

The Public

First Year.

CHICAGO, SATURDAY, OCTOBER 29, 1898.

Number 30.

LOUIS F. POST, Editor.

Entered at the Chicago, Ill., Post-office as second-class matter.

For terms and all other particulars of publication, see last column of last page.

The intelligent classes of North Carolina are "defining the rights of the unintelligent" down there, in a typical way—with whips, shot-guns and bloodhounds.

What can be at the bottom of all this plotting in Paris, which has at last brought the Dreyfus ministry to the ground? Why did M. Cavaignac resign the war portfolio last summer, rather than consent to an inquiry into the justice of Dreyfus's sentence? Why did Gen. Zurlinden, who succeeded Cavaignac with the understanding that he would consent to such an inquiry, why did he, as soon as he had got into the office, become stubborn and resign when his colleagues showed a disposition to institute the inquiry? Finally, why did Gen. Chanoine, Zurlinden's successor, at first assent to an inquiry and then resign because he was opposed to it? What is the reason that all these three successive ministers of war became so firmly convinced, while in office, that Dreyfus is guilty, as to choose to embarrass the ministry rather than give the public the benefit of the evidence which had been so effective in convincing themselves? The fair inference is that they fell, in some way, under the power of the military ring, and that the military ring has something bad to conceal which a Dreyfus inquiry would disclose.

The Chicago jubilee was a vulgar show. Professing to be a peace jubilee, it was in fact a disgusting glorification of victory and conquest. Professing to be patriotic, it was politically partisan and commercially sordid.

At the beginning, one of its principal promoters, a man of the name of Truax, grew so indiscreetly candid as to proclaim its primary purpose to be the bringing in of outsiders to spend their money in Chicago; and republican politicians were unable to restrain their enthusiasm until the end of the show, over the number of votes they supposed the jubilee speeches had won for them. These were the transparent objects of the affair—to make money for street cars and stores, and votes for republican politicians. And its outward expression harmonized with its inward character. False in sentiment, the jubilee was appropriately tawdy, in display. It would be a wanton insult to the good people of Chicago to refer to it as an indication of either their patriotism or their taste.

An investigation made by the Chicago Tribune shows that a vast majority of the democratic candidates for congress are running on the Chicago platform. In only 124 of 347 congressional districts have the congressional conventions ignored the platform, while in 223 they have unreservedly indorsed it. Nearly all the opposition to the platform comes from east of the Alleghenies, New York and Pennsylvania contributing 57 districts to the total of 124. This is all very significant, and the facts will be worth remembering in connection with the returns next month from the congressional elections.

Indiscreet friends of Col. Roosevelt, who have been running an inferior wild west show in the provinces of New York, have deprived him of the president's support in his political aspirations. These friends were not satisfied with booming Roosevelt for governor, but they must needs cry

out that they would first make him governor and then president. That startled Mr. McKinley, who, with the aid of his good friend Hanna, has staked out another term as president for himself. So, upon his recent stumping tour in the west, he carefully avoided passing through the state of New York. McKinley did not want to speak for Roosevelt as he had done for his congressional friends in Iowa, Illinois and Ohio. Roosevelt was looming up as a rival. But Mr. Platt, who was not to be turned down so easily, went to Washington, and, declaring that Roosevelt was in great danger of defeat, suggested that a few speeches in the state from the president would turn the adverse tide. The president smiled blandly, as is his wont when he says one thing and means another, and admonished Mr. Platt that a due regard for the proprieties forbade the president's making partisan speeches. Thereupon Mr. Platt departed, wondering where the president had stowed away those proprieties while he and his cabinet stumped the northwest.

The injunction order issued by the federal court at Cleveland, a full copy of which has come into our possession, clearly explains why the strikers have declared their strike "off." So long as it appeared, as from the general press despatches it did appear, that the injunction only forbade violence, it was not easy to understand why the strikers, if they were really peaceable, should have abandoned a fight which they claimed to have almost won. But an examination of the order shows that the question of violence plays no vital part. It is an order against striking—whether peaceably or not makes no difference. The Cleveland strikers therefore had nothing to do but to declare their strike "off" or go to jail for contempt.

To demonstrate that we are not exaggerating the force of the Cleveland injunction, let us quote from it. Though it orders the defendants to refrain from threats, violence, intimidation, and the like, those words are evidently thrown in only for "color," for it also orders them to desist and refrain—

from in any manner interfering with, hindering, obstructing or stopping any of the business of the complainant, The American Steel & Wire Co.

From doing this "in any manner," let it be observed. The order further enjoins them—

from doing any act whatever in furtherance of any conspiracy or combination to restrain either The American Steel and Wire company or its officers or employes in the full and unlimited control of the business of The American Steel & Wire Co.

Note the language, "Any act whatever" in furtherance of "any combination." Again—

from in any manner interfering with The American Steel & Wire Co. in carrying on its business in its usual and ordinary way.

These clauses, if obeyed, make a strike impossible. For a strike consists in a combination of workmen for the purpose of withdrawing from their employment. Any such combination, no matter how peaceful it may be, does in some manner interfere with, hinder and obstruct, and it may probably stop the employer's business; it does restrain the employer in the full and unhindered control of his business; it does in some manner interfere with the employer in carrying on his business in the usual and ordinary way. The Cleveland injunction, therefore, is an injunction against strikes.

If generally followed as a precedent this Cleveland decision would outlaw all labor strikes—something that legislatures have carefully refrained from doing. Legislatures have, on the contrary, been legalizing peaceable strikes. But government by legislation is a weakling as compared with government by federal injunction.

But the Cleveland injunction case is even more revolutionary than we

have yet shown it to be. Not only does it prohibit peaceable strikes, but incidentally it prohibits peaceable freedom of speech. That may sound preposterous, but let us consider the terms of the order a little further. In addition to the numerous other restraints it imposes, this choice specimen of government by injunction prohibits the defendants named, and all other persons associated with them— from compelling or inducing or attempting to compel or induce, by threats, intimidation, persuasion, force or violence, any of the employes of the American Steel and Wire company to refuse or fail to perform their duties as such employes.

These words appear at first reading to be directed only against violence or threats of violence. So confusingly mixed up with language describing violence, is the language describing peaceable persuasion, that the full import of the clause is not at once apparent. But peaceable persuasion was what the steel trust wished to prevent, for there had been neither violence nor threats of violence, and peaceable persuasion was prevented, as a careful reading of the extract quoted above in small type will show. To facilitate its examination let us reproduce the clause with the confusing words regarding violence omitted. Here it is:

from . . . inducing, or attempting to . . . induce, by . . . persuasion . . . any of the employes of the American Steel and Wire Co. to refuse or fail, etc.

There is no room for reasonable question, in the language of the injunction order itself, that the federal court at Cleveland intended to make the injunction so broad that the strikers and their friends could not exercise their undeniable natural right to discuss the situation with men who were imported to take their places, and to plead with those men to quit performing the duties of employes. It seems that the judge intended also to prevent the use of peaceable persuasion to induce workmen not to enter the employment of

the trust. For though the language of the order does not clearly prohibit that, yet the judge refused so to modify his order as to prevent it. Before the order was signed, Arnold Green, who was associated with ex-Congressman Foran in defending the strikers, asked to have the following words added:

But it is no part of this order that any of the defendants shall be restrained or enjoined from inducing, persuading or advising others by peaceable means and without threats, force or intimidation from leaving complainant's employment, or from entering into the employment of complainant.

Had the federal judge honestly intended only to prohibit violence, he would have granted Mr. Green's request. But he refused it. The inference is unmistakable.

Thus this Cleveland injunction carries "government by injunction" further than it has ever been carried before. For here we find freedom of speech absolutely forbidden. Prior to this, the federal courts had invaded the exclusive lawful province of the local police by attempting to preserve local order with injunctions. So also they had waived aside the guaranteed right of trial by jury in criminal cases, by issuing injunctions against crime—contrary to a long settled practice—in order to convict without a jury and to punish in discretion for contempt of court, persons accused of the crime. But not until now have they gone so far as to issue an injunction against the peaceable exercise of the right of free speech. Yet this they have now done. "Government by injunction" has reached such a culmination, that upon the demand of powerful complainants, complaisant federal judges would not lack precedent for forbidding public meetings for the discussion of "dangerous" questions.

Among the astonishing decisions rendered this week by the Supreme Court of the United States and the Supreme Court of Illinois, is one by

the latter which protects the wheelmen of Chicago from a license tax. Attacked by that common craze for taxing everything in sight, the Chicago common council had passed an ordinance requiring all vehicles, regardless of their value, to pay a license fee, to be devoted to street improvement. It will be observed that the "poor man's horse"—the bicycle,—and the rich man's coach were thus taxed alike, though one might have been worth \$25 and the other \$2,500; and it was apparently on account of that inequality that the Supreme Court of the state nullified the ordinance as unconstitutional. The court held that the city council had no right to levy a tax in that manner.

