

tudes through which the distracted country has passed. But the Mexico of the nineteenth century has solved the problem, and is witnessing the completion of that which has been long recognized as a national need though in some respects considered an unattainable dream.

At a dinner party in this city on the occasion of his recent visit, Senator Stephen B. Elkins, who had lately come from the land of the Montezumas, gave a luminous account of the work that was being done in this great undertaking, then nearing success. From a recollection of his remarks, and from a late article in the *Age of Steel*, the following facts are obtained. By way of introduction it will be proper to remind those who have been in Mexico's capital, and to inform those who have never been there, that the city, though at a considerable elevation above the sea, is so situated in a scoop of the Cordilleras as to have no natural outlet for drainage purposes. This in a sanitary sense was a constant menace to the public health, and was probably responsible for a heavy death rate. In case of sudden and prolonged rains inundations were not uncommon, and grave damages to property imminent. The Texcoco lake was a basin for the streams, but when these were overtaxed the rim of the basin was no protection for the surrounding country. To remedy these evils, modern engineering has attempted a great task and succeeded. By means of a canal and of a tunnel under the hills the drainage of the valley finds its way to the Gulf of Mexico. The canal is twenty-nine miles long and the tunnel is a little more than six miles. The cost so far has been about \$13,000,000. Aside from the purpose of drainage, the canal can be of service to local navigation, and may be of more or less use in irrigation.

There can be no question that in a sanitary sense it will do much for popularizing the City of Mexico as a health resort, and remove an old-time incubus from the reputation of an historic and beautiful city. As indicating the progressive spirit now dominant in our sister republic, and the destiny to which it is moving, the completion of this engineering task is worthy of note, and signifies a great deal. Whatever may be thought or said of President Diaz in other respects, his encouragement of and perseverance in this mighty work will redound to his fame and credit as long as Mexico shall have an existence or history be written.

THE MONROE DOCTRINE.

The foreign policy of the United States is at present the subject of serious contemplation in England, owing especially to the Venezuelan and Cuban questions. It is recognized on all hands that this country has become a powerful factor in the affairs of the western continent, and that to any dispute with the smaller countries, the Washington government must be taken into consideration. In the present trouble between Venezuela and England, the interference of the United States does not go any further than a suggestion that the matter be referred

to arbitrators, but this proposition, it is thought, is backed by claims, which if logically carried out, would necessitate armed interference by the United States in behalf of Venezuela, in case of actual hostilities.

Speaking of the situation, a London paper, from an English point of view, sums up as follows:

Europe must understand that the people of the United States are decided, first of all, to prohibit, if necessary with the bayonet and rifle, any extension of European domination; secondly, that popular sentiment in the United States enthusiastically favors every insurrectionary movement which aims at the removal of a European flag from American soil. This will enforce expenditures and complications. But these facts are not clearly seen yet by the American citizen who blunders blindfolded but headlong into what used to be called the path of manifest destiny.

The position of the United States is defined by the much-talked-of Monroe doctrine, as stated in the message to Congress in 1823. At that time Spain was endeavoring to enlist the aid of the so-called holy alliance, consisting of Russia, Prussia, France and Austria, to recapture her lost colonies, and it appeared that the powers were too willing to render assistance. Russia claimed the right to extend her possessions, by means of colonization, from Alaska southward, along the Pacific coast. Referring to these facts, Monroe stated:

We owe it, therefore, to candor and to the amicable relations existing between the United States and those powers to declare that we should consider any attempt on their part to extend their system to any portion of this hemisphere as dangerous to our peace and safety. With the existing colonies or dependencies of any European power, we have not interfered, and shall not interfere. But with the governments who have declared their independence and maintained it, and whose independence we have on great consideration and on just principles acknowledged, we could not view any interposition for the purpose of opposing them, or controlling in any manner their destiny, by any European power, in any other light than as the manifestation of an unfriendly disposition toward the United States.

This is the celebrated Monroe doctrine, endorsed by all American statesmen. It recognizes the establishment on this continent of European systems of government on the ruins of those already existing, as a menace to the liberty of this republic and consequently as an unfriendly act to the United States, which this country is, for obvious reasons, bound to resist.

The most notable illustration of its application is furnished by the history of Mexico. When Napoleon III landed his troops in that country and established an empire on the European plan, the United States notified France that the proceeding must lead to war between these two countries. The War of Rebellion then raged, and France was in a position to ignore this warning. But no sooner were our own domestic difficulties settled than troops were sent to the Mexican frontier, and the French speedily withdrew.

A number of newspaper writers lately have claimed that the United States by virtue of the Monroe doctrine is under obligation to protect any American country against the acquisi-

tion of territory by European powers. This is, however, looked upon as a new principle and a new policy to which our government is not committed.

The Monroe doctrine itself, as originally enunciated, deals with the establishment of European systems of government in the western world, and with the maintenance of the American governments whose independence has already been acknowledged.

PATTERNS OF SOLDIERSHIP.

The claims of western nations to superiority over their eastern neighbors in the arts of both peace and war are not all possible of acceptance until something more than mere say-so shall be advanced in their support. As to war, there seems to be no doubt that, comparing the two latest exhibitions, the Japanese in Formosa have shown themselves far in advance of the French in Madagascar, although the former had much the more difficult task. Comparisons are said to be odious—to the French they certainly must be in the case in question. In the matter of climate Formosa is worse than Madagascar; the Black Flags and other irregular Chinese levies were more formidable opponents than the Hovas; the French employed 18,000 men for a task which could have been carried out, according to their own officers, by 3,000, backed by 1,500 or 2,000 Soudanese. They have lost 8,000 by fever, aided by mismanagement. The Japanese, on the other hand, did not do any such bungling. They threw 60,000 troops into Formosa, and relieved their men so cleverly that none of the soldiers was kept on the island long enough to fall a victim to the local conditions. The whole campaign has not cost them half so many lives as the French have lost. Such is the judgment of an acute critic in the *New York Evening Sun*—one who has kept close watch of the progress of events in both countries. As to Madagascar, it will be remembered by the French people as Tonquin is; but the remembrance of a campaign marked by incompetency, blundering, lack of preparation and slowness of action, will not rise up from Formosa to vex the thoughts of the sturdy Japs.

WHAT PAUPERISM costs in England can be gathered from a British blue-book just issued and containing the poor rate return for the year ended Lady Day, 1894. The principal items of expenditure were: In-maintenance, £2,198,812; out-relief, £2,460,503; maintenance of lunatics in asylums or licensed houses, £1,466,185; workhouse or other loans repaid, and interest thereon, £677,082; salaries and rations of officers and superannuation allowances, £1,629,061; other expenses, £1,242,362; total, £9,673,505, or \$48,367,525. In comparing the expenditure of 1893 with that of 1894, under every item in the latter year there was an increase. Of these figures it can be seen that it costs three and a half million pounds sterling to distribute a little over six millions to the poor and the lunatics.

A COMMON order for lunch in places where the microbe and bacillus fear prevails, is for soft boiled eggs and hard-boiled water.