

IN CONGRESS.

This report is an abstract of the Congressional Record, the official report of congressional proceedings. It includes all matters of general interest, and closes with the last issue of the Record at hand upon going to press. Page references are to the pages of Vol. 35 of that publication.

Washington, Dec. 10 to 16, 1901.

The senate resumed proceedings on the 10th, but its proceedings were unimportant. The bills introduced on subjects of general interest were—No. 1,450, Chinese exclusion (p. 197); 1,552, presidential assassination (p. 199); 1,572, Nicaragua canal (p. 200).

Nothing was done on the 11th beyond the introduction of bills, the only one on a subject of general interest being a joint resolution, No. 17, for amendment to the constitution so as to change inauguration day from March 4 to the last Thursday of April (p. 241).

On the 12th Senator Mason spoke on the adulteration of food products (p. 251), and Mr. Tillman offered a resolution (p. 251) with reference to favoritism in the punishment of convicted bank officers. The adjournment was to the 16th.

House.

Having adjourned on the 6th until the 10th, the House reassembled on the latter day. It received from the president the report of the Isthmian Canal commission (p. 206), and in committee of the whole considered a message to refer the various parts of the president's general message to various committees (p. 206). Only Mr. Grow (p. 207) spoke, however, his speech being devoted to the question of legislation for the Philippines. When he had closed, minority discussion and amendments were cut off by the previous question (p. 210), and the references as proposed by the ways and means committee were made. This business disposed of, the House adjourned, out of respect to the late Senator Kyle, to the 13th. The bills of general interest introduced were—No. 4,325, revenues for Philippines; 4,326, army; 4,328, trusts (p. 213); 4,333, national pardon board; 4,343, Hawaiian currency; 4,347, funding treasury notes into bonds; 4,348, additional revenues; 4,350, presidential assassination; 4,360, anarchist immigration; 4,361, federal jurisdiction over state corporations; 4,362, free postal delivery; 4,370, paper money (p. 214); 4,385, immigration; 4,387, land grant to Alaska railroad; 4,406, frauds in congressional elections; 4,664, ship subsidy (p. 215); 4,672, lynching; 4,576, constitutional amendment; 4,578, bimetallicism; 4,581, trusts; 4,618, oleomargarine (p. 216); j. r. 65, defining treason; j. r. 68, polygamy; j. r. 70, income tax; j. r. 73, income and succession taxes (p. 217).

Reassembling on the 13th, pursuant to the adjournment of the 10th, the house in committee of the whole ordered a reference (p. 257) of house bill 5,833, being the substitute of the ways and means committee for house bill 4,325, on revenues for the Philippines; and further ordered (p. 257) that the bill be considered on the 17th and 18th in committee of the whole, and that at the close of the debate in committee, but not later than four o'clock on the 18th, the committee rise and report the bill back to the house and that the previous question be considered as thereupon ordered. The house adjourned to the 17th. Bills introduced on subjects of general interest were as follows: No. 5,797, convict labor goods; 5,798, convict labor goods; 5,817, immigration (p. 260); 5,823 public lands in Porto Rico; 5,824, presidential assassination; 5,833, (from ways and means committee), revenue for the Philippines; 6,271, presidential assassination (p. 261); 6,320, convict labor; j. r. 76, constitutional amendment; j. r. 77, constitutional amendment; j. r. 79, telegraph ownership (p. 262); house resolution 51, inquiry into refusal of governors to surrender fugitives from justice (p. 263).

"No, I'm not very well impressed with the house," said the prospective tenant. "The yard is frightfully small; there's hardly room for a single flower bed."

"Think so?" replied the agent; "but—er—mightn't you use folding flower beds?"—Philadelphia Press.

MISCELLANY

THE PROBLEM.

For The Public.

How much we have done for the woes of the poor,  
Whose bare contemplation we scarce can endure,—

The weariness, want and anxiety which  
Rack the kind souls of even the monstrously rich.

Sweet Charity! greatest and highest and best

Of the eternal three by Christ's legate confessed,

What a comfort beneath thy broad skirts to conceal—

Along with our sins—the compassions we feel,

And enjoy, at a price we can so well afford,

Of duty well done the delightful reward.

But what is this harrowing statement we hear

That breaks to our hope what was promised our ear?

Can it be the almsgiving we gladly hire done

Makes two paupers or more, while relieving but one?

We have heard this before from the meddlesome crank

Who would level society down to one rank,  
Who would snatch the reward from superior skill,

And the motive of progress would ruthlessly kill.

But now our own experts take up the same tone,

And Charity's helplessness loudly bemoan,  
Even saying our gifts she but vainly consumes

In sweeping back misery's tide with her brooms.

What, what can be done in such heart-rending plight?

Shall poverty's prisoners perish outright?  
No! we never will cease while our incomes pour in,

To pay for the battle with want and with sin.

Ye preachers and teachers and writers galore,

Statesmen and economists, come to the fore!

On you does this difficult duty devolve  
Of reading the riddle our souls yearn to solve,

Whose solving alone can our safety insure,

The problem of permanent help for the poor.

Dead silence at first; then there comes to the ear

A babel of counsels confusing to hear;  
Religious revivals, home missions, trade schools,

Sound temperance instruction, good cookery rules,

And many more things than find room in this verse;

But all now in use, and our case growing worse!

Ah! what is this voice which comes up from the rear?

Compared with the rest it rings startlingly clear:

"O world, broken-hearted at poverty's wall,

Blind, and led by the sightless, how can ye but fail?

What is God's cure for poverty? Ask yourselves this;

Be sure that no better—no other—exists.

While authorities drone, and experts delve in holes,

Look ye out on the world, look ye in on your souls;

See the earth made for all—naught in nature more plain;

Make man free to its use, or all else is in vain.

From the slough of despond, where ye flounder in doubt,

On quackery ladders hope not to climb out;  
Ye must suffer with plagues as did Egypt of yore

As long as God's children are fenced from God's store,

And the one help for poverty under the stars,

Having found the right way, is to let down the bars!"

O Liberty! long to our poor race denied,  
By lip-service insulted, by power defied,  
Through what lessons of woe will men finally learn

The fetters of privilege nobly to spurn,  
And with clarified vision their salvation see,

O mother of peace and of plenty, in thee!

JAY HAWKINS.

Haskell Flats, N. Y.

AN OPEN LETTER TO SENATOR BURROUGHS.

For The Public.

Hon. J. C. Burroughs, Senate Chamber, Washington, D. C.—Honored Sir: Permit me to tender you some suggestions that may prove helpful in the matter of your bill, now in process of construction, as the press informs us, having for its object the establishment of a bureau of inspection to seek for marks of anarchism in immigrants.

As to the physical stigmata I can render you no assistance, as all scientists know them, and doubtless the officers who will find places under your bill will be scientists who cannot be deceived. But there are certain intellectual stigmata whereof your measure should take cognizance. The test should be applied in the form of a series of questions, and the nature of the answers may be accepted as an infallible indication as to whether the subject of the inquiry is an archist or an anarchist, and of course we must all be of one or the other of these classes.

We must not guard against anarchists only, but also against those who may logically be deemed on the anarchistic road.

I beg to submit a series of questions, an affirmative answer to any one of which may be accepted as sufficient proof that the respondent is not to be included among the respectable classes, and is, therefore, on the

high road to anarchism, if not already contaminated by the heresy.

1. Do you agree with Macaulay that "the evils of liberty are to be remedied only by more liberty?"

2. Do you believe that the earth was made for all mankind?

3. Do you believe that a child born into this world who is doomed to pay rent for the privilege of using and occupying what he needs of the earth's surface has been unjustly disinherited?

4. Do you agree with Thomas Jefferson that "that is the best government that governs least?"

5. Do you agree with Eugene V. Debs that "while there is misery at the bottom there will be no security at the top?"

6. Do you believe that it is possible for a workingman to entertain any intelligent opinion on any subject that he does not get from his master or his landlord?

7. Do you believe any of the stuff attributed to Jesus of Nazareth in Matthew v. and vi.?

Of course I realize that your method of applying the physical test is more scientific, and the learned men who will seek for the marks of anarchism can scarcely be deceived in view of the many ascertained stigmata that science has discovered. Nevertheless my suggestion may be of some value in sifting out those who are in the incipient stages, whose stigmata are therefore not sufficiently developed to attract the notice of the savants employed by the government.

Assuring you of my sympathy for your noble endeavors to keep out all who entertain opinions that may prove dangerous to our class,

Yours admirably,

HERMAN KUEHN.

70 Dearborn St., Chicago, Dec. 16, 1901.

#### GUERRILLA WAR.

Portions of a letter written by Sir William Harcourt to the London Times, reprinted here from the Times Weekly Edition Supplement of November 15.

