

himself to do in office what some workingmen sincerely think they are entitled to have done, but which to him seems opposed to those principles of equal human rights to which his conscience clings. And when a man of that kind actually appears in a political campaign he is a sufficiently unique figure to be pointed out. Such a man is James W. Hill, who was a candidate last Tuesday for alderman in Peoria. Mr. Hill was asked this question: "If elected to the city council will you vote for the employment of none but union labor on all city work? Yes or no." He replied:

I am in favor of organized labor and all things that will tend to give labor its full earnings. I am well aware that labor now does not get what it earns. I also favor shorter hours for labor in order that the worker may have time to improve his mind and enjoy life. If elected to serve in the city council I shall vote for the building of an assembly hall on condition that it be free and open for all time for free discussion on every phase of the social or labor question. I would also vote that the union scale of wages shall be paid for all work done in the construction of said assembly hall and on all public works. But having contended all my life for equal God-given opportunities for all men to earn a living, I cannot now promise to favor one class of men at the expense of another. I stand for equal rights to all men, union or non-union, white or black, rich or poor—special privileges to none.

The new English vaccination act is said to be more tyrannous in operation than the one it superseded. Parents who have conscientious objections to the vaccination of their children must procure a certificate to that effect from a bench of magistrates, who, it is reported, browbeat them and often refuse the certificate, as if it were a matter of the magistrates' consciences rather than one of the parent's conscience. Besides this, the vaccinating officers are paid in fees, and to earn these they visit the parents (usually the mother while her husband is at work), and use various devices to secure opportunities to vaccinate the children. Still other forms of pressure are reported. One corre-

spondent sums it up by saying that "never before in the history of the English government has there been a law under which more injustice, tyranny, browbeating, bull-doing and intimidation has been used than is now being used to secure compliance with the vaccination acts." Possibly this condition may account for an announcement from the English local government board, made some weeks ago, that voluntary vaccination had increased since compulsory vaccination had been abolished.

PUERTO RICAN FRANCHISES.

Whether or not the senate and house of representatives of the United States, in passing the Puerto Rican government bill, deliberately and wilfully intended to throw to greed and corruption the rights and property of the people of Puerto Rico, it is certain that this is the result of their work.

The bill, as passed, provides for two houses which shall constitute a "legislative assembly." One is a "house of delegates" to be elected by the qualified voters of Puerto Rico. The other is to be an executive council composed of eleven members and the governor. All these twelve members are to be appointed by the president of the United States and only five of them need be native inhabitants of Puerto Rico. As to the others, they are merely compelled to reside in Puerto Rico during their term of office. Now while the concurrence of the legislative assembly is required in other matters of local legislation it is expressly provided—

that all grants of franchises, rights and privileges or concessions, of a public or quasi public nature, shall be made by the executive council with the approval of the governor, and all franchises granted in Puerto Rico shall be reported to congress, which hereby reserves the power to annul or modify the same.

Throughout the whole of the debate in the Senate and in the house of representatives upon this bill, the only comment which appears to have been made by either side, upon thus taking away from the people of Puerto Rico any voice whatever in the dis-

posal of what is their most valuable property as a community—that is, the use of their streets and roads, the right of eminent domain, the right to exercise and enjoy and use for the welfare or profit of the community its communal functions—was an apparently incidental remark of Mr. Foraker who had charge of the bill and who was explaining its provisions. He said that the committee would have left the granting of franchises to the legislative assembly except for the fact that the legislative assembly cannot be in session in accordance with the law, more than sixty days in any one year. "The granting of franchises," he continued, "is something that may come up at any time, and the executive council and the governor will always be there to act upon such application." (It may be remarked in passing, that of the truth of this proposition of the senator I think there can be no doubt.)

Senator Pettus, of Alabama, had originally proposed an amendment to the section, providing that the legislative assembly as a whole should have the granting of the franchises; but upon Mr. Foraker's explanation and his cheerful adoption of the rider not found in the original draft of the bill as it came from the committee, that congress "reserves the power to annul or modify" such franchises, Mr. Pettus withdrew his amendment and declared himself satisfied. And so seemed all the other opposition senators.

In the house, indeed, where the senate bill was rushed through with scarcely an opportunity for anything to be said upon it, Mr. Williams, a democratic congressman, found opportunity to declare—

The territorial part of this bill is simply infamous. The executive council or upper branch of the legislature is appointed by the president, 11 in number, and six of them may be residents of the United States outside of Puerto Rico. These 11 men appointed by the president have the power to dispose of all the franchises and public privileges in that island, and yet they are in no way responsible to the people of Puerto Rico. This provision is sure to breed corruption. It is a public shame to rush such an unjust and vicious bill through this house without debate and without any opportunity for amendment.

