

one imbibes culture in the mere passing from one pavilion, impregnated with its distinct atmosphere of taste and style, to another.

To take the lace exhibits for an example, one may start with the excellent and really beautiful handwork of art-needlework amateur in the Woman's and other buildings, and work up through a scale comprising the results of the delicate executions of professional lace weaving in the various countries, and thence to the pinnacle exhibits shown in the French laces, which are beautiful enough, it would seem, to stand for all time as the highest ideal capable or desirable of being obtained in the art.

With regard to these laces exhibited in the French pavilion it is perhaps not too much to say in fact that a view of them is in itself alone sufficient to repay one for a trip to the Exposition.

These glimpses of the ideal achievements in different lines of art are excellent training for the sight and taste which is the principal part of the education provided by the fair. To trace which is the difference, even, between the products of the loom in the line of rugs, carpets, etc., from the results of primitive or careless methods and work, to the beautiful exhibits made by France, Germany, Spain, England and the United States, and from these to the incomparable Persian products, is as interesting and instructive in its more homely and practical way as to compare the paintings of Bouguereau, Millet, and the other masters with that of unknown artists yet on the lowlands leading to heights of excellence and superiority.

Uptairs in the Liberal Arts building we are shown examples of the achievements in bookbinding, printing, photography, lithography, steel, wood, and photo-engraving together with the most improved appliances belonging to each art, and are enabled to gain not only a knowledge of the artistic values of each, but also an impression of the practical work and details connected with the development of each.

The *Century*, *Harper's*, the *Cosmopolitan* and other periodicals illustrate their choice methods of magazine making with an interesting display of important numbers of the respective periodicals, original drawing and engravings made for special work use, and the illustration of their process of reproduction for the magazines. One of the most interesting displays in the magazine department, perhaps, is the collection of original manuscripts written by noted authors of the day.

The *Century* shows the written manuscripts of "Ben Hur," "The Fair God," and also of famous short stories published in its pages; *Harper's* has several manuscripts of Howells, James, T. B. Aldrich, Richard Harding Davis, Amelie Rives Chandler and others—the most of them being noted stories written by the authors for the special use of the magazine. The appearance of some of these manuscripts may well restore confidence to the unlucky literary aspirant whose chance of success, however, well founded on other grounds, may seem to be inevitably threatened by the drawback of a hopelessly impossible penmanship, for no worse scrawls were ever perpetrated than some of these

manuscripts penned by famous writers. William D. Howells' is the most desperate specimen, perhaps, though Amelie Rose follows close in the wake of slovenliness. Mary E. Wilkens shows a tolerably neat page, though the characters are far removed from regularity. Richard Harding Davis writes a plain, bold hand that is very refreshing after the other ink-splashed specimens, the chief curiosity and interest of his manuscript lying in the fact that it is written in lead pencil, a fact which is apt to pose as something of a miracle to the awe-inspired and uninitiated literary aspirants who have always been led to suppose that such off-hand and disrespectful copies would need only to be seen to be returned without reading or instantly cremated by the professional readers of the great magazines.

Present space will not permit a review of the list of exhibits in either the Agricultural or Liberal Arts building, though both have variety and interest enough to merit exceptional notice.

To give the literary details of these or any other of the countries reported in the mammoth Liberal Arts palace, however, is a hopeless task, and a description of the latter can only be constrained to the principal of its mighty array of treasures.

PERDITA.

MORE MONEY TALK.

Although the time appears to have almost passed for discussion of the financial question prior to a time when a vote will be taken in Congress thereon, yet it may not be too late to appeal to the people who are behind Congress, to make a business of studying the question and to make up their minds as to what policy will be most conducive to their interests, hence I beg to trouble you with one more screed before the curtain drops.

Among my friends and private correspondents is a gentleman who, though I believe is really a monometallist, has made to me a singular suggestion, which is about this: He says that he would consent that both silver and gold should be coined, and either one made a legal tender in all transactions, leaving it optional with the payee to determine which coin he will take—gold or silver, and he asks what objection I can have to that proposition. I do not know whether there is or not such a plan in contemplation by the gold men, but there may be, hence I will suggest an objection, should one be promulgated, and so I answered my friend.

There are many objections to this, but one only of which it is necessary to mention, as it, in my opinion, is insurmountable. There was no power or authority entrusted by the people when the Constitution was adopted to any man or body of men save and except the Congress of the United States to make, by law or otherwise, any kind of money a legal tender except gold and silver. This plan would give the creditor class that power which might, and no doubt would, be exercised in such manner as to operate materially to the injury of the debtor class. I hold that Congress cannot delegate to an individual authority to do that which is the duty of Congress

to perform; hence I believe the plan if adopted would be unconstitutional and therefore illegal.

Much is being said and written on the subject of what is a proper ratio between gold and silver, some persons advocating that of 16 to 1, and others being willing to go up to 20 to 1, and others higher still. For my part I have favored the old ratio of 16 to 1, because I am led to believe that it was about right when the government established it, and with an occasional slight variation, it is and has ever since been about right.

From statistics furnished by the United States mint I learn that the product of the gold and silver of the United States from 1792 to 1892 inclusive, has been, gold \$1,969,696,976; silver \$1,158,631,869, being an excess of gold over silver of \$810,861,107. If such be the case what reason can be given why an increase of the ratio in the interest of gold should be demanded by the gold people?

The world's production of gold and silver for 400 years, from 1493 to 1893, has been as follows: Of gold \$8,204,363,000; of silver, \$8,726,072,500, being an excess of silver over that of gold of only \$1,511,769,500, which is not a sum so large as to require the debasement of silver and the appreciation of gold.

The total amount of gold and silver used as money in the world in the form of coin and bullion, according to the director of the U. S. mint, is as follows: Of gold, \$3,727,018,869; of silver, \$3,820,571,346, an excess of silver over gold of only \$93,552,477, which is not a very large excess considering the total amount in use.

I learn from what I consider good authority, that the total gold of the world in coin and bullion used as money amounts to \$2.51 per capita, and that the total silver coin and bullion of the world used as money amounts to \$2.58 per capita, the coins and bullion of both metals being \$5.09 per capita.

Now, assuming the last statement to be correct, what would the necessary result be if the Lombard street and the Wall street speculators should succeed in wiping out of existence as money the silver coin and silver bullion of the world? The result would simply be to reduce the value of all property a little over 50 per cent if gold should be the only kind of money in use in the world, and the wage earner's salary would depreciate at the same ratio. In short, such policy would tend to make the rich man richer and the poor man poorer. Laws to be just must not discriminate against any class; the law-maker is at the same time the representative of all classes of his constituents and laws should be so enacted as to protect all alike.

I have seen a statement showing that, at the time of the passage of the law which demonetized silver in 1873, a silver dollar was worth 8½ per cent more than a gold one. If that is true, why was that act passed? Was it in the interest of foreign (and home) capitalists and foreign governments who controlled the gold of the world and did not want to see it superseded by silver?

It has been said (but whether it is true or false I do not know) that English capitalists sent their gold over to