Frances E. Willard in her address before the annual convention of the National Woman's Christian Temperance Union, at Buffalo, N. Y., on Friday, Oct. 29, dwelt with much eloquence on some of the great questions of the day. She strongly condemns moderate drinking and "regulated vice" and speaks enthusiastically of the progress of woman suffrage.

On the arbitration question she says:

"The greatest sorrow of the year to most of us was the defeat of the arbitration treaty between England and America. So heart-sick were we when the announcement came that we overlooked the fact that the treaty having been signed with enthusiasm by our President and the British minister, forty-three senators cast their votes for its ratification, while twenty-six voted no, the pity of it being that we required two-thirds to carry it; but let it never be forgotten that the senators representing the historic states of the Union all voted solidly for the treaty except Pennsylvania, of all others, whose foundation stones were laid by William Penn, than whom no greater friend of peace has lived since the Founder of Christianity. It is well known that the degeneracy of this state is due to the bad reign of a political boss, who shall be nameless here as he will be hereafter. Ten of these twenty-six benighted senators are from far western states, whose united population represents a smaller number than either of the cities of New York, Chicago, Philadelphia or Brooklyn. New England sent her greeting to old England in the total vote of her twelve senators. Another consolation lies in the fact that not a senator who is nationally known to the people voted against the treaty, those who opposed

were men of strong provincial minds, education and outlook. We want this known and evermore remembered, for if there has been one disgrace more withering than another under which the great army of disfranchised women has blushed with shame for the Republic in the last year of many calamities, it was the failure of the treaty whereby difficulties between mother and daughter were to be henceforth settled by reason instead of blood."

Against the deplorable lawlessness that takes the form of lynchings the speaker protested in the following manner:

"Hard upon two hundred lynchings will have disgraced the annals of America this year. It is a grim way of reckoning to anticipate more of these barbaric proceedings before the birthday of the Prince of Peace, but alas, we have abundant warrant to believe they will go on.

"The President of the United States in his inaugural address spoke out strongly against lynching, and some of our public men have urged the adoption of a law, declaring that those who participate in lynching shall hold no public office. A similar law abolished dueling and would doubtless do more to put lynching under ban than any method yet devised.

"I feel sure we shall not weaken, but if possible strengthen the resolution adopted without a dissenting vote last year; namely, 'We declare ourselves unalterably opposed to lynching and all other lawless proceedings affecting white or colored people in our own or other countries.'"

DANGERS TO GOVERNMENTS.

The San Francisco Chronicle of last Sunday, in a lengthy and rather interesting leading editorial enters upon a controversy with Professor Bernard Moses, chief of the history department of the University of California. It appears that the professor a few days ago delivered a lecture on social growth and democracy in the United States and in the course of his talk he claimed "that the congregation of rural populations in large cities endangers democratic government and imperils future civilization; that every government is doomed to final destruction, due to inherent causes, and that there is no reason for believing this government will be an exception." The Chronicle strongly protests against these views.

Our cotemporary contends that there has been a steady evolution of the mental and moral forces of mankind—not of the few but of the many—a growth foreseen by no philosophers or prophets of preceding centuries. It has been the result of the operation of irreversible natural laws. Mankind can no longer take a step backward, and hence it cannot be inferred that the form of government adopted by this country is doomed to destruction. "The youth of the Republic," the article says, "should not be instructed to look for a political future quite so hopeless, and it would be well for Professor Moses to withhold such views from the students of the state university."

It will be readily admitted that no human system of government, either past or present, has more perfect foundations than that of the United States. They are broad enough and strong enough for a superstructure of, as it were, eternal duration. But in considering the point in controversy the question is not so much of the stability of the foundation as of the building reared on it. While it may be true that no other foundation can be laid, yet if any man or any generation