

pavements had actually cost. Thus a valuable fund of information was accumulated.

Mr. Osinga feels that if each school in the city were to make investigations along certain lines, each in its own way, the material thus gathered could be compiled and distributed for the use of the city schools in general. The Principals' club has appointed a committee to prepare a plan for carrying out Mr. Osinga's suggestions.—Chicago Record, of January 18.

ECHOES FROM THE LINCOLN DINNER IN NEW YORK.

For The Public.

In a game of chess there comes a time when one player or the other believes he has the game well in hand, and, from being intent on winning, takes thought as to the manner of winning; he desires to win in impressive style, with a spectacular display of chess pyrotechnics. He becomes scornful of pawns and places his reliance on the pieces of rank. In the pride of his power he becomes careless of his defense in order to conduct a brilliant attack or mask a prospective checkmate. And if his opponent cannot see through things, woe unto him, for there is something bewildering and confusing in the sudden advance of the stronger pieces—something mentally akin to the delivery of a shower of blows by a clever prize-winning tactician.

It appears to me that the leaders of the ultra conservative element have arrived at this stage of the great political chess game.

This thought comes to me from reading sundry speeches in honor of Abraham Lincoln, reports of which were printed in the papers. At the Waldorf-Astoria Mark Hanna spoke on "The Business Man in Politics." Tom Johnson once called Mark a "plutocrat in politics." Mark said among other things:

This (the Republican) club is an object lesson of the representative business man in politics. . . . What higher duty is there than to take part in affairs which are the foundations of their success? . . . I had pride and satisfaction in calling upon business men, to find a ready response with a full appreciation of the needs of the hour. Let me hope that the experience of the last two campaigns will be an incentive to all business men of this metropolis to improve the opportunities of the future. . . . It is on those having greater advantages that the responsibility falls for educating and leading the men who cannot be expected to work out these problems.

I don't suppose Mark ever read Machiavelli, but he nevertheless clearly recognizes the fact that the masses

of men are chumps, and need men like himself to manage things.

Judge Baldwin, of Omaha, was the heavy-weight speaker, or big gem imported for the occasion, and lent Twainesque humor to the occasion. He said:

Let us not deceive ourselves. There are social anomalies and phenomena that portend trouble to the republic, and the party of Abraham Lincoln is morally pledged to an honest investigation as to the cause and the remedy. Let us not be discouraged. Only search unweariedly for the truth.

Senator Depew, "Our Chauncey," must have been reading The Public's article on John Marshall, together with the New York Sun's essay on the same interesting figure. He said:

As we look over the records of history, the men who possessed the creative genius to carve out principles and institutions of the unknown can be numbered on the fingers of one hand. The question arises whether the five men, Washington, Jefferson, Jackson, Grant and Lincoln, whose birthdays the American people celebrate, belong, any of them, to this class. I know the statement will arouse controversy, and hope it will, because in controversy and discussion we reach the truth. None of these men belong to the order of creative genius. Of them all, Lincoln came the nearest. The two minds and marvelous intelligences to which we owe the foundation and superstructure of our institutions and our national life as they exist to-day were Alexander Hamilton and John Marshall. Jefferson achieved immortal fame by the condensation of the principles of liberty in undying expressions in the declaration of independence. But his whole theory of government was opposed to that majestic concentration of national power which makes the republic of the United States the strongest and mightiest nation in the world.

We have revered the names of these idols of the people, because we had to, long enough, it would appear. We can now discard with scorn those advanced pawns, and rush our real heroes to the front. It takes greatness, indeed, to recognize greatness.

Whitelaw Reid, editor of the New York Tribune, also spoke. His subject was "Our New Possessions," and he said:

Is the flag to be withdrawn from Cuba? It is not one of "our new possessions," but our responsibility for it is imbedded in successive and solemn declarations by almost every administration since Madison. . . . Who says the hasty resolution of congress, rushed through in the moment of declaring war, is not, at least, to be construed, like every other act, in the light of the previous policy of the government on the same subject? . . . Under that protectorate the island could have as much freedom as any state in the union, but it would not be likely to have more. Its foreign relations would and its custom house might remain under the guidance of the protecting power. Does that break the congressional promise to leave the government and control of

the island to its people? Must Cuba, though thoroughly dependent upon us for protection and defense, and absolutely essential to our safety, nevertheless have more freedom thrust upon it than Vermont or Massachusetts or New York? Our congress is capable sometimes of extraordinary things, but it is hardly capable of that.

If there is any way of "keeping our promise to the ear" of the Cuban people while "breaking it to their hope," we may depend upon Whitelaw Reid to find it.

And there they sat and talked and consulted, did these intelligent men, who understand things, secure in the knowledge vouchsafed them by Niccolo Machiavelli:

All men have eyes, but few have the gift of penetration.

STEPHEN BELL.

Brooklyn, N. Y., Feb. 13, 1901.

A QUESTION OF NEUTRALITY.

An Open Letter.

To Hon. W. Astor Chanler, M. C., Fourteenth Congressional District, N. Y.

As I am a resident and voter in your congressional district, I take the liberty of addressing this letter to you, hoping that you may call the attention of congress to the subject of this communication.

Having read from time to time in the public papers of the shipment of horses and mules from New Orleans in vast quantities for the use of the British army in the war in South Africa, I thought there must be some exaggeration. To convince myself on this subject, I made a trip to New Orleans, and found that the numbers shipped had been underestimated, instead of overstated. Over 60,000 animals of all kinds for remounts and to replace worn-out cavalry and artillery horses used up by the British army in South Africa have already been shipped from that port; and it is contemplated to ship some 40,000 or 50,000 more. In fact, 100,000 is the minimum; and what the actual number may reach is not known.

A fleet of transports has been employed in this service ever since the war began. When one transport is loaded and leaves the wharf, another takes its place, and sometimes two transports are loading at the same time.

On arriving in New Orleans last Thursday morning I took the trolley car down to the Slaughter House wharf, some five miles below the center of the town. I found the British transport Montezuma at the wharf taking on horses as fast as they could be put aboard. It grieved