

for their vitality. The list may begin with Pythagoras and comprise anyone in the more than 25 centuries since his decease. Then there is the defiance to produce the names of 20 vegetarians besides G. Bernard Shaw famous for their beauty. No limit as to time or place is imposed in this proposition. Then it is demanded, "What would Nansen have done with only a vegetarian diet permissible in his equipment for his polar expeditions?" And how would vegetarians have provisioned Columbus' vessel?

Flanking all these defiances and inquiries are letters from any number of actresses famous for good looks as well as ability testifying that they are firm believers in the joys and sustenance to be found in a mixed diet, with small birds not too scarce. The most interesting thing about all this is that vegetarianism has reached such proportions that those who, for reasons best known to themselves, oppose it think it advisable to mobilize.—Boston Evening Transcript.

HAMILTON ON LAND VALUES.

For The Public.

Here is an item for the admirers of Alexander Hamilton. In the Federalist, No. 12, on "The Utility of the Union in Respect to Revenue," advocating the adoption of the constitution because union would encourage commerce between the states which would otherwise interpose tariff barriers between one another, Hamilton says that the interests of agriculture and commerce "are intimately blended and interwoven," and adds:

It has been found in various countries that in proportion as commerce has flourished land has risen in value. And how could it have happened otherwise? Could that which procures a freer vent for the products of the earth, which furnishes new incitements to the cultivation of land, which is the most powerful instrument in increasing the quantity of money in a state—could that, in fine, which is the faithful handmaid of labor and industry in every shape, fail to augment the value of that article which is the prolific parent of far the greater part of the objects upon which they are exerted? It is astonishing that so simple a truth should ever have had an adversary, and it is one among a multitude of proofs, how apt a spirit of ill-informed jealousy, or of too great abstraction and refinement is to lead men astray from the plainest paths of reason and conviction.

And again: Personal property is too precarious and invisible a fund to be laid hold of in any other way than by the imperceptible agency of taxes on consumption.

"Two truths are told as prologues to the swelling act of the imperial theme," says Macbeth.

Strange that a man who could so clearly express two kindred truths should then proceed to advocate a revenue system which would restrict commerce and retard the increment of land values. Strange that even in that age he should fail to consider municipal as well as agricultural land values. And unfortunate that he should not have exerted his great influence to secure the total exemption of personal property from all taxation and the establishment of a revenue system which by freeing industry from all restrictions and raising public funds from a tax on land values would have tended constantly to increase at the same time the earnings of the individual and the earnings of society. Freedom of production increases land values and wages. Increased land values means more abundant social revenues. Increased wages means more abundant individual revenues. One hand washes the other.

WILLIAM S. RANN.

SPAIN TREATED PUERTO RICO BETTER THAN WE TREAT HER.

Extract from speech of Hon. William Sulzer, of New York, at the banquet of the Mohawk club in Detroit, Mich., Wednesday evening, May 2.

Since the ratification of the treaty of peace between Spain and the United States the island of Puerto Rico has been and is now a part of the territory of this country, and the constitution applies to it, and should apply to it, just as much as it applies to the District of Columbia or the territory of Arizona. To contend otherwise is preposterous.

The people of Puerto Rico are citizens of the United States, and entitled to the same privileges, the same rights and the same immunities under the constitution that the people of any other territory are entitled to in the federal union. The law compelling the citizens of Puerto Rico to pay a tariff tax on their goods, wares and merchandise to and from this country is unwarranted, unjustifiable, unprecedented, un-American, and, in my judgment, unconstitutional. In all our past history no political party ever dared to attempt to pass such a law—a law as inhuman as it is unfair.

The constitution regarding this matter is clear and plain. Section 8 of article 1 says in language that cannot be misunderstood:

Congress shall have power to lay and collect taxes, duties, imposts and excises; * * * but all duties, imposts and excises shall be uniform throughout the United States.

The republican party has deprived

the Puerto Ricans of self-government and given them a military government. They have no representation in congress. Under Spanish rule they were represented by 12 representatives and four senators in the Spanish cortes. They had their own local legislature and absolute home rule. Why, under the circumstances, I ask, in the name of all that is fair and just and decent, should we now tax them and rob them?

Have we liberated them from monarchical tyranny only to enslave them in industrial oppression? The poor people of Puerto Rico will speak, and the great heart of the republic will answer and respond in the coming campaign. The American people will never repeat in the dying year of the nineteenth century the crimes and the blunders of George the Third in the closing years of the eighteenth century. In the sisterhood of states there must be no stepdaughters. The flag we all love must not be used as a cloak to rob and oppress our fellow citizens at the dictation of the trusts and to bolster up the falling republican protective tariff fallacy.

GOLDWIN SMITH ON THE BOERS.

Mr. Goldwin Smith, who gave up a place in British politics of considerable importance, and also a place as instructor in Oxford university, to live in Canada, has just returned from a visit of a few months in Italy. He expressed himself quite freely on the war in South Africa, and the place among the nations of the Boers, at the Fifth Avenue hotel this morning. Among other things he said:

"None of my English friends and correspondents," began Mr. Smith, "has ever doubted what would be the issue of a war in which the entire forces of the British empire were opposed to those of a population not half as large as the population of Liverpool. The Boers have put into the field decrepitude and childhood. They have no reserves. We shall win; and, having won, we shall, too, probably, reap in the judgment of posterity a measure of the same glory which we reaped in the burning of Joan of Arc. We shall be fortunate if we escape the guilt of opening an era of unscrupulous rapacity and violence which might throw back for a century the progress of moral civilization.

"A civilian can have nothing to say about this dispute as to the conduct of our generals. The generals were distinguished men. The British sol-