But the bicycle tax would commend itself to the average man as fair, in spite of its discrimination. He would say that the owners of vehicles get the benefit of street improvements, and ought therefore to contribute to the expense of keeping them up. This is a badly distorted notion, as we may see by a little reflection. Street improvements are beneficial to everybody, as a convenience. But it does not follow that everybody ought to pay for them. To some people, to whom they are beneficial as a convenience, and only to some, they are beneficial also pecuniarily. These are the lot owners along the improved streets. Lots are worth more if the street on which they abut is improved than if it is not. The street improvement is as beneficial to the owners of those lots in all other respects, as to anybody else; but to them it is peculiarly beneficial because it makes them richer. Fairness demands, therefore, that out of their pecuniary benefit they bear the pecuniary burdens of the improvement. Under a bicycle tax, the tenant on an improved street, if he owned a bicycle, would be doubly taxed for street improvements—once in the bicycle tax, and once by his landlord in higher rent for enjoying the benefits of the improved street.

Judge Peckham, of the United

States Supreme Court, in the opinion of that court in the railroad pool case, delivered by him this week and assented to by a majority of the court, uses an expression that should be kept constantly before the public. He says: "The business of the railroad carrier is of a public nature, and in performing it the carrier is also performing to a certain extent a function of government which requires it to perform the service upon equal terms to all." This concession from the highest court in the land, that the business of a railroad is to a certain extent "a function of government," is of supreme importance. Let that idea—and it is sound to the core—once take hold of the public mind, and we shall have the people seriously asking themselves why business, to the extent that it is a function of government, should be farmed out to private corporations. They will want to know why the government should not execute its own functions.

A sound common sense decision has been rendered by the Supreme Court of San Francisco in the case of Mrs. Botkin, who is accused of having murdered two people in Delaware. It is charged that she mailed poisoned candy from California to a person in Delaware, and that the two deaths occurred from eating of it; but there is no pretense that Mrs. Botkin was ever bodily in Delaware. Yet the governor granted a writ of extradition upon the theory that she was a fugitive from Delaware. He held that though she had never been bodily in that state, yet, as she had consummated the crime there by means of the United States mails, she had made that institution her agent and, constructively, had gone to Delaware and then escaped. This theory was a necessary condition of the extradition, for it is only fugitives from justice that a governor has the legal right to extradite from his own state to another. But the San Francisco court, with a bench of five judges, has unanimously upset that theory. It holds that no one can be a fugitive from jus-

tice, unless his flight is actual and not constructive.

This decision does not allow Mrs. Botkin to escape a trial for her alleged crime. If guilty at all she is as guilty in California as in Delaware, and she will be tried in the courts of California. What the decision does is to prevent the dragging of a person charged with crime, and presumably innocent, three thousand miles away from her home, out of the reach of friends and friendly witnesses, to undergo a capital trial among strangers. The San Francisco court is deserving of exceptional commendation for thus preventing the substantial rights of a citizen and resident of the state from being construed away.

At last the Torrens law for the transfer of land titles is to have a chance in this country. The supreme court of Illinois has sustained the Torrens law of that state. This law looks to the establishment of a system of transfer that will make it as simple and almost as cheap to pass real estate as to pass promissory notes. The state guarantees the title. Title searching, risks of bad titles, and all other difficulties that now obstruct transactions in real estate will disappear. Doubtless the pecuniary benefits of this reform, like those of all other reforms, will enure to land owners; for when titles pass more cheaply, land sellers will be able to exact higher prices. But the reform is in the direction of familiarizing the public with the idea that land tenure is a privilege secured by the state, and that familiarity is a condition precedent to the establishment of justice with regard to land.

In one of his campaign speeches during the present year, the one delivered at Indianapolis on his way from Chicago to Washington, President McKinley said: "The war was inaugurated for humanity; it must not stop until it embraces humanity." This evoked great applause, says the Chicago Record, from which we take the report. But why? What did

Mr. McKinley mean? Did those who applauded understand him? Did he understand himself? What are we to expect, when the president declares that the war "must not stop until it embraces humanity?" Are we to go on fighting until we get everybody by the ears? or what? Has Mr. McKinley no scruples against embracing humanity with war? Couldn't he find something more kindly to embrace humanity with? Or was he in trouble for something to say that would sound great without meaning anything?

The American consul general to Sweden and Norway, who is home on a vacation, is enthusiastic about the great field these kingdoms offer for American trade. He should urge Mr. McKinley to annex them. This war with Spain ought not to stop until it embraces Sweden and Norway, along with the rest of humanity whom Mr. McKinley proposes to embrace with it. "Trade follows the flag," and if Sweden and Norway offer a territory for American trade, it is patriotism to demand that the flag be forthwith planted there.

President McKinley evinces no disposition to avail himself of the precedent set by his immediate predecessor, of invading a sovereign state without a requisition from its governor. It cannot be for lack of opportunity. Gov. Tanner, of Illinois, has thrown one opportunity wide open. If there was any legal justification for the sending of federal troops to Chicago in 1894, there certainly was a better one for sending them to Virden in 1898. At the same time, down in North Carolina, the propertied white classes are mobbing negroes so as to prevent them voting, and the state authorities seem unable to control the mobs. Yet McKinley ignores the handy precedent that Cleveland made. Rather than order federal troops into a sovereign state until requested by the governor, he allows the mobbing to go on without any manifestation of concern. In

this he is undoubtedly doing his constitutional duty. The president of the United States has no more constitutional right to use the army for the preservation of local peace in one of the states of the Union, except upon requisition from the governor, than Queen Victoria would have to do so with a body of red coats sent across the Canadian border. We hesitate, however, to commend the president very heartily for ignoring Mr. Cleveland's revolutionary precedent, because he is not under the severe temptation that confronted Cleveland. It was at the instigation of a powerful railroad ring that Cleveland acted.

When in our issue of October 1 we said that nobody has any difficulty in approximately determining the value of any given site of land, in a neighborhood in which he is acquainted, except when called upon to do so for the purpose of understanding the single tax, we had no intention of inviting a metaphysical controversy. But Mr. E. D. Stark, of Cleveland, proffers one. Mr. Stark asks:

How can you find the value of anything which is not property, and so is not the subject of bargain and sale at all? Value is unthinkable, as an incident of anything that is not property. I mean, of course, commercial value. That is what we mean when we talk of taxing land according to its value. You say correctly that we can easily find the value of a "site" (land) under present conditions, for the law and universal opinion regard land as property, over which the owner has the same right as he has over his horse or his plow. Difficulty arises when by the single tax scheme there is no individual ownership of land, and so no buying and selling of it.

You may say that in your scheme of economic philosophy "land value" means what one pays for use and occupation. Very well. Then why not call it "rent" and done with it. Rent is the payment for the privilege of use and occupation. The state or municipality then becomes the landlord. My difficulty remains, for you have no selling value to guide you as to the amount of your "tax" (rent). I can conceive of no way of making the rent charge fair and equal, only by an open market where there is competitive bidding.

Mr. Stark confuses the moral principle which justifies the exclusive taxation of land according to its value, with the practical method by which it is proposed to realize that principle approximately. The principle is that the incomes men receive from the advantages of their ownership of especially desirable land, differ morally from the incomes they receive from their industry. The latter they earn by serving their fellows; the former they derive from the community, without earning it. Single tax men therefore argue that the one kind of income should be sacred as private property, to the last cent; and that the other should by moral right go to the community to the last cent. The plan proposed for accomplishing this is to abolish all taxes except those on land in proportion to its value. But of course neither that plan nor any other plan could more than approximate its object. Nothing in this world can be done with theoretical exactness, not even the placing of a keystone. If the land value tax were high enough to take the entire ground rent, there would indeed be no capitalized value upon which to estimate a tax. But so long as the tax left a marketable margin of rent, there would be a market value and the tax could be readily estimated. For instance, if 90 per cent. of the rent were taken, there would still be ten per cent. for capitalization. To this Mr. Stark would doubtless agree. He in fact does so in advance. But then the other difficulty arises in his mind. If we leave ten per cent. of annual land value, or rent, with the owners, we do not abolish private ownership of land, and our moral principle is stultified by our method of realizing it. That metaphysical difficulty, however, need give us no concern. If we find that taxation is on the whole a better and fairer mode of taking ground rent for public use, than by a government leasing system, the ten per cent. more or less of public income left to private use would go to

the account of profit and loss as part of the expense of the better method. We should thereby approximate substantial justice, which is all that can be hoped for.

As to one most important kind of land, the single tax would completely abolish its private ownership, and make it, not government property, but free land—free as air. If even very much less than 90 per cent. of ground rent, potential as well as actual, were taken by the single tax, it would no longer pay to hold land vacant for a rise. Therefore, such vacant land as was really needed for use would come at once into use, while such as was not needed would be abandoned and become as common as the highway.

