

wide, with a high instep; consequently the market absolutely demands broad last, high instep, and a shoe roomy and full over the ball of the foot immediately forward of the instep and extending thus over all the front half of upper to the toe or tip. This is applicable to both sexes. Shoes made long and tapering, to give a shapely effect, can rarely be sold. The shoe worn and required is short, wide and very full in the upper, having a last cut oval, being stubby in appearance without having the broad or wide toe. In connection with the foregoing it may be of interest to know that the imports of shoes into Porto Rico in 1896 were valued at \$712,323.

It seems conclusive that the United States is expanding in more ways than one. Territory once acquired, the work of transplanting people and customs begins, and it is scarcely questionable that the latter is as great a field and of as much consequence as the other. It certainly will require a much greater time and a great deal more patience and persistence, but it will be accomplished notwithstanding. A revolution among the inhabitants of the nooks and corners of the earth, one in which only the weapons of physical, moral and intellectual advancement are used, has set in and will not go backward.

IMMIGRATION FIGURES.

According to statistics published, the immigration into the United States during the year ending June 30, 1898, amounted to 218,562 persons, the lowest figure on record since 1879. Great changes seem to have taken place in the immigration current. Until lately the majority of new settlers came from Germany, Ireland and the Scandinavian countries, but at present the Latin races chiefly help to swell the numbers of our immigrants. Commissioner Powderly gives the following figures as to nationality:

Austria-Hungary, 39,797; Belgium, 695; Denmark, 1,946; France (including Corsica), 1,990; Germany, 17,111; Greece, 2,339; Italy, 58,613; Netherlands, 767; Norway, 4,938; Portugal, 1,717; Roumania, 900; Russia (proper), 27,221; Finland, 2,607; Poland, 4,726; Spain, 577; Sweden, 12,398; Switzerland, 1,246; Turkey in Europe, 176; England, 9,877; Ireland, 25,128; Scotland, 1,797; Wales, 1,219; other European countries not specified, 1; Mexico 107; Central America, 7; Quebec and Ontario, 196; Nova Scotia, 14; New Brunswick, 11; Prince Edward Island, 12; British Columbia, 105; Newfoundland and Labrador, 12; Cuba, 1,377; other West Indies, 247; South America, 39; Turkey in Asia (Arabia and Syria), 4,276; China, 2,071; Japan, 2,230; Asia, not specified, 61; Australia, 153; Hawaiian Islands, 40; Pacific Islands, not specified, 8; Africa, 48.

From this it will be seen that Italy heads the list; then come Austria-Hungary and Russia. Quite a few Arabs and Syrians arrived in this country during the year. Another feature of the year's immigration was that there were 40,000 more males than females among the new-comers, and 3,000 applicants for admission were turned back.

MILITARISM.

The curse of militarism in Germany has been illustrated repeatedly in the overt acts committed by men of the sword, and now comes a story from Austria of a similar nature. It is to the effect that a lieutenant of the dragoons accompanied by six privates entered a hotel and demanded a room. The proprietor politely informed the officer that the hotel was quite full and that he could not accommodate him.

The lieutenant replied that a room must be found for him, and approached the door of a chamber already occupied by a guest. Finding it locked, he ordered his men to smash it in. The proprietor protested against this outrage. The officer thereupon rushed at him with his drawn sword, pursued him into the street, and, overtaking him, slashed at him with savage fury. Bleeding and unconscious he was carried into the hotel. A crowd attempted to mob the officer, who at once called his six dragoons, and charged the people with drawn swords, hitting out right and left. The officer then re-entered the hotel, shouting that he must have a room. It is said the officer and his men are still at large, and no steps are being taken to bring them to justice.

History seems to teach emphatically that a strong military spirit and the genius of liberty cannot dwell together in a country. It is the tendency of the former to trample upon the rights of the latter. Despotism and militarism are genuine twin relics of a barbarous age, and wherever one is invited to be, come a guest, the other is sure to put in an appearance, too. The plea will undoubtedly be made that the new responsibilities devolving upon our government will demand change of policy in this regard, but that is only partially true. Spain has found out that distant colonies cannot be successfully ruled nor defended, by a sword blunted by despotism. It remains for the United States to demonstrate to the world that the principles on which this government is founded are superior to the antiquated European methods, and there is no reason why we should not furnish this grand lesson to the oppressed nations of other continents.

OUR POLICY OF EXPANSION.

Those who are opposed to territorial expansion seem to forget that every new step in this direction taken by the young giant of this hemisphere has been accompanied by prophecies of disaster, all of which have failed. Eighty-eight years ago Josiah Quincy, representing Massachusetts in the House of Representatives, declared the bill to purchase the Louisiana territory a danger to the Union, and he but gave voice to the sentiment of many of his contemporaries. In his address on Jan. 14, 1811, he said in part:

"The act contemplated lays ruin at the feet of all our hopes. It is my deliberate opinion that, if this bill passes, the bonds of this Union are virtually dissolved; that the states which compose it are free from their moral obligations, and that, as it will be the right of all, so it will be the duty of some, to prepare definitely for a separation—amicably, if they can; violently, if they must."

"The Constitution is a political compact. By whom and about what? It is we, the people of the United States, for ourselves and our posterity; not for the people of Louisiana, nor for the people of New Orleans, or of Canada. . . . The territory contemplated is settled by the treaty of peace, and is included within the Atlantic ocean, the St. Croix, the Lakes, and a line drawn through the middle of the Mississippi river, until it intersects the northernmost part of the 31st degree of north latitude, thence within the line drawn due east . . . to the Atlantic ocean. . . . This Constitution was never constructed to form a covering for the inhabitants of Missouri and Red River country, and whenever it is attempted to be stretched over these it will be rent asunder. . . . Why, sir, I have already heard of six states, and some say, at

no great distance of time, more. I have also heard that the mouth of the Ohio will be far to the east of the center of the contemplated empire. It was not for these men that our fathers fought. It was not for them this Constitution was adopted. You have no authority to throw the rights and liberties and property of this people into a hotch-pot with the wild men on the Missouri, nor with the mixed though more respectable race of Anglo-Hispano-Gallo-Americans who bask on the sands at the mouth of the Mississippi. It would be a virtual dissolution of the Union."

Notwithstanding such predictions the addition was made that gave us Louisiana, Arkansas, Missouri, Iowa, Minnesota, Kansas, Nebraska, North Dakota, South Dakota and Oklahoma and Indian territories. The expansion continued by the addition of what is now New Mexico, Arizona, Nevada, California, Oregon, Utah, Wyoming, Colorado, Idaho, and Montana. Florida and Alaska were added, and all without disastrous results. Why, then, should a policy that has been followed from the beginning now be regarded as suicidal?

Undoubtedly great wisdom is needed in dealing with the inhabitants of the Philippine islands. They need education and such measure of liberty, as will prove beneficial to them—neither more nor less. When they enjoy this under the protection of the American flag, they will cause no anxiety to our patriots and present no danger to our institutions.

UTAH AFFAIRS DISCUSSED.

Among the papers that discuss the noise being made over the election of Hon. B. H. Roberts for Congress is the Chattanooga Times. In an editorial that appeared on Nov. 28, this journal says:

As for Roberts, it appears that all of his wives were acquired when plural marriage was lawful in Utah, and he takes care of them, as he always did; says that he could not abandon one of all of them without being guilty of gross cruelty and immorality. His domestic relations were, it seems, pretty well ventilated during the campaign, and the returns show that he has lost votes among the Mormons and gained votes among the Gentiles—this being the testimony of the Salt Lake Tribune, the leading Gentile organ. The Smith faction of the Mormon Church is very strong anti-polygamous, and they did not support Mr. Roberts.

We are no apologists for plural marriage; but we remember that Christ did not denounce the institution. The early Christians practiced it. There is but one single disparagement of it in the New Testament. In his first epistle to Timothy, iii: 2, Paul enjoins on his disciples to see to it that "an elder should be the husband of one wife," which is an admission by the Apostle that there were in the church men who had more than "one wife."

Neither Christ nor any of His twelve disciples made monogamy a condition of membership in the Christian body. It was not made a condition during the first three hundred years of the era that began with Christ's coming. Even now, converts in polygamous countries are received, by missionaries of some of the churches, into the communion, without being required to put away any of their wives.

And, finally, it may easily be true that the Hon. Brigham H. Roberts is quite as moral a man, as good a Christian and patriot as are many of his colleagues in the House, who are not practical polygamists. If he is not superior to some of them, in these respects, we ought to be properly sorry for his constituents.

The Times is, as we say, no defender of the attempt to transplant an eastern domestic institution into this country. We do not believe that it can be made to suit western or any other advanced civilization; but the country is entitled to the facts of the case that has started this fresh discussion of a mere remnant