These were words of truth and soberness. But so far as the dominant majority was concerned, they fell upon entirely unheeding ears, and no other voice seems to have been raised against this provision. The newspapers, indeed, report that in the republican caucus, objections were made to it by one or two representatives; but there was no expression of such objection on the floor of the house. And thus the most valuable property—for that is what franchises and government privileges really are—of a million people, were placed entirely at the disposition of a body of which the majority may be and in all probability will be foreigners appointed by a foreigner; and the only reservation is that of the power of modification or annulment by a foreign legislature in which the people of the island have no representation.

Although in the senate the fundamental question of the right of the people of Puerto Rico to have a voice in the disposition of their own property was thus carelessly ignored, there was quite a little discussion as to whether this reservation of power should be to the congress of the United States or to the president. The original bill as reported from the committee on Pacific Islands and Puerto Rico read as follows:

"That all grants of franchises, rights and privileges or concessions of a public or quasi-public nature shall be made by the executive council with the approval of the governor, subject also to the approval of the president of the United States, who shall report the same to congress."

The first amendment proposed was by Mr. Foraker to make this read:

"Provided that all grants or franchises, rights or privileges or concessions of a public or quasi-public nature shall be made by the executive council with the approval of the governor, subject also as to railroad, telegraph or telephone franchises, to the approval of the president of the United States, who shall report the same to congress."

This amendment, which altered the original bill in making the approval of the president necessary only in what Mr. Foraker termed the "more important franchises," leaving such things as electric lighting, gas lighting, etc., to the unchecked dis-

posal of the executive council, seems to have been proposed by Mr. Foraker at the instigation of an American lawyer at San Juan, who declared in a letter to Mr. Foraker, read by him in the senate, that it was very important to avoid the expense and delay of a reference to the president in the case of many local and municipal franchises, which were already demanded. Mr. Foraker's fellow senators did not seem to care much about the approval of the president of the United States being required, but some of them were quite sensitive about the power of congress, and as Mr. Foraker obligingly said, that he had no personal objection to reserving expressly to congress the power of annulment, the distinction between the "important" and "less important" franchises was given up, and the approval of the president to any franchise dispensed with; but when Mr. Allen, of Nebraska, proposed that the congressional power should be reserved in this form—

"Said franchise shall not have any legal force or effect until approved and ratified by congress,"

Mr. Foraker declared that this would unreasonably delay enterprise and the development of the island; and again Mr. Allen and the other senators promptly acquiesced in his suggestion, and the clause was adopted as it stands.

It seems to me that both the principle and the practical results involved in this part of the Puerto Rican legislation are more important so far as the people of Puerto Rico and indeed of the Philippines, and it may be of Cuba and other prospective dependencies, are concerned, than even the much debated and discussed question of the tariff.

This Puerto Rican bill is explicitly avowed to be the model upon which legislation for other dependencies is to be based hereafter, and I have little doubt that despite their seeming carelessness in discussing this question the people really behind this bill knew exactly what they were about. We have heard much by the advocates of imperialistic expansion of the advantages which would accrue to the business interests of the United States from such a policy. Arguments either a priori or from statis-

tics, irrefragable as they can be made, against the absurd doctrine that "trade follows the flag," have no effect upon the "business men" who believe in the policy in question. This is because trade and commerce in their legitimate meaning are farthest from their thoughts when they speak of "business interests." That which these shrewd, able, wealthy men desire is new fields for franchise grabbing. Not that the crop of such opportunities to make money out of government concessions is gone in this country by any means, but that a country in the process of new development always furnishes for many years a more inviting field than any other for such enterprises. It is altogether too common, as Mr. Bryan in his notable speech at the convention of 1896 declared, to confound the business interests of the country with the interests of stock-jobbers and bond-traders. It is these "business interests" that have apparently convinced the present administration that both "destiny and duty" require that we should possess ourselves of "Islands beyond the Sea."

If special privileges are still to be granted by government, citizens of the United States will undoubtedly always have a certain advantage in dependencies of the United States. But it would seem that if these governmental functions in various quarters of the globe are to be farmed out to American citizens, doubtless to their great enrichment, the people whose property they are should, as a matter of decency, have something to say concerning their disposition; and that such disposition should not be given to a body appointed by the president of the United States for the time being the members of which will be almost sure to be under deep personal and political obligations to rich individuals and corporations in the United States, and too likely to regard the salaries which they are to receive for temporary residence in their respective satrapes as the most important thing about their office.

It certainly is needless to discuss the futility of the reservation to congress of the power to "annul" or "modify" the franchises. It affords no safe-guard to the interests of the people, although it is conceivable that

it opens the door to additional corruption and blackmail.

EDWARD OSGOOD BROWN.
Chicago, Ill.

