

tions. An examination of these shows about the same general average as is paid in the United States, a little below rather than above. So, that, while the price of all articles of ordinary consumption is greatly in excess of that charged in this country, and the cost of living is from 20 to 40 per cent greater, the workingman's income is substantially the same. All that he has won by State interference and State subordination to trade unionism is a scale of wages based on the prices commonly paid in a new country, and less rather than more than would have been paid under free contract, as the experience of our own country proves.

This experience not only deserves, it demands study from those who believe that the condition of labor can be bettered by constant interference on the part of the State. It remains only to notice, by a word, the absolute denial of freedom of action which this system involves for the laborer himself. Here is the picture which Mr. Griffin, an impartial authority, draws of the method of government by unions and strikes in a recent instance:

It may be mentioned that patrols and pickets were appointed by the unions to interfere with and intimidate those who, because they did not come under the orders of the unions, endeavored to pursue their ordinary occupations, and the most arbitrary and unjustifiable methods were resorted to for the avowed purpose of inflicting hindrance and loss upon certain employers. No effective notice was taken by the government of these proceedings any further than to send a police or military force to preserve order in the event of any violence being committed by either side. Special constables were also sworn in, and their employment, together with the additional expense entailed through the use of the regular militia and police force, involved the country in very heavy expenditure, but this expenditure was small in comparison with that occasioned by the stoppage of the shipping, coal mines, gas works, flour mills, iron foundries, shearing operations and trade generally while the strike lasted.

This is the net result to date of the nearest approach to State socialism ventured upon by any Anglo-Saxon people, with a free field for action, and with a high capacity for managing new institutions. How does it seem to strike the believers in incessant State interference, and the establishment of a benevolent paternalism?—*St. Paul Press Pioneer.*

#### A SMOKELESS BATTLEFIELD.

In the ensemble of battle and in the practice of following its different phases the smoke of the field has been a useful auxiliary to the commander-in-chief. The clouds and puffs floating over the lines of fire, which he followed from his post of observation—usually an elevated one, where the atmosphere remained clear—certified the troops engaged, revealed to his practiced eye an estimate of the adversary's forces, and showed him step by step the fluctuations of the battle. In fact they often told him more than the delayed reports of aides-de-camp.

But powder without smoke is now an

established fact. Artillery and infantry open fire and no smoke is visible. A single shot from the skirmish line is henceforth absolutely imperceptible, and a salvo from the line of infantry at 300 yards only produces a thin blue-white vapor like tobacco smoke, that vanishes almost instantly. In no instance, not even in the firing of heavy ordnance, is the vapor dense enough to indicate even at short firing range the position of artillery or infantry.

These facts and others showing the insidious properties of this new agent in modern warfare were discussed at length in a recent meeting of the military board in the army building, when it was decided that the new powder should be tested officially at Springfield with a view to its introduction into the American army. Of course, powder without smoke, cannot become the privilege of the American army. European nations have taken up the problem and several of them boast of having a formula of their own. Hence advantages and disadvantages attending its use on the field of battle will be common to both sides. Each acquires a better view of his adversary, but loses the protection that a veil of smoke afforded him. A priori one can judge how doubly important becomes the advantage of being the first to see the enemy, unseen by him, if possible.

In spite of all the precautions which may be taken to discard those details in the uniform that might mark too conspicuously the presence of a troop, surprise—and surprises are common occurrences in war—will be much easier to effect than before. The side that first receives the fire will suffer a serious disadvantage, for some time must elapse before it can ascertain whence comes the attack, and the forces belonging to either side though not two miles away, may know nothing of the skirmish.

Owing to the distance that two armies preserve during the preliminaries of a combat, cavalry is intrusted with the honor of getting information, a perilous trust at best, when it is considered that a mounted troop is not easily kept out of sight, and that the chances are against its being the first to discover a well-intrenched advance post. Moreover, if it is true that in recent wars the increased improvements of quickfiring arms has diminished the efficiency of the cavalry role, its future charge without the protection of smoke to cover its advance is looked upon as problematic.

The result of the new powder in what concerns infantry is doubtful, so much depends on the quality of the troops. As long as he is ambushed the infantry soldier will be a myth; firing at 600 yards, his shot will neither be seen nor heard, only felt. But, it is stated by army officers, his role is not to remain stationary. He must advance and show himself. No longer protected by a cloud of smoke, he will have to face a fusillade tenfold more appalling than Antietam or Gettysburg. Then?

Artillery, says the veterans, gains everything by operating in a clear field. Before it worked blindfolded; the enemy's smoke served as aim, and it was often deceptive. Now the exact position of the opposed artillery will be visible. With even chances, when

once a battery has attained precision in its aim, which before could be but imperfectly determined on account of smoke, it will serve as a guide to neighboring batteries, and thus the fire will be concentrated and more effective. So that the artillery, if not the infantry and cavalry, would seem to be the gainer by the great martial transmission from much smoke to no smoke at all.—*New York Times.*

#### "THE MEXICAN MESSIAH."

THERE is in the May number of the *Popular Science Monthly* a specially interesting article, taken from the *Gentleman's Magazine*. It is entitled "The Mexican Messiah," and is from the pen of Dr. Dominick Daly. It gives an explanation of the Mexican tradition regarding the visit to this continent of Quetzatcoatl, or the Air God. Some writers state that the title applied to this personage is the "Fair God." The article contains references not only to his visit, but to his personal appearance and the character of his teachings, which were those of pure Christianity, resulting in the introduction of a golden era of peace and prosperity, thus accounting for the existence of relics which plainly indicate that that religion had been established upon this continent many centuries previous to the advent of Cortez, the Spanish invader. The tradition includes the anticipated return of the "Fair God," according to a promise made by him when he took his departure after establishing the new order of things, which abolished war and caused brotherly love to take the place of strife and bloodshed.

Because of the expected return of this traditional personage, the conquest of Mexico by Cortez was an undertaking of comparatively small difficulty, when the host of inhabitants is numerically compared with the handful of invaders. The natives were impressed with the belief that Cortez was Quetzatcoatl, returning according to his promise, as he answered the traditional description of the Mexican Messiah, being white and bearded. In reference to his personality the article says:

"The Mexicans have preserved a minute and apparently an accurate description of the personal appearance and habits of Quetzatcoatl. He was a white man, advanced in years and tall in stature. His forehead was broad; he had a large beard and black hair. He is described as dressing in a long garment."

Dr. Daly reasons thus as to the improbability of this person being a mere invention, he being convinced that the tradition refers to a genuine individualism:

"It is therefore difficult to suppose that this curiously accurate portraiture