But the real point at the outset is not whether the single tax could or ought to take the entire ground rent of land. It is whether it could be, and if so, whether it ought to be, adopted, as the exclusive method of raising public revenues under existing conditions. That it could be, Mr. Stark admits. Upon this point he says:

My difficulty, you will observe, does not go to the scheme of state revenue which puts the entire burden on land according to its selling value, under conditions of private ownership and right to buy and sell sites in the open market. Such a scheme of taxation is coherent, workable, and—barring the evils of the transition period in old settled communities—might be beneficial.

Mr. Starks' only objection to this is that from the single tax man's point of view it would be inconsistent, as recognizing private ownership. That point we have already considered, and need say no more upon it than that the substantial right of ownership would be denied to the extent of the tax. The moral justification for this denial is the truth that, as Emerson puts it, every man's title to land is vitiated so long as any man is landless. The aim of government should be to secure peaceable possession of land for use, and security for improvements and other products. That done, the de-

mands of justice are substantially satisfied if all public needs be paid for out of ground rents, and vacant lands be free.

For the information of people who think that there is an abundance of good public land still left open to settlement, we beg to call attention to a recent statement prepared by the land office at Washington. According to that statement, the total amount of public land, outside of Alaska, now open to settlement, is 579,368,274 acres. Of this area 546,549.65 acres are in the desert-land states and territories, and 332,176,000 acres are estimated as desert. Thus the amount of public land reported by the land office as available for settlement is less than 250,000,000 acres in area. And much of that would appear to be unavailable if its distance from markets, its saturation with malaria, and its other objectionable qualities were made known. There is in truth but little land left in the United States which may be had for nothing; and such as there is, is just about worth its price—nothing.

Our peace-loving friends who have jumped at the czar's proposition for disarmament, mistaking that play for despotic position as an overture for universal peace, should note what the Russian government is at this moment doing in Finland. When the Finns accepted Russian rule, at the close of the Russo-Swedish war in 1809, it was upon condition that they should retain their constitution and all the rights and privileges they had enjoyed under Sweden. But now the czar has commanded the Finnish parliament to convene in extraordinary session and register the will of the czar respecting military service. This is in bold violation of the condition ratified by the Russian government when Finland came under its jurisdiction. It is a sample of what all may expect when the Russian policy of fastening the Russian empire and despotism upon the rest of the earth shall have been realized.

Disarmament would be a glorious thing; but disarmament at Russia's suggestion, while she gags the press so that military preparations might be carried on there in secret, would be imprudent to the degree of childishness. What the czar is now doing in Finland he would soon be doing everywhere if the rest of the world laid down its arms. Let those who want peace advocate the things that make for peace. When we have a free press and free trade the world over, arms will be abandoned without any equivocal suggestion from a despotic monarch.

To those philanthropists who, ignoring the influence of environment in producing criminals, search up and down the earth with statistical microscopes to find proof of its origin in heredity, and thereupon propose in more or less barbarous fashion to prohibit "the propagation by criminals of their species," we commend the substitute proposed by one David J. Smith, of St. Louis. Mr. Smith proposes that on the 1st of January in every year the worst man in each ward of St. Louis shall be hanged, the choice to be determined by popular vote. This proposition is not less barbarous than that of the heredity experts, nor is it any more lacking in rationality.

There was a great to-do in England last summer over revelations of the usurious rates of interest which a London money lender had been exacting from the scions of the nobility and others of their kidney. So important was the matter that it got into parliament, where an attempt was made to enact legislation to crush out this kind of money lending. Most drastic measures were proposed. We commented upon some of them at the time. But the great difficulty encountered, as may well be supposed, was to define money lending so as safely to prohibit it. This is now painfully apparent from the report of the parliamentary committee, which has defined money lending as "transactions with persons carrying on the

business of a money lender, in the course of such business." As the Manchester Guardian says, that definition is like Bardolph's "accommodated"—"that is, when a man is, as they say, accommodated; or when a man is being—whereby—he may be thought to be accommodated."

In commenting upon the parliamentary committee's acute definition of money lending, the Manchester Guardian delivers itself of an admirable analysis of commercial interest. Speaking of the total or gross interest on a loan, it says:

There is, first, net interest, the sum that in a free and open market, with all parties intelligent, well informed, and able to wait for what they want, a loan of money on the best possible security will fetch. In England to-day the net interest on money is about 2½ per cent. per annum. An investor in consols is as nearly as possible a receiver of net interest pure and simple. The next element in gross interest is insurance against risk of loss. The sum yielded in interest by Russian government bonds is greater than the sum yielded by the same amount of money invested in consols, because Russian credit is a little lower than ours and her creditors must be insured against risk as well as paid the current rate of net interest. The third main element in gross interest is really a kind of wages of management. If the amount of money that we have supposed to be invested first in consols and then in Russian bonds were invested in a pawnbroker's business it would bring in a rate of gross interest never lower than 25 per cent. Scarcely any risk would be run, as security would be held for every loan. But nobody would engage in a business so troublesome, on account of the great number of small transactions, unless he were paid a good deal more than the net interest and a reasonable insurance on the loans made. He would expect liberal wages or earnings of management as well, and that is what the high gross interest charged by pawnbrokers consists in, so far as it is not really excessive, as some part of it no doubt is.

Gen. Shafter's plea that the result of the battle of Santiago is a complete

defense to all criticism, is boyish. It is often the case that the management of battles, as of other things, must be judged by the result. But that is so only when there are no other great facts to judge by. With the battle of Santiago, however, there is another great fact. It is plain to the commonest understanding that Shafter's campaign would have been a humiliating failure, had not Cervera abandoned the city. Why he did so has never been explained; but it is certain that Shafter did not drive him out.

When Prof. Laughlin says that in its essentials banking consists in receiving deposits and making loans, and that the issue of circulating notes is not essential to the business, he is absolutely right. It is the one truth about banking, which, if generally understood, would soon put an end to the possibility of the banking ring's getting the government by the throat. This is not the effect that Prof. Laughlin aims to produce, but it would be the natural effect.

Not only is the issue of circulating notes not essential to banking, but it is not a legitimate function of banking. So long as banks confine their work to receiving deposits and honoring checks (thus doing the communal bookkeeping of their respective localities), and to making loans on commercial paper (thus acting as middleman for the distribution of credits), they serve a most useful purpose. But when to these normal functions they add the sovereign function of manufacturing money, they generate the financial rings of which the country justly complains.

These rings are now engaged in endeavoring to secure from congress the right to supply all the paper currency of the country, the greenbacks to be withdrawn and destroyed. That right, if granted, would enable the banks to expand and contract the money volume almost at will. And in addition it would increase our interest

bearing debt by millions of dollars. The measure by which this object is to be accomplished is known as the McCreary bill. The banking rings have already secured for that bill a favorable position, and with all their might will push it through congress this winter if possible. Whatever may be the specific merits or demerits of the McCreary bill, the fact that it would turn the greenbacks into interest-bearing bonds, and invest the banking rings with the privilege of supplying the people with their currency, ought to damn it. No virtues the bill may possess can offset this vicious principle which it embodies.

To the ranks of papers that foresee the wisdom and recognize the morality of repudiating unconscionable public debts, may now be welcomed one of the most respectable weekly publications of the world—the London Speaker. Discussing the responsibility of Cuba for debts loaded upon her by Spain, the Speaker asserts that the doctrine that a debt incurred by a ruler binds his successors, rests upon a slight foundation; and then it says:

It is monstrous that a tyrant should be able to burden future generations simply because he is in possession of the material government. If investors felt that in international law loans incurred against the will of the people would not attach to the country in the event of a change of government, there would be less of that monetary support of misgovernment which has disgraced the high finances of the nineteenth century.

These are brave words, bravely spoken, and eternally true from first to last.

FARMERS' TAXES.

To show how the single tax would affect farmers, we must consider all kinds of farmers, thus:

1. Renting farmers.
2. Mortgaged farmers.
3. Wage-working farmers of both sexes.
4. Farmers who own farms of small value.
5. Good farmers, or those who are really working their farms, and whose

improvements and personal property are as valuable as their land.

6. Landlord farmers, or those who do not work their farms, and whose improvements and personal property are of less value than their lands.

The first class of farmers, the renters, are, according to the United States census, 35 per cent. of all farmers. If they all paid their rent to the government, instead of to private individuals, it would go to enrich the government, which in this country is the whole people, and they, as part of the people, would get their share of it. They now pay the rent to private individuals and get no share. Evidently they would be helped by the single tax.

The mortgaged farmer differs very little from the renting farmer. He pays in interest what the other pays in rent, and would be benefited as much by the single tax as the renter. This class is 18 per cent. of all farmers.

The third, or wage-working class, would be helped, because the single tax would destroy monopoly of land and render it unprofitable for rich men to hold land out of use. That would enable vast numbers of wage-working farmers to go on farms for themselves, instead of working for wages, which in turn would raise the wages of those who continued in service.

To understand how the single tax would affect the fourth class, we must find how much value of land every person would have if the land were divided up into portions of equal value. The single tax is a method of giving to all citizens their equal share of the value of the land. It is found that if the land were so divided, each person in the country would have a portion worth \$500, or each family a portion worth \$2,500. Therefore, any family now owning a less value of land than \$2,500 would be helped by the single tax, at least to the extent that its present holding is worth less than \$2,500.