NEWS

The military situation in South Africa is practically unchanged since our report of last week, when the Boers were attacking Wepener. British reports from Bloemfontein on the 13th described the Boers as in full retreat from this point, but this was contradicted on the 17th by reports from Boer sources; and on the 18th Lord Roberts reported Wepener as still surrounded. He declared, however, that the Boers were now fighting half-heartedly and exhibiting uneasiness about the security of their communications. For their uneasiness there would seem to be reason. Lord Roberts is reported to have "spread his net far and wide" to catch the Boer detachments that are operating before Wepener and throughout the southeastern part of the Orange Free State; and on the 17th his forces were said to be converging. His forward movement to Pretoria is at a standstill. The explanation offered is lack of horses.

Gen. Gatacre has been called home for incompetency, and Gen. Chermenside assigned to his command. This change made a slight sensation in London; but it was followed by one of much greater proportions, caused by the first publication, on the 18th, by war office authority, of a dispatch written by Lord Roberts as far back as February 13, and which had been in the possession of the war office for five weeks. Lord Roberts in this dispatch very freely criticised both Gen. Buller and Gen. Warren for the Natal campaign for the relief of Ladysmith. The publication of the dispatch at this time is regarded as intended either to force the resignation, or prepare the public mind for the recall, of both Warren and Buller.

On the 15th the Boer peace delegation, consisting of Messrs. Fischer, Wolmarans and Wessels, arrived at The Hague. These delegates were first mentioned in these columns at page 7 of No. 104, as being on their way to some of the European capitals and Washington to negotiate for intervention in behalf of the independence of the two republics. They

were received at The Hague enthusiastically with cheers and cries of "Long live the Transvaal and the Orange Free State."

The Boer general, Cronje, with his family and staff were landed on the 14th at St. Helena, as prisoners of war. Other Boer prisoners of war were landed at the same time, and others still were reported as having been sent to St. Helena from Cape Town. The Boers complain of this disposition of prisoners, asserting that the humid atmosphere of St. Helena means death to men accustomed to the dry climate of the African veldts, and they threaten to retaliate.

American casualties in the Philippines since August 6, 1898, inclusive of all official reports given out at Washington to April 18, 1900, are as follows:

Killed	473
Died of wounds, disease and accidents	1,205
Total deaths	1,678
Wounded	2,092
Total loss	3,770
Total loss reported last week....	3,725
Total deaths reported last week..	1,653

In the Philippines, the petty warfare of which we wrote last week continues. On the 16th 300 Filipino riflemen and bolomen had attacked the American garrison at Batoc, in the province of North Ilocos—which is in the northwest of Luzon—and were repulsed. A few days before this an American detachment had surrounded a Filipino recruiting village in Benguet province—on the western coast, about half way further down toward Manila—and after capturing several prisoners had burned the village. Another American capture was that of Gen. Montenegro, who, with Gen. Macabulos, had been trying to reorganize the Filipino army in the province of Pangasinan, which is on the same coast, still farther south. Montenegro surrendered, but Macabulos escaped. Along with these reports came others of futile attacks by Filipinos upon San Jose, in the province of Batangas, which is on the southern coast, and Santa Cruz on the lake. On the island of Mindanao, the most southerly of the group, at Cagayen, the Americans were attacked on the 7th. A street fight of 20 minutes' duration fol-

lowed, in which the Filipinos were worsted and withdrew to the mountains.

The Philippine question was elaborately and impressively discussed in the senate on the 17th by Senator Hoar. The extracts and descriptions given by the daily press indicate that Mr. Hoar's speech was one of great power and eloquence and the occasion historic. His references to Aguinaldo and his compatriots were brave and discriminating. Aguinaldo he ranked with "that small band who have given life and everything dearer than life to their country in a losing cause," and predicted that "he would live with Kossuth, with Oom Paul, with Joubert, with Emmet, with Egmont and Horn, with Nathan Hale, with Warren, with all the great martyrs of history whose blood has been the seed of the church of liberty." And as one indication of the qualifications of the Filipinos for self government Mr. Hoar declared that—

the state papers of Aguinaldo, the discussion of the law of nations by his attorney-general, the masterly appeal of Mabini, are products of the Asiatic mind. They are not unworthy of the Asiatic mind, the vehicle through which came to us the scriptures of the old and new testament, the poetry of David, the eloquence of Isaiah, the wisdom of Solomon, the profound philosophy of Paul.

The most dramatic feature of Mr. Hoar's speech appears to have been an imaginary roll call of distinguished Americans voting on the question of imperialism. It began with Washington, who briefly gave his reasons and voted "No," and ended with McKinley, who was made to say:

There has been a cloud before my vision for a moment, but I see clearly now; I go back to what I said two years ago: "Forcible annexation is criminal aggression; governments derive their just powers from the consent of the governed, not of some of them, but all of them." I will stand with the fathers of the republic. I will stand with the founders of the republican party. No.

Aaron Burr alone answered "Yes," explaining: "You are repeating my buccaneering expedition down the Mississippi; I am to be vindicated at last."

It was not expansion that Mr. Hoar argued against but imperialism. He found authority enough in the declaration of independence for expansion, but, he said, this is—
the expansion of freedom and not of