

been abused and villified by that sheet, without stint, for intimating that the so-called Woman's Industrial Home was a useless institution and the expenditure of public money upon it was a mistake. Now, it appears, the opinion is obtaining in many quarters that the project is a failure, and plans are devised to turn the building to some useful purpose.

We have not endorsed either of these movements, and do not think the present proposition a good one. These schemes to raise the value of real estate in the neighborhood of the "Home" are not to be applauded by sincere people, because they have been concocted and fostered under the guise of a patriotic desire to save government funds. But whatever sordid motives may have moved the promoters of these advocates for a change, the fact shows up in the midst of all, clearly and unmistakably, that the bleeding of Uncle Sam in the past and the further attempt at phlebotomy in the present, are shameful and deceptive, and it is becoming more and more perceptible every day, that the whole concern is a fizzle and an inexcusable waste of national funds.

DEATH OF THE BLAIR BILL.

THE following comments from the *St. Paul Pioneer Press* fairly illustrate the feeling with which the intelligent and independent newspapers of the country, republican as well as democratic, have received the news of the defeat of the noted educational bill, introduced into the Senate by Senator Blair, of New Hampshire:

"All honor to the Senate of the United States, which has at last given its quietus to the pernicious bill of Senator Blair for national aid to education; and all honor to the Northwestern senators by whose vote the offensive and dangerous measure was killed at last. It is eight years now since this most objectionable proposition first came before the country. It drew its strength at that time from the consideration of the then recent census returns of 1880, showing the prevalence of illiteracy, especially among the freedmen of the Southern States. There were many men in Congress from the North who honestly believed it to be their duty to contribute to the cost of the great work that the emancipation of the negro has cast upon the South. There were many men from the South who grasped eagerly at the offered subsidy from the federal treasury. As a rule, their public schools were poorly conducted and supported. They had not the splendid system that spread from New England all over the Northern states, and they had not the public spirit and willingness to sacrifice for educational ends that would enable them to imitate

it. The great danger of a centralization of power, never so imminent as when it was proposed to turn our schools over to federal control, was lightly thought of. Had it not been for the principle of distribution according to illiteracy, which the introducer insisted upon retaining, and which offered practically the largest subsidy to the community that had done least for itself, it is probable that the bill would have become law. As it was, the escape was a narrow one."

Just prior to the vote which killed the bill an interesting debate occurred. Senator Bate of Tennessee opposed the bill because, in his opinion, it led the people to rely on the Federal treasury for the support and management of the public schools. Continuing he said:

"The head of the Interior Department would dispense national funds under national laws, and having the keys of 100,000 schoolhouses hanging at his girdle, that girdle would become as potent in politics as the sceptre of any crowned head. The school patronage would be used in political campaigns of partisan demagogues. The tendency of the bill was dangerous. It fascinated and charmed, but it destroyed. It wooed to destruction, as a siren of Capri. It would lead to despotism. It was a dagger behind a smile, a serpent coiled beneath the rose."

Senator Edmunds favored the bill, and declared there was no moral nor legal objection to it in the Constitution. It will be remembered in Utah that this statesman has for some years maintained the position that "for twenty years there has been no constitution of the United States except the public opinion of the American people." Such are his own words.

Senator Hawley of Connecticut made an argument in opposition to the bill. Following are some of the points he made:

"He prophesied that if the bill became a law, it was not merely \$77,000,000 that it would cost. It would cost hundreds of millions, and would go on for fifty years, unless the bill became so odious that an extra session would have to be called to repeal it. The bill was against the spirit of States rights. He did not want to have the secretary of the national board of education sent into his State. The town committees and school boards were capable of taking care of the schools, and he wanted the national government to keep its hands off."

Thirty-one Senators voted in favor of the bill, of whom only eight were democrats. Thirty-seven Senators voted against the bill, of whom twenty are democrats. Senator Blair changed his vote that he might move to reconsider.

The vote was close, the bill being defeated by a majority of five; and in view of the growth of the "new nationalism," a change may soon take place in the Senate that will reverse the tide of its favor.

THE "NEW NATIONALISM."

WITHIN the last few months some of the leading magazines of the United States have devoted space to the discussion of what is called the "new nationalism." This term may be defined as a new political theory which favors a supervisory participation in or control of the social and fiscal affairs of the people by the general government.

A few examples will aid in conveying a clearer comprehension of the nature of this new theory. It favors a national divorce law, national participation in the management of the public schools, a postal telegraph and the consolidation under one general management, to be established by Congress, of all the railroads in the country. One of the latest outgrowths of this theory is a proposition for the government to lend money to farmers at a low rate of interest.

Nearly every feature of the "new nationalism" has in view pecuniary advantage of some kind, in the way of economy or profit. To make money faster, or to make it go further, is the object of nearly every one of its propositions. It is, throughout, a mercenary school of political doctrines, because it places self above principle, and prefers wealth to popular liberty and local self-government.

Let it be supposed that the plan now under discussion to lend to the farmers the surplus revenues of the government, has been put in practical operation. The politician who offers or advocates the lowest rate of interest will get the most granger votes, and from now on demagogues will attain power by pandering to corrupt tendencies among the people. What must be the result? Who that has read history, is so dull of comprehension that he can not foresee speedy national decadence as the consequence?

Undoubtedly the railroads of the country could be operated far more economically under one general management, backed up by congressional legislation, than at present. But what would a presidential election amount to, if the railroad employes of the country, like those of the postoffice department, were preferred on account of their politics? The railroad vote alone, in many of the States, and in the Union as a whole, would decide a presidential contest.

Suppose money could be accumulated by the masses under these processes of centralization, whatas-