The good farmer, or the farmer whose improvements and personal property are at least equal to the value of the land, is the fifth class. How will the single tax affect him? We will illustrate by taking three farmers, A,

B and C, all of equal wealth, but having their capital invested differently, thus:

	A	B	C
Land values.....	\$800	\$1,200	\$1,600
Imp'm'ts on land..	400	200	000
Personal property..	400	200	000
	\$1,600	\$1,600	\$1,600

Let us suppose it is required to raise from A, B and C \$100 in taxes. On the present system they would all pay equal amounts, \$33.33 3, because they are each assessed at \$1,600. But under the single tax they would only be taxed on their land values. Their combined wealth would be \$3,600, and the question would be as follows:
 A.... 3,600 : 800 :: 100 : 22.22.2
 B 3,600 : 1,200 :: 100 : 33.33.3
 C 3,600 : 1,600 :: 100 : 44.44.4

Under the single tax A would pay \$11.11.1 less than he does now, B would pay the same as he does now, and C would pay \$11.11.1 more than he does now.

A was the only good farmer, because he alone had as much value of improvements and personal property as of land. B had three times as much value of land as of improvements and personal property. C had nothing but land. Is it not plain that only the landlord farmer would have to pay more taxes?

To summarize:

	Per Cent.
1. Renting farmers.....	35
2. Mortgaged farmers.....	18
3. Wage-working farmers.....	20
4. Farmers having small land values	10
5. Good farmers.....	12
6. Landlord farmers.....	5
	100

We have had to guess at the percentages of the last four classes, but our guess cannot be very far from correct.

No person will be inclined to dispute that the single tax would help the first three classes, or 73 per cent. of the farmers; and we have proved that it will also help the fourth and fifth classes, or 95 per cent. The remaining five per cent. are not worthy of consideration. The pure landlord is a man who is trying to live by the sweat of his neighbor's brow. He is trying to monopolize the earth. If he be compelled to go to work it will make a better man of him.

J. G. MALCOLM.

NEWS

In France, the ministry has been forced out of office under circumstances that suggest another Dreyfus reaction and indicate at least a temporary victory of the royalist and military factions.

Immediately upon the opening of the chamber of deputies, on the 25th, a bitter speech was made by one of the deputies against Gen. Chanoine, the minister of war. Gen. Chanoine is the third minister of war in the present cabinet, of which M. Henri Brisson has been—from the time of its formation, June 27, 1898,—the premier. M. Brisson's first minister of war was M. Cavagnac, who resigned early in September, giving as his reason that he was in disagreement with the rest of the cabinet regarding the Dreyfus case, he being firmly convinced that Dreyfus was guilty. It was popularly understood at the time that Cavagnac had been influenced by the military ring. He was succeeded by Gen. Zurlinden, whereupon it was given out that a revision or review of the Dreyfus case would be ordered. But Gen. Zurlinden disappointed every one, and the order for revision was still withheld. Owing to Zurlinden's defection, the cabinet could not come to a decision. Two explanations of his conduct were suggested, first, that his army friends had influenced him, and, second, that he had discovered the corruption to be so widespread in upper army circles that he feared to let in any light. Zurlinden resigned when the cabinet decided to refer the Dreyfus question to a commission. He explained that he had made an exhaustive study of the case, and was too fully convinced of Dreyfus's guilt to agree, as head of the army, to any other solution than that of the maintenance of the judgment in its entirety. Then Gen. Chanoine came in as minister of war. It was while he held the office that the cabinet, on the 20th of September, decided to order the minister of justice to submit the question of revising the Dreyfus case to the court of cassation for a legal opinion. This decision of the cabinet was opposed, but apparently not by Gen. Chanoine. At any rate he remained in the cabinet until attacked in the chamber of deputies on the 25th, as stated at the beginning of this paragraph. At the conclusion of the speech attacking him, he excitedly re-

plied. Among other things he declared that he was of the same opinion as his predecessors regarding the Dreyfus case. This declaration caused a tumult of cheers and protests that lasted for five minutes. Resuming, Gen. Chanoine exclaimed that he was the guardian of the honor of the army, and then in an outburst of anger shouted: "I place in your hands the trust I received, and I tender my resignation in this tribune." With that he descended from the tribune and left the chamber.

No sooner had Gen. Chanoine abandoned the tribune than M. Brisson, the premier, ascended it. He was greeted with shouts of "resign!" from the conservative side of the chamber, and with cheers from the radical side. M. Brisson explained that Gen. Chanoine's resignation came as a surprise, for the general had been present at the cabinet meeting which agreed to submit the question of revision to the court of cassation and had not then raised any objection. He asserted also that the ministry was fully determined to maintain the supremacy of the civil over the military power. At this point a recess was taken at M. Brisson's request, to enable him to confer with the president as to Gen. Chanoine's resignation; and upon his return and the resumption of the session he reported that a successor to Gen. Chanoine would be appointed. Attempts were then made in the chamber to discuss "military plots," "insults to the army," etc., causing great confusion, and culminating in a motion censuring the ministry for failure to support the army. This motion was lost by 261 to 274 votes. It was immediately followed by a resolution calling upon the ministry to "end the campaign of insult against the army," which the premier refused to entertain. He was overruled by a vote of 243 to 296. To overcome the effect of this adverse vote, a vote of confidence was moved, but M. Brisson's small majority had now disappeared. The vote of confidence failed by 254 to 286. The Brisson government was at an end, and the ministers left the chamber.

After the departure of the ministers, the chamber adopted a resolution affirming the supremacy of the civil over the military power and calling upon the government to end the campaign of slander against the army. It then adjourned until November 4.

The degree of commercial fear which the political crisis has excited, may be inferred from the fact that rates of exchange on London have risen several points above that at which gold exportation receives an impulse. Money and credits are evidently being transferred in a panic from Paris to London.

The excitement over the fall of the French ministry has completely submerged all interest in the possibility of a war between France and England about the occupation of Fashoda on the Nile. Most of this war talk, except what the newspapers worked up, was probably mere diplomatic bluff anyway; but bluff must take on an appearance of genuineness, and the French fleet had been mobilizing at Toulon, while in England there was much said about calling out the reserves and ordering the White Star and Cunard lines of steamers to hold their subsidized vessels in readiness for immediate service. Gen. Kitchener has arrived in Paris. He came in company with Capt. Baratier, who carries dispatches from Maj. Marchand, at Fashoda, to the French government.

There was reason to believe last week that the deliberations of the joint commission sitting at Paris for the preparation of a treaty of peace between Spain and the United States, would soon reach a satisfactory termination. But no progress has since been made. The delays are due to the efforts of the Spanish commissioners to induce the United States to modify the terms of the protocol with reference to the relinquishment by Spain of Cuba. Spain aims as far as possible to cast responsibility for the Spanish-Cuban debt upon Cuba or the United States; but the American commissioners refuse in any way to depart from the terms of the protocol, under which Cuba is to be relinquished unconditionally. Three joint meetings have been held since our last report. The first took place on the 21st. The time then was devoted to the reading by the Spanish commission of arguments in opposition to the American position on the debt question. This meeting lasted two hours and a half, and adjourned to the 24th, when the longest meeting of the series was held, which lasted four hours and three-quarters. Again the sole question under consideration was the Cuban debt, and the American commissioners are

reported to have made a resolute and final refusal to assume any obligations in Cuba arising out of Spanish contract or guaranty. The second joint meeting adjourned till the 25th. At the third meeting, the Spanish commissioners appear to have made some kind of new proposition, the nature of which is variously stated by different reports. What it was has not been authoritatively nor even intelligibly divulged. This meeting adjourned until the following day.

The evacuation of western Cuba has begun. On the 20th 1,500 Spanish regulars embarked at Havana for Spain.

In eastern Cuba Gen. Wood has issued a proclamation as military governor pro tem., whereby he guarantees to the people the rights of assembly, petition, free worship, free speech, free press, open courts, the sanctity of property, and generally all the guarantees of freedom which in this country are secured by bills of rights.

The Cuban assembly held its first session on the 24th, at Santa Cruz del Sur. A majority of the delegates were from the different corps of the Cuban army, one of them being Gen. Garcia. It is reported that the delegates express unqualified gratitude to the United States, but are strongly in favor of an independent Cuban government.

The naval board which was convened for the purpose of reporting upon the engagement in which Cervera's fleet was destroyed, has reported. A report purporting to have emanated from it was published generally some weeks ago, of which an abstract appeared in these columns, but that report proved to be false. According to the true report, now published, which very minutely describes the fight, Com. Schley's vessel was the nearest American vessel to the Colon when the latter surrendered, being three and four-tenths miles away. Sampson's vessel was nine and a half miles away.

This week is notable for the delivery of several startling court decisions, some by the Supreme Court of Illinois and others by the Supreme Court of the United States. One of these decisions holds the "Town of Pullman" business of the Pullman Palace Car Co. to be a legal usurpa-

tion, and another outlaws the railroad pool.

The prosecution of the Palace Car Co., was begun by Maurice T. Maloney, Gov. Altgeld's attorney general, in his official capacity. He sued to compel the company to go out of the real estate, gas, water, heating, brick-making and other businesses in which it was engaged at Pullman, on the ground that its charter conferred no authority upon it to engage in those businesses. The company demurred, as it is technically called, which means that it claimed that even admitting the facts charged by the attorney general, he had no legal right to a judgment against the company. In the lower courts this demurrer was sustained, the courts holding that the alleged illegal acts of the Pullman Co. had become legal through long acquiescence on the part of the state. But the Supreme Court now reverses the lower courts, three judges out of seven dissenting. The opinion of the majority of the judges holds that the Pullman company not only is unauthorized to carry on the business objected to, but also that of some of those businesses it—

assumes and exercises powers and functions which the general law of the state contemplates shall be possessed and exercised only by municipal authorities of cities and towns and the public school authorities, and that other of its unauthorized acts tend to restrain competition in various branches of trade, to remove real estate from the operation of our statute of descent and place the title thereto in a corporation having perpetual succession and unending existence, and thereby withdraw it from the channel of trade and commerce to create monopolies in the business of selling the necessities and concerns of life, and that its acts and doings are opposed to good public policy.

And on the point upon which the lower courts decided in favor of the company, the Supreme Court says:

We do not think the demand of the sovereign people that usurpation so clearly antagonistic to good public policy shall be restrained, can be defeated by any imputation of laches or upon the ground that acquiescence is to be inferred from the failure to invoke the aid of courts at an earlier day.

The property involved in this decision includes the houses, lots, sewerage and water systems, gas plant, schoolhouses, churches, theater, market hall, hotel, and a large tract of vacant land, at Pullman, and stock in

various side enterprises; and in value it runs far up in the millions.

The Joint Traffic Association fares as badly in the Supreme Court of the United States as does the Pullman company in that of Illinois. This association was formed Nov. 19, 1895, by 32 railroads representing the great trunk lines and their branches. Its purpose as stated in its own articles of agreement was "to establish and maintain reasonable and just rates, fares and regulations on state and interstate traffic," which means of course that the rates and fares should be what the association chose to make them. A smaller association of the same kind, known as the Trans-Missouri association, was established by the southwestern roads. Both associations were prosecuted under the Sherman anti-trust law, and also under the interstate commerce law, as conspiracies in restraint of freedom of trade. The Trans-Missouri case reached the Supreme Court first, and in that the prosecution was sustained—Fuller, Harlan, Brewer, Brown and Peckham being the justices who decided against the combination; Field, Gray, Shiras and White deciding in its favor. This majority was so narrow that the Joint Traffic Association looked forward with some confidence to being able to induce one of the judges to discover a distinction between its agreement and that of the smaller conspiracy. In the United States circuit and appellate courts in New York it did secure favorable decisions, just before the supreme court decision in the trans-Missouri case; but the decision of the Supreme Court, just rendered, in the Joint Traffic case appears to be conclusive against all such combinations. The justices stood five to three. Fuller, Harlan, Brewer, Brown and Peckham decided in condemnation of the agreement, and Gray, Shiras and White in favor of it. Justice McKenna, who succeeds Field, took no part. The majority of judges held that the only new point was as to the constitutionality of the Sherman anti-trust act, and they were of opinion that as railroad corporations perform functions that are to a degree governmental, it is within the constitutional power of Congress to regulate them in accordance with whatever policy it may choose to adopt.

Both the courts already mentioned made other important decisions of

general interest along with the two reported above. The United States Supreme Court held in the case of the Kansas City live stock exchange, that it is not a trust within the meaning of the Sherman law. Justice Harlan dissented, declaring that such exchanges tend to place the commerce of the country under the control of a few rings or syndicates. The Illinois Supreme Court held in the case of the Chicago bicycle license tax for street improvement purposes, that the city has no power express or implied to levy such a tax. It also held that Mary G. Hennessy, a laundress who had been boycotted by the Chicago Laundrymen's association, because she cut rates, was entitled to the verdict of \$6,000 which she had obtained against the association as damages. But the most important decision of all, more important in its ultimate effect than that in either the Pullman or the railroad pool cases, was that of the Illinois Supreme Court sustaining the Torrens land transfer law. This law will do away with title searching, and make real estate transfers almost as simple as transfers of stock.

The Indian war in the northwest appears to have been subdued. Though the chief whose resistance to arrest was the immediate cause of the trouble is still at large, 15 armed Indians of the tribe have gone after him. Eleven of the Indians for whom warrants were out for resisting officers gave themselves up on the 20th, and were tried at Duluth on the 23d. They were convicted, fined \$100, and sent to jail. Six warrants are still unexecuted.

The negotiations for the settlement of this Indian outbreak were carried on by William A. Jones, commissioner of Indian affairs. Upon his return to Washington he made the following public statement of the cause of the trouble:

The origin of the whole trouble was dissatisfaction with the handling of the Indians' timber, but the immediate cause was irritation at the frequent arrests of Indians on trivial causes, often for no cause at all, taking them down to Duluth and Minneapolis for trial, 100 miles away from their agency, and then turning them adrift without means of returning home. I have information that there is a definite arrangement between the United States marshal and some boarding houses where the courts are located, by which the deputies are to bring down delegations of Indians as witnesses in whisky

and other cases. This secures fees for the deputies and money for the boarding places. The Indians were prompted to their outbreaks by the wrongs committed on them and chafed under unfair treatment. When I reached there they were surly, ugly, defiant, but soon adopted a conciliatory attitude and finally agreed to negotiate for the surrender of the men wanted. The Indians now will go back to their homes and live peaceably, if the whites will treat them fairly, which is very likely, as the whites were thoroughly impressed with the stand taken by the Indians. In this respect the outbreak has taught them a lesson.

The Indian war in the northwest is succeeded by fears of trouble in the southwest. For 30 years the government has fed the Comanche, Kiowa and Apache Indians, under a treaty made at Medicine Lodge. But that treaty expired on the 1st of July, and now the Indians, suffering from hunger, have begun killing Texas cattle. The fears are not allayed by the reported escape of Geronimo, the famous Apache chief, who has been in United States custody for 10 years. He escaped at Wichita, while on his way back from the Omaha exposition, and was supposed to have headed for his tribe in New Mexico.

Race trouble of another variety is imminent in North Carolina. The news about it is not very definite, but extensive riots between whites and blacks are looked for on election day. The democrats appear to have set out upon a preconcerted campaign of violence, with a view to driving negroes from the polls, and finally disfranchising them. Their cry is that property must govern. Both races are arming, and some conflicts have occurred. The blame for these is thrown upon the negroes, but the reports are transparently partisan and untrustworthy. Gov. Russel issued a proclamation on the 25th, in which in general terms he recited lawless conditions, the invasion of the state by lawless armed men from another state, the breaking up of political meetings, and the use of intimidation to prevent registration.

Another race war is in progress in South Africa, in the Transvaal. The South African republic is fighting the Magato tribe of natives, who are located in the Zoutpansberg district, to the south of the Limpopo river. The natives had massacred a Lutheran missionary and his family at the town

of Zoutpansberg, and the boers undertook to punish them. The boer expedition was met by a large body of natives, but it chased them back into the mountains. That victory is not regarded as conclusive, however, and a long campaign is expected.

NEWS NOTES.

—Emperor William, of Germany, left Constantinople for Palestine on the 22d.

—On the 24th the members of the Puerto Rican island cabinet took the oath of allegiance to the United States.

—The national authors' congress of Russia, in session at Moscow on the 29th, paid especial honor to the name and works of Tolstoi.

—A bed of marl and clay from which the finest Portland cement can be cheaply made has been discovered near Coldwater, Mich., by L. W. Hoch, a former mayor of Adrian.

—At the elections in Paris, France, held on the 24th, to fill 13 vacancies in the municipal council, the socialists secured 9 of the seats. The majority of the council was already largely socialist.

—The Turkish troops are leaving Crete, and the Turkish civil officers are to follow. Great Britain, France, Russia and Italy are now conferring as to the selection of a Christian governor general.

—The director of the mint reports to the secretary of the treasury that the amount of gold produced in the United States in 1897 was 2,774,935 fine ounces, worth \$57,363,000, and of silver 53,660,000 fine ounces, worth \$69,637,172.

—Prof. George D. Herron, of Iowa College, lectured at noon on the 24th at Willard Hall, Chicago, before the National Christian Citizenship League, on "The Ethical Tragedy of the Social Awakening." His next lecture, to be delivered at the same place at noon on the 31st, is on "Public Resources and Spiritual Liberty."

—Intense excitement, amounting almost to terror, prevails in Vienna, Austria, over the possibility of the spread through the city of the bubonic plague of India. Some days ago an assistant in Prof. Northnagle's establishment for the cultivation of the plague bacillus for scientific purposes, contracted the disease and died of it. Since then seven cases have occurred. Dr. Mueller, who had survived all the dangers of the disease at Bombay and was considered an authority upon it, is among the victims who have died.

