

and they do not remain long anywhere without resorting to the profession they have adopted as a means of making a living. The intervals between their acts of lawlessness are necessarily brief.

The recent criminal spurt will put the new chief of police and his subordinates on their metal. The public will watch with some interest the course of the officers, and weigh the degree of activity and sagacity displayed by them, and the amount of success they attain in discovering and bringing to justice the culprits who are breaking into the houses and business places of our citizens.

A WORLD'S PARLIAMENT OF RELIGIONS.

THE term ecumenical is usually applied to Roman Catholic councils at which the various nations of the earth are represented. Inasmuch as representation is confined to that sect alone, the word is a misnomer both from a theological and etymological view. It means literally the inhabited globe, and the parliament of religions to be held next year in Chicago realizes the full and real import of the word. The scheme involved in the Chicago project contemplates the bringing together, in one common assembly, representatives of all the religions of the earth. The official nomenclature of this congress is said to be "A World's Parliament of Religions."

In this assembly the representatives of each religion will be given full liberty to set forth the doctrines, principles and cardinal truths of their belief. They can even go further and show how far humanity has been or will be benefited by their theology, but controversy and criticism are sternly to be prohibited. Praise, commend, eulogize your own religion as much as you please, but not a word of censure, reprobation or rebuke for others. The idea is in truth grand, poetic, sublime. Phillips Brooks says:

"It appeals to the imagination, to the reason, and to our best desires for humanity. To bring together in a large council the representatives of all the religions of the world, so far as that can be done, is at once an acknowledgment of the reality of the religious impulse wherever it has shown itself, and of the universal guidance, action and love of God."

Another distinguished writer says:

"It would never have been possible until the present day, and it now marks a distinct epoch in the evolution of the race."

The report of the general committee appointed for the purpose of bringing about the religious conference has just been issued. It is signed by Dr. John Henry Barrows, chairman, and addressed to Charles C. Bonney, president of the world's auxiliary congress. Responses have been obtained from representative men in various parts of the world favoring the scheme. The State church of England and nearly all the dissenting sects have been spoken for. President Washburn of Robert College, Constantinople, has volunteered to act as Oriental agent of the committee, and to procure the representation of the Eastern Christians and Mohammedans.

The president of the Imperial law school at Tokio, Japan, has been heard from, and says that Buddhism will be represented. The address of invitation will be printed and published in the various languages of the Occident and Orient, though it is understood that the proceedings of the ecumenical parliament will be conducted in English. This may prove antagonistic to obtaining the most accurate conceptions of the religions outside the non-English speaking sects. But the general committee, to which is annexed an advisory council will see that everything is done for the best.

The latter includes Lord Tennyson, Sir Edwin Arnold, Doctors Carpenter and Fairbairn of Oxford University, Lord Egerton, Mr. Stead, and Prof. Drummond, all of England. In this council the two distinguished Jewish doctors, Rabbi Maybaum and Prof. Lazarus of Berlin are included. Ameer Ali, a Moslem Asiatic Judge, is also a member. Italy, Switzerland and other countries are already represented. The American advisers are Lyman Abbott, Prof. Fisher of Yale, Fiske of Harvard, Bishops Janssens and Ryan of the Catholic church, Park of Andover and a dozen others.

The general committee is not an unwieldy body. It is select and will perform all the executive work, but will consider the suggestions and counsels of all members of the advisory body. It is composed of one representative from each of the leading religions. Rabbi Hirsch and Bishop Feehan, both of Chicago, represent the Jewish and Catholic churches in the committee. Dr. Barrows, the chairman, is, we believe, an Episcopalian, and a man of great learning and broad news generally. Altogether this project promises to be a highly interesting feature of the great fair.

THE RHODE ISLAND ELECTION.

GEOGRAPHICALLY speaking Rhode Island is the most insignificant State of the Union. Its area is but a little over 1000 square miles. It would take about eighty-one Rhode Islands to make one Utah. Politically speaking, however, the little commonwealth is at present a Goliath. During the past four weeks the eyes of the nation have been turned to it. The distinguished chieftains of both the great parties have spoken there, and the hottest political campaign in its history has just closed. The elections held on the 8th instant show an increase of 10,000 ballots over the largest vote ever polled before. The Republicans have triumphed, but the figures prove that it was a hard fought conquest.

The national interest awakened by these elections arose from the fact that the result in Rhode Island would indicate the drift of popular sentiment in New England. The issues in the campaign were tariff reform and currency, but the former engrossed most attention owing to the "wool debates" in Congress two weeks ago.

Until 1887 Rhode Island was known as an impregnable Republican stronghold. Even in 1886 the Republican candidate for Governor received 26,000 votes, while the Democratic opponent received only about 10,000. A prohibition issue was injected into local poli-

tics during that year, and in the year following (1887) the Democrats carried the State by a plurality of nearly 3,000. In 1888, presidential year, the Republicans were victorious, with a plurality of about 3000. In 1889, 1890 and 1891 the Democrats carried the State by pluralities, but did not obtain a majority in any case, except in 1887. This was what threw the election of Governor last year into the Legislature, a majority being required in that State to secure any State office. The Legislature chose a Republican for Governor, and that is why political feeling ran so high. The Democratic candidate for Governor in 1891 had 22,249 votes, the Republican 20,995, the Prohibition 1,829. The Democrat, though having a plurality of 1,254, failed of obtaining a majority by about 500, and the Legislature gave the office to the Republican.

In the election on Tuesday last the Republican candidates for Governor, Lieutenant Governor and Secretary of State obtained clear but small majorities, though there were four tickets. The Attorney-General and General Treasurer did not obtain majorities, though having received pluralities, hence the choice for the offices goes to the Legislature. Thus the tide of triumph flows to the Republicans in "Little Rhody."

DR. ELIOT AND RELIGIOUS LIBERTY

IT is astonishing how great an excitement can be raised over a very small and essentially unimportant matter. All New England was set afire by a spark of falsehood sent over the wires from Salt Lake in reference to Professor Eliot's speech in the Tabernacle. The blaze has spread throughout the country, and though the respected head of the leading university in America has so high a social and professional standing, and though he did not allude in any way to the subject of marriage, he is accused of favoring polygamy, of embracing "Mormonism," which to the average editor means polygamy, of encouraging vice and rebellion and other vile things, and people and papers everywhere are still discussing the matter as though it was of national moment.

Prof. Eliot has been greatly misrepresented, but is well able to take care of himself and has explained his position in a manly way. We are pleased to see that some of the journals of the country perceive the truth through the dust that has been kicked up and the smoke that has come out of the fire of fury which falsehood and bigotry have kindled.

The Chicago Post has this to say:

"President Eliot's explanation of his now famous Salt Lake City speech is exactly in the line laid down in these columns at the time the speech itself and the Cambridge criticisms thereon were first published. It was incredible that the president of Harvard College should appear in public as a volunteer apologist for polygamy, but unhappily it was also impossible that any utterance of his upon so unpleasant a subject as the Mormon religion should be either reported correctly or interpreted fairly in the Saintly walks of Boston."

The gentleman's San Francisco remarks about the "Mormons" are reproduced and the Post goes on to say: