

to form the first government, but Reid will probably oust him when the tariff comes up for final adjustment.

Adelaide, S. A., Nov. 8, 1900.
CRAWFORD VAUGHAN.

WHAT WAS NOT SETTLED AT THE LAST ELECTION.

You cannot vote down the Decalogue. No moral question was ever settled until it was settled right. None ever will be. That is the only way to kill it off as an issue. Every man in America might vote that two and two make five; but the multiplication table would outlast them all, and be just the same as though they had never lived. For the truth is eternal, whereas man is a snippy and ephemeral little ex-monkey who has done as many wrong and foolish things as he could, by himself. His only salvation is that having nothing else to tie to, and being much more "wobbly" than any other animal, he finally drifts to the unvarying truth.

Men who are still young can remember when the United States voted overwhelmingly to maintain human slavery. Men who are only middle-aged can remember when the few Americans who stood up for the abolition of slavery were alone and despised and even mobbed. But even the election of Buchanan did not prove slavery right, nor yet "settle the question" in politics. The very next campaign brought Abraham Lincoln and the downfall of slavery. The election of 50 Buchanans would not have made slavery right—it would not even have proved that the American people deemed it right. All men that God has made have conscience; the Americans, we trust, as much as the next. That is the reason why whoopings-up, and torch-light processions, and tin badges and full dinner pails never settle a question. An American votes for president one minute in four years; but his mind and his conscience he has to sit up with all the time. Not only that. Truth never fails of sons; and the sons of truth never say die. Every real cause begets men to fight for it; and they always win. It was only a few men, at first, who overcame the colonial Tories and defied the king. Only a schoolboy thinks that even in 1776 the colonies were unanimous. And '76 was the outcome of a long uphill campaign. Only a few men were they who, in time, overturned the slave-holding south and the slave consenting north. But they were right. And it was then, as it shall still be, that "One man on God's side is a majority." It seems incredible to us to-day that Americans ever cringed under the brutal rule of

George III.—but they did. We can hardly realize that for more than four-score years this nation defended and practiced human slavery. Even to the elderly men who used to own 500 "niggers" in the United States, it seems a dream. But it was no dream. And men now living will see the time when our present comparable policy of subject races will seem as unreal. I myself, who am no chicken, expect to see this bad dream forgotten in our waking.—Chas. F. Lummis, in *Land of Sunshine*.

THE LONDON TIMES UP AGAINST AMERICAN HUMOR.

An editorial note in the number for November 17 of *Literature*, published weekly by the *London Times*, runs as follows:

The popularization of history can, of course, be carried to excess. Chicago university is gaining a reputation for "fads," and this seems to be one of them. Here is a literal report of part of a lecture by Prof. Thatcher on Charles I.:

Charles was a good many different kinds of a chump. He couldn't play a square game, and made ducks and drakes of everything he got his hooks on. He had a first-class show at the king business, but he slipped his trolley every time he undertook to touch the democratic bosses. He tried a lot of monkey business with parliament, but it landed him in the soup; and when he tried to tackle old Pym, who was a tough proposition, he found himself up against it to beat the band. Pym took a fall out of him every round. He had no more chance to win out than a pair of deuces against a straight flush, and though he put up a first-class bluff it didn't go. It took him a good while to drop to it that the old gag of divine right was well enough when playing to the gallery, but that the orchestra and boxes were on to it, and that it was played out anyway. Cromwell and Ireton were too fly to be scooped by any such tommyrot. Charles had always been a high roller, and when his gang got scrapping with the Roundheads he was dead broke and had to pull the leg of all the dead-easy tenderfeet in the kingdom. The ante was too much for him. Cromwell finally sized him up and got the district attorney to press the indictment of his royal nibs for everything that was out. Charles worked his pull for all it was worth, but he got the razzle-dazzle just where the chicken got the ax. They waltzed him off to the bone-yard p. d. q., and Cromwell had the innings. See?

The professor's study of the American language and its resources would seem to be more profound than his study of English history.

In *Literature* of December 15 appeared the following editorial note, supplementary to the first:

We seem to have done some injustice to Prof. Thatcher, of Chicago, in a note which we recently published on a lecture he was supposed to have deliv-

ered on Charles I. Mr. Edward Osgood Brown, counsellor-at-law, writes to us from Chicago to assure us that the professor's "worst offense in the way of 'slang' was an instance or two of colloquial expressions, in his teaching work, which would have passed entirely unnoticed if uttered from any chair in England; but which the 'priggishness,' so to speak, of certain of his female auditors made a subject of criticism which accidentally reached the newspapers." The quotation which we gave was, as Mr. Brown supposes, "taken from some American newspaper, where it was jocosely credited to Prof. Thatcher." This, says our correspondent, is "a very common form of American humor." The jocosity of the newspaper which gave the extract had, we fully admit, escaped us. For us in the old country the true inwardness of the Chicago humorist is somewhat subtle; we have hardly yet risen to what may be called "the higher jocosity." But we are much obliged to Mr. Brown; and the more so because he assures us that "those of us in America who have most attachment to the 'old home' and its people are often obliged to defend your fellow-countrymen from the charge that they have a very poor sense of humor, and find it difficult to take a joke."

THE POWER OF THE TAFT COMMISSION IN THE PHILIPPINES.

For The Public.

We are told by the news dispatches that the Philippine commission has enacted legislation for the establishment of provincial civil government under American sovereignty in the Philippines. I find, also, upon reference to the report of the secretary of war for 1900, page 83, that a decree of the commission assumes to be a civil enactment. It begins with these words: "By authority of the president of the United States, be it enacted by the United States Philippine commission, that—" etc.

Now, I do not understand how that commission can legislate, i. e., make laws as a civil power. It is merely a branch of the military rule enforced by the president. The executive order appointing it instructed it to report to the secretary of war.

As the good McKinley has frequently told us, we all know that until congress acts, the military arm of the government is supreme in the archipelago. Congress has not acted, because the Spooner bill, which was to authorize a civil authority, was withdrawn by the administration for fear that its enactment would make more