—Acting Attorney General Richards renders an official opinion holding that the United States statutes relative to the admission of Chinese persons of the exempt classes and the regulations

made under the provisions of the treaty between the United States and China providing for the departure and return to this country of registered Chinese laborers, are applicable to Chinese persons applying for admission to the Hawaiian islands, or to such persons residing there who may wish to depart with the intention of returning.

MISCELLANY

THE AVERAGE MAN.

When it comes to a question of trusting
Yourself to the risks of the road,
When the thing is the sharing of burdens,
The lifting the heft of a load,
In the hour of peril or trial,
In the hour you meet as you can,
You may safely depend on the wisdom
And skill of the average man.

'Tis the average man and no other
Who does his plain duty each day,
The small thing his wage is for doing,
On the commonplace bit of the way.
'Tis the average man, may God bless him,
Who pilots us, still in the van,
Over land, over sea, as we travel,
Just the plain, hardy, average man.

So on through the days of existence,
All mingling in shadow and shine,
We may count on the every-day hero,
Who haply the gods may divine,
But who wears the swarth grime of his
calling,
And labors and earns as he can,
And stands at the last with the noblest,
The commonplace average man.
—Margaret E. Sangster, in Harper's Weekly.

THE NEW INDIAN.

I looked from the swaying, painted warriors in the ring (at the Trans-Mississippi exposition) to the handsome young Indian in his smart tweed suit who was holding an umbrella attentively over two Indian maidens in civilized finery, and a voice at my elbow said: "Say, Jim, why ain't you painted up like them, an' dancing?" to which came Jim's scornful reply: "I wasn't ever painted in my life, or danced, neither!" He seemed to me speaking the doom of the old ways.—Octave Thanet, in The Cosmopolitan.

THE CITY OF BOSTON GOES INTO BUSINESS.

Mayor Quincy's latest novelty in the way of municipal progress is a scheme to have the city take in washing.

When the plans for the new Dover street public bathhouse were published it was found the basement was to contain a model laundry, in which were to be washed the bath towels of all the city's public baths.

The laundry will be able to handle 30,000 towels a day, and as it is more than probable there will not be enough stock to keep the machinery busy a

scheme is put forward to arrange that by the payment of a small sum family washings can be brought there and made white as the falling snow.

It is estimated that 100 family washings can be handled a day and that the receipts would go a great way toward paying the expenses of the institution.—Dispatch to Chicago Chronicle under date of October 18.

REPUDIATION IS BECOMING RESPECTABLE.

It is monstrous that a tyrant should be able to burden future generations simply because he is in possession of the material government. If investors felt that in international law loans incurred against the will of the people would not attach to the country in the event of a change of government there would be less of that monetary support of misgovernment which has disgraced the high finances of the nineteenth century.

For 50 years Spain has ruled Cuba in defiance of the will of the Cuban people and in spite of the constant protests of the United States. The cost of her military operations there has been met by loans specially chargeable upon Cuba, in the first place in order to punish the Cubans and in the second in order to arrange for a cheap retreat in the event of being driven out of America. In a word, the debt has been charged upon Cuba largely with the object of saddling it upon the United States. The bondholders were encouraged to look to the supposed doctrine of international law as part of the security while they were lending to Spain against the will of both Cubans and Americans.

It is to be hoped that the United States, while assuming sovereignty over Cuba, will refuse to pay any part of the debt except the money used in the development of the island, thereby setting a most useful precedent, of which tyrants and financiers will do well to take note.—The London Speaker.

THE SLUM BABY.

Suppose the paper came out with headlines, an inch or two in height. "A Vanderbilt Baby Born and Brought Up in the Slums." "Little Brother of William K. Vanderbilt Heartlessly Left to a Miserable Existence in a Filthy Tenement." "Appalling Neglect, Brother of a Millionaire Resigned to the Care of Paupers and Criminals." etc. Would people believe it? No, not even if they saw it in the New York Journal. And yet babies are born and brought up in the slums, and we say

we are all brothers; and millionaires go to church and read the Bible and pay fine ministers to preach the brotherhood of man. We are not brothers. We ought to be, and our saying we are is a very encouraging sign, because it shows our ideals, and where our ideals are we shall be some day. But we are not brothers now. Our actions belie our words. Imagine, if you can, a millionaire allowing his baby brother to be raised in the slums by the most degraded men and women in the land. Even a millionaire as stingy as Russell Sage would not do it, let alone a respectable millionaire, or an ordinary working man. Imagine a baby in the slums with a dozen millionaires for brothers and sisters, all of whom knew he was there, and was their lawful brother in direct need and sore distress. Imagine a baby in slum life with brothers and sisters worth sixty-five billions of property! You can't do it. Yet that's what the brothers and sisters of every baby in the slums of this country possess, according to the brotherhood of man and the census of 1890—nearer seventy-five or eighty billions, probably, but it might as well be zero as far as the average slum baby is concerned. It doesn't do any good to be born into Uncle Sam's family, if he is a billionaire, and a multi-billionaire at that, for most of the family won't acknowledge the relationship except with wind.—Prof. Frank Parsons, in *The Kingdom*.

HOW TRADE FOLLOWS THE FLAG.

President McKinley, in one of the brief speeches which he made in Iowa, is reported as saying:

We have pretty much everything in this country to make it happy. We have good money, we have ample revenues, we have unquestioned national credit, but what we want is new markets, and as trade follows the flag, it looks very much as if we were going to have new markets.

The phrase "trade follows the flag" had its origin in the eighteenth century at a time when England, France, Spain and Holland were reddening the seas with their best blood in their efforts to retain or establish colonies in the East and West Indies, in North America and South Africa.

A colony, at that time, meant a portion of the earth's surface whose inhabitants were authorized to trade only with the mother country and to allow only the ships of the mother country to carry their imports and exports. This principle formed the real groundwork of the colonial wars in which our own ancestors took part before the revolution. France and England were in a deadly

struggle for trade in North America, in India, and in the Antilles. The British colonists and the French colonists joined in the fight as a matter of course. When the British arms prevailed, the home government naturally felt at liberty to apply the rules of exclusive trade and navigation to the colonies that she had so long fought for, and when the colonists felt the pinch they remonstrated and finally rebelled against the tyranny.

The phrase "trade follows the flag" is true only in this wicked sense. When a country is strong enough and selfish enough to seize another country or province, and to force the latter to buy and sell only with the conquering country, then, and then only, does trade follow the flag. The flag in this case means simply powder and ball, although that idea is not offensively presented in the euphemism which President McKinley employed. The flag may represent either peaceful commerce or violence and bloodshed. That it means the latter when it is used as Mr. McKinley used it is evident, because to say that trade follows peaceful commerce would be tautology and sheer nonsense. And yet nobody would think that Mr. McKinley meant to say that trade follows the cannon-shot. What he probably meant was that since our guns have taken possession of certain territory and populations heretofore belonging to Spain, and which were oppressed by her commercial restrictions, therefore we may apply our own restrictions to them; of course not so severe as those of Spain, but such as will insure good trade for us. Mr. McKinley believes in moderation in all things. He said at Omaha that in dealing with our new international problems we must "avoid the temptation of undue aggression and aim to secure only such results as will promote our own and the general good." In his first message to congress Mr. McKinley said that seizing foreign territory in certain cases named would be "criminal aggression." He has now got down to "undue aggression," which is simply the amount of aggression that we think fit.

The words which we quoted at the beginning of this article are the first that Mr. McKinley has uttered in any public way regarding his policy in the Philippines and other territory that succumbed to our arms during the war. They indicate that his purpose is to hold everything that we have laid our hands on. We may be mistaken in our interpretation of his remarks. It is just possible that he

meant that where our flag goes trade will be freed from Spanish restrictions, not that it will be subjected to our restrictions. If this was the thought in his mind he might have made it clearer. If he meant to apply the colonial policy of the eighteenth century to the Philippines, Cuba and Puerto Rico, then his talk about trade following the flag becomes intelligible. If this policy prevails we shall present an edifying spectacle to the world—stepping into Spain's shoes and adopting her policy for our own benefit in dollars and cents, after violating our solemn promise not to annex her territory.—New York Evening Post.

PUBLIC INDIFFERENCE IN ELECTIONS.

Thoughtful men deplore the widespread carelessness and indifference to good municipal government, manifested especially at election time, when one would suppose that every good citizen would take time and trouble in an important public matter, instead of having to be persistently canvassed by candidates and their agents, and perhaps coaxed to go to the polls.

Various superficial and penal remedies have been proposed, amongst them compulsory voting and the legal abolition of canvassing. Such methods are objectionable and inefficient.

But what are we to do? Is there no way of curing these evils?