What has been the fatal feature of this unhappy war from the beginning to the present moment is the invincible ignorance of those responsible for it, both at home and in South Africa, of the conditions they had to deal with, both physical and moral. Of their acquaintance with the physical conditions of the war they were about to wage the preparations they made for it are sufficient indication. But the most inexcusable of all the blunders which have brought us to the present situation has been the moral and intellectual obliquity of vision which has

blinded those who have brought about and conducted the war to the real character and spirit of their opponents. . . The government ignored the terrible nature of the enterprise which is undertaken by those who set about to subjugate a brave and a free people. And yet the lesson is written large in the pages of history from the days of the Persian king, of Philip of Spain with the Indies, of Napoleon at the head of countless legions. It is one which it is incredible that a British government should not have learned, especially as under evil counsellors, 120 years ago, the same thing was attempted on our own race. It is still more deplorable that the British government should seem to have forgotten the issues of that ill-omened contest, which for many years was as enthusiastically applauded as that in which we are now engaged. But at least those who profess to call themselves liberals cherish with pride the memorable protest against that ruinous policy which found a voice in the thunder of Chatham's "mother tongue," in the fervor of Fox, and the wisdom of Burke. They, too, in their day were assailed by ministerial slander and popular clamor as pro-Americans, as traitors, as enemies of their country, and friends of its foes. But they knew the truth, they spoke it, and their record remains for the instruction and imitation of those who come after them. . . .

Of course Mr. Chamberlain is for more and more violence—as Dr. Watts says, "it is his nature to." Like many penitents, he confesses only his virtues. He candidly admits that he has weaknesses; they are—too much courtesy to his opponents at home and too great leniency to his foes abroad. These foibles he promises to correct. . . .

No! We shall not, with Mr. Chamberlain, take refuge in the precedents of Poland or of Hungary. I trust we shall take counsel of our record and the example of, I fear we must say, better men and better times. When it is proposed to deal out "greater severities" to what are called "guerrilla bands," I will show that the English government and their noble military chief, the duke of Wellington, insisted that these guerrillas were entitled to exactly the same treatment as the combatants in the organized battalions of the great military powers. The Partidas of Spain in the Peninsular war were the exact counterparts of the Boer guerrillas to-day. The history of the guerrilla warfare in the Peninsula and their valiant chiefs is portrayed with graphic eloquence by

Southey in his history of the Peninsular War and the way in which they "held the fort" from 1809 to 1812 against all the marshals of France. Southey relates that he derived his information from a personal acquaintance with Mina, the Botha or the De Wet of that famous drama. The story is well worth reading to-day. Let me record what were the opinions of the duke of Wellington on guerrilla warfare. On August 9, 1809, he writes:

The guerrillas should be employed on the enemies' communications. The plan of operations I should recommend for the Spanish nation is one generally of defense. They should avoid general actions, but should take advantage of the strong posts in their country to defend themselves and harass the enemy.

Later on, after the defeat of the Spanish armies and in contemplation of his own retirement to Portugal, the duke writes, December 21, 1810: "We cannot beat the French army out of the peninsula; we must give occupation to as large a part of it as we can, and leave the war in Spain to the guerrillas." The war was accordingly left in the main to the guerrillas, and it was owing to their maintenance of the contest during 1810 and 1811 that the later operations of Wellington in his advance became possible. . . .

I do not believe that at this moment what the nation desires is the announcement of fresh severities. It wishes to hear a spirit of conciliation and a real attempt at peace. Peace will never come through the channels in which the conduct of the war has up to this time run. The temper and the tongue of Mr. Chamberlain are admirable instruments for the promotion and exasperation of war. They are employed without remorse for inflaming passion and aggravating prejudice at a general election. He has the happy knack of irritating for no purpose by bitter taunts each and all the nations of Europe; he insults and maligns his opponents at home; and by futile menace and actual severities he stiffens the resistance of the enemy in the field. This is not the statesmanship that makes for peace. A declaration from him that what he intends is equal rights for the British and the Boers gains no credit, but is regarded by them as a cruel mockery. They look to the bullying tone in which British ascendancy and Dutch subjection predominates the colonial office and the Cape; and they believe that the performance of the promises thus held out will practically rest in the hands of the authors of the Raid, who are the dominant factors in South African policy.

We have the confession of Lord Milner that as it has been and is now con-