Certainly there is. For every wrong act there is a motive. When the wrong act is a common thing amongst many respectable people, then there must be an underlying motive common to all these people, which leads them to act as they do. To find out and remove that motive, and to supply a stimulus in the opposite direction, is far better than your prohibitions and pains and penalties. It is the old story that prevention is better than cure—especially when the cure does not cure.

What, then, is the motive, the reason, for public indifference at municipal elections? Its root is in a system which restricts the choice of the elector to candidates that he does not care about, or gives him occasionally the privilege of throwing away his vote on a man he is interested in, but who cannot be elected. No wonder the voters are indifferent. Remove your stupid obstacles to their doing the right thing before you punish them for not doing it.

Consider the effect of a reasonable and proper system of election.

Take as an illustration a city gov-

erned by a council of nine aldermen, elected by proportional representation every year from the city at large, the ward boundaries being abolished. Those aldermen would be elected in such a way that one-ninth of the electors, from all over the city, could elect one alderman.

See the wide freedom of choice! Instead of half a dozen ward candidates, 16 or 18 men of wide reputation, known from one end of the city to the other. Amongst these there would surely be some man whose candidature would strongly rouse your interest, and for whom you would make a point of recording your single vote. Perhaps he might be a supporter of some reform that you believe in; perhaps advocating some special city improvements that you wanted; perhaps a man so well and favorably known that you would be glad to support him; perhaps even a personal friend of yours, but not living in your particular political "pen"—the old ward. Little matter what, so long as you, the voter, had a wide choice to rouse your interest.

Then, the grand feeling of an efficient ballot, the knowledge that your vote would tell—would be a real factor in the contest—would count either for some one you wanted or against some one you did not want! This feeling would come from marking nine candidates in the order of your choice, so that if your favorite candidate did not need your vote, it would not be thrown away, but would count for some one else.

Besides, the caliber of the candidates would be greatly improved, because they would have to be favorably known throughout the city, not with mere ward reputation.

As to canvassing, the motive and necessity for it would be largely removed by the abolition of the ward system, and the introduction of proportional representation; because each candidate would appeal to that group or quota of the electors, spread over the whole city, who were in accord with his ideas; and it would be a difficult, almost impracticable, thing, to tramp the whole city, or hire men to do it, and pick out the particular one-ninth of the voters on whom he could rely for election. Appeal by printed addresses on the ground of principle and character would be the principal factor; whilst the factor of personal persuasion would become of little value. That is a better way of abolishing canvassing than by prohibition with pains and penalties.

It is not easy to overestimate the

necessity and importance of public interest in elections, because this is a vital matter. But the way to do right is to begin rightly—on a right foundation.

What we have said about the benefits of ward abolition and effective voting applies to nearly every city, town and village on the continent. Everywhere there is reason for the same complaint of indifference to elections, and difficulty of getting the right men elected. Everywhere the cause is the same faulty method of election, which restricts the choice of voters, prevents their uniting to get the men they want, places a premium on mediocre ward politicians and straddlers, and shuts out radical advocates of social and municipal reform. There must be a strong public interest and even enthusiasm in elections before we have good municipal government.

To arouse that interest permanently there is but one way; the adoption of proportional representation, which has well been called effective voting. And the first step in this direction is in many cases the advocacy of the initiative and referendum, which is a good thing in itself, and, if in force, would give a sure means of getting proportional representation when a majority of the people understood the value and desired the adoption of this latter reform.—Citizen and Country, of Toronto.

THE PILLAGER INDIAN OUTBREAK.

The Bear Island outbreak has caused much surprise in Washington, as the Chippewas have been from time immemorial the friends of the whites. The impelling grievance, it is thought, must have been much more serious than appears on the surface. The commissioner of Indian affairs was so impressed with this idea that he was unwilling to trust the handling of the matter to Indian Agent Sutherland and Inspector Tinker, who had hastened into the Leech lake country at the first alarm, but started at once for Minnesota to take personal charge of it. Those persons who know most of the conditions prevailing among the Minnesota Chippewas believe that he will find the causes of friction cumulative. The origin of the whole difficulty probably dates back to a purchase of land made by the government from the Pillagers in 1847. The tract contained nearly 700,000 acres, and the Indians let it go for \$15,000, with the understanding that the government was buying it to make a home

for the Menominee Indians, who were friends of the Pillagers, and also of the hereditary foes of the Chippewa nation, the Sioux. The reason the Pillagers were willing to part with the land was that it lay between their home and the home of the Sioux, so that the presence of the friendly Menominees there would serve as a barrier against the predatory raids of the Sioux, and insure a permanent peace for all parties concerned.

But the government had, as so often before and since, made a promise it was unable to fulfill. The Menominees refused to remove to their proposed new reservation. Instead, they relinquished their claim upon it in consideration of receiving back a part of their old lands in Wisconsin and a generous sum of money. It has never been possible to make the Pillagers believe that they were not shamelessly cheated in this labyrinth of bargains. As they accepted that \$15,000 agreed upon, their strict legal rights in the land have of course been extinguished, though their moral claim survives against the government for its failure to carry out what they deemed the most important feature of the agreement of 1847. Their more progressive men, who have adopted the ways of civilization, and consented to let bygones be bygones for the sake of keeping the peace with the whites, have held the smaller restless element in check, but the sense of injustice has never ceased to rankle sorely even in their breasts.

The tract purchased for the Menominees, when rejected and ceded to the government by the latter tribe, was thrown open to white settlement, with the usual result. Lawless men swarmed into the villages and small towns, and opened dram-shops for the sale of "Indian whisky," in contemptuous defiance of the statutes. The white man's whisky is bad enough in its effect upon the red men, but "Indian whisky" is a compound of crude alcohol, strychnine and a variety of other ingredients, which, united, make a fiery but quickly stupefying drink. Indians who came into town with something to sell would, as soon as they had got their money, spend a quarter or a half dollar for this liquor, and, when overcome by it, be robbed of whatever they had still in their pockets.

But the outrage did not end here. Deputy marshals of the United States, often recruited from behind the illicit bars, made a fat living by arresting men engaged in the Indian whisky traffic, subpoenaing Indian witnesses

by the dozen, and carrying both prisoners and witnesses off to St. Paul, where the federal courts were held. The largest part of this business was collusive. One dram-seller would be fined or sentenced to a brief imprisonment; another would be discharged for lack of competent evidence against him; in both cases the officers would pocket large sums of government money under the guise of mileage, witness fees, charges for hotel accommodations, and the like, sharing their plunder with their friends the prisoners. The Indian witnesses were encouraged to respond to their subpoenas by being given a free excursion to the city, a "good time" while there, and perhaps a trifle in cash by way of a makeweight. At one time this abuse became so gross that the secretary of the interior felt compelled to protest against it to the attorney-general, some 300 Indians being simultaneously absent from their reservations and in charge of deputy marshals at St. Paul, to their own demoralization and the downright robbery of the government.

The older and soberer Indians realized that the lives of their young men were being wrecked by this practice, but their earnest appeals counted for little. At last, however, the marshals overreached themselves by trying to make too much money out of their speculation in witnesses. A member of the Bear island band of Pillagers was carried off as a witness, and when he returned was sick and famished, having walked 160 miles without food. He explained that the deputy who had taken him away and made use of his testimony had refused him the money necessary to pay his fare back by the cars or buy meals on the journey. This aroused great indignation among the Indians, and is said to have been at the bottom of the recent resistance to the authority of Marshal O'Connor. The marshal denies the Indian's story, but the outbreak will undoubtedly bring about an investigation, which may not be wholly barren of good results.

The Minnesota Chippewas at large have another grievance against the government in the way the department of the interior has permitted them to be robbed right and left under the pretense of disposing of their timber. The outrages perpetrated upon the Chippewas of the Red lake country were exposed a year ago last winter, when it was discovered that the so-called expert estimators appointed by the government to appraise their growing timber, preliminary to its

purchase by white lumbermen, were not experts at all, but were political heelers who knew nothing about the business and wasted the Indians' money in salaries and expenses while making worthless guesses at the quantities, varieties and values of the timber. Sitting in the bar-room of a backwoods hotel, or playing cards in a comfortable camp, they would make up their reports out of nothing tangible. As typical of these frauds may be cited one case where they reported 65,000 feet of pine as growing on a tract, which, on investigation, was found to contain 872 feet; or another, where the report showed 25,000 feet and investigation showed 75,000; or a third, where the estimators reported 45,000 feet, and the tract was found to contain none at all! Swindling as bad in kind, though possibly somewhat modified in degree, has been, and probably still is, in progress in other parts of the Chippewa country.

In the mind of the educated white man one grievance does not necessarily lap over upon another, and wrongs perpetrated by individuals are not charged up against a whole race. The Indian's mind works differently. His patriarchal system has trained him to regard the family, the band, the tribe or the race as a unit, and to regard all men of one color, or all the representatives of one government, as sharing the responsibility for the sins committed by a single element or a single person in the same category with them. Keeping this difference in view, it will be easier to understand why one of the less progressive bands of Pillagers, cherishing memories of the broken compact of 1847, seeing their fellow-tribesmen turned over to the spoilers of the logging-camps, and being themselves victims of the rapacity of the dram-sellers and law officers, should reach a point of desperation where they are willing to resort to the one remedy which seemed open to them—the shedding of white blood.—Francis E. Leupp, in Harper's Weekly.

THE SKELETON FEAST.

For the Public.

Mr. Editor: As mortals tab time it is two o'clock in the morning. A woman has just returned from the great "Peace Jubilee Banquet" in the great Auditorium in this great city of Chicago, where she was one among the great throng of observers of the marvelous spectacle of the president of the great United States, great representatives of great foreign nations, great officers of our great army and

great navy, splendid, indeed, in full uniform of their rank; great college presidents, great bishops and other great divines, and the great Mark Hanna, feeding themselves in the great eyes of the people, together with nearly 800 fellow feeders, some great, some who at least did not look great. And, being a woman, and of course not conversant with the great ways of the great of this great world, she observed some things which were naturally perplexing; and in her dilemma in the solemn night of her bewilderment and her unworldliness and unwisdom, she would appeal to you, Mr. Editor, in whose wisdom and worldliness she has learned to have confidence, for enlightenment.

Firstly, all this gorgeous spectacle of tables laden with flowers, of glittering glass under electric fires, of glittering diamonds on glittering shirt fronts, of glittering water and glittering liquids which were not water, of glistening clouds of smoke gracefully gliding from great mouths, of food so plentiful that there could have been taken up more than "seven basketsfull after the multitude had been fed;" all this glitter and glare and glory of feeding, while society looked on—the best society—beautiful women in beautiful attire, handsome men, youth and loveliness and benign maturity, filling boxes and balconies to their completest measure—a brilliant ensemble; all this matchless setting of this special performance upon the great Auditorium stage; this great tragedy—this comedy—of feeding, Mr. Editor, appeared to the dilettante mind, which was perhaps not "in correspondence with its environment," "out of equilibrium." But still, Mr. Editor, it appeared—all this pomp and circumstance of feeding (and possibly of peace and politics, Mr. Editor?)—all this appeared to this mind a little, just a very little bit, gross.

Was it gross, Mr. Editor? or was it not gross? If it was gross, it seems strange that these great representatives of the greatness of the nineteenth century, and these a priori exponents of the culture of our high civilization, should have seemed to enjoy it so much, and deemed it a fit occasion upon which to invoke divine blessing in these wonderful words: "Almighty God, we invoke Thy benediction upon our solemn joy;" and, "We thank Thee for the spirit of self-sacrifice, that it hath been granted to some favored of us to be brothers of the world's Saviour; to hunger, to suffer, and to die for man." There was

considerable more said in the great speechmaking that followed the great feeding, about the "Almighty."

Do you think, Mr. Editor, that the great spirit of the Almighty, the great spirit of mercy and justice, the spirit of our Lord, the lowly Nazarene, floating through the mellow mist of this powderless smoke, and bathed in the fragrance of flowers and flowing glasses and in the presence of the great Mark Hanna, did, Mr. Editor, bless this "solemn joy?" Did accept the thanks for the "spirit of self-sacrifice?" Did reveal to these knights of these "long tables" the vision of the Holy Grail? What do you think, Mr. Editor? This woman cannot tell; she cannot think; she is bewildered; she is dizzy—the effects of this banquet, although she "touched not, tasted not, handled not"—only watched with bated breath the great men do so.

But, Mr. Editor, before total coma arrives, she would tell you some things that she heard during the great feeding and speechmaking, which did the soul good. They were words in praise of our soldiers, our heroes of battleships, our heroes of Caney and San Juan hill. She heard them compared to the Greeks of Marathon, and to the Greeks of Thermopylae; heard it declared that "the list of the heroes of the recent war is not confined to the officers; all are heroes, whether they wore an epaulet or a blue shirt."

But, Mr. Editor, this woman could not help observing, and also thinking upon her observation, that at this great feast in honor of the peace THEY HAD WON, she saw not one "blue-shirted hero," not one unepauleted one. She saw them in the street in the day, tramping a weary parade for the city of Chicago; but this night at the feast time, at the time of the gorgeous, glittering, gay and festive "solemn joy," where were they? It had been granted to them "to hunger, to suffer," and it is still granted to some "to hunger, to suffer."

And these boys in blue have told this woman of their hunger and suffering, and of the horror of pest camp and hospital and cruel neglect; and they have also told her sometimes who was to blame. But at the speechmaking at the gorgeous feasting she heard not a word of blame, not a word of wonder as to who was responsible for their "hunger," their "suffering;" not a word of the cruelty.

Perchance some one has told these "great ones" that there was no one to blame. But, Mr. Editor, this woman

will believe these boys in blue, these blue-shirted heroes, these heroes without epaulets, these picked and perfect and best of America's youth, who charged up San Juan hill like gods, and who were "granted to hunger, to suffer" in pest camps. America's almighty do not lie. This woman would take their word against the whole world, even were she a "whitewashing committee." There is some one to blame for their "hunger," their "suffering," and although great words were said in their praise, Mr. Editor, it still appeared to this mind, perhaps a mal-adjusted mind, that as these blue-shirted heroes had had none of the feast, a word in remembrance of the fact that they had sometimes "hungered" and "suffered" where some one was to blame, and a word of sympathy for that unnecessary "hunger" and "suffering," and a word for those to whom it is still being granted to hunger and suffer—that just a word from these feasters to our unfeasted heroes, just a word of "humanity," sympathy, would have made the words of praise more beautiful. What do you think, Mr. Editor?

This woman is still dizzy, more dizzy and bewildered. Night wanes. She dips the colors to all our heroes, and to all of the poor, old world, and wonders, Mr. Editor, if our paleolithic ancestors had "Peace Jubilee Banquets." She is ill. She would like to go back to the stone age. She would like to form herself into a "hollow square," and thresh somebody. And although her father was a soldier, and her mother a Presbyterian, and she is an eminently respectable citizen, she feels like an anarchist; feels as though she were the crater of Kilauea. She is more dizzy, more bewildered and dizzy, and feels as though she were the whole "frieze of the prophets" as well as the ghost of the Colossus of Rhodes. She has heard it said that "Dore could not paint a saint, nor Michael Angelo a devil," and she wishes they both were here. She is more, more, more dizzy, more ill and more dizzy, and, quoting Kipling:

"Horrible, hairy, human, with pawlike hands in prayer,
Making his supplication, rose Adam-
and the bear."

She is more dizzy, more ill and more dizzy, and thinks she is a "survival of the fittest," and of the great "Peace Jubilee Banquet."—Dizzy, dizzy—Your friend,
HETTIE HAPPY.

P. S.—You know, Mr. Editor, women always have postscripts. The president expressed "gratification" beautifully. The president said some other

things which of course a woman could not grasp, but, Mr. Editor, the president always expresses "gratification" beautifully.—More and more dizzy; more ill; more bewildered and dizzy; most dizzy. H. H.

THE WRECKING OF THE ARMY BY SICKNESS.

An extract from an article with the above title, by George Kennan, published in *The Outlook* of October 22. Mr. Kennan was one of the Red Cross officers in Cuba during the Santiago campaign, and was personally cognizant of the facts of which he writes.

Some of the defenders of the war department and of Gen. Shafter seek to convey the idea, by implication at least, that the wrecking of our army was inevitable—that it was a sort of divine visitation, which could not have been averted, and for which no one, except the Creator of microbes and the Cuban climate, was responsible. But this theory accords neither with the facts nor with Gen. Shafter's explanation of them. In his telegram of August 8 to President McKinley, he does not say: "What put my command in its present condition was a visitation of God;" he says: "What put my command in its present condition was the 20 days of the campaign when they had nothing but meat" (fat bacon), "bread and coffee, without change of clothes and without any shelter whatever." From this admission of the commanding general it is clear that the wreckage of the army was not due primarily to uncontrollable climatic conditions, but rather to lack of foresight, mismanagement and inefficiency. This conclusion is supported and greatly strengthened by the record of another body of men, in a different branch of the service, which spent more time in Cuba than the Fifth army corps spent there, which was subjected to nearly all the local and climatic influences that are said to have wrecked the latter, but which, nevertheless, escaped disease and came back to the United States in perfect health. I refer to the battalion of marines under command of Col. Huntington. This small naval contingent landed on the western shore of Guantanamo bay June 10—two weeks before the Fifth army corps finished disembarkation at Baiquiri and Siboney. It was almost immediately attacked by a superior force of Spanish regulars, and was so harassed, night and day, by the fire of the latter that some of its officers slept only two hours out of 115. As soon as it had obtained a foothold it went into camp on a slight elevation in the midst of an almost impenetrable jungle, sur-

rounded itself with defensive trenches, and there lived, for a period of ten weeks, exposed to the same sun, rain and malaria that played havoc with the troops of Gen. Shafter. On the 6th day of August, after eight weeks on Cuban soil and in a tropical climate, its condition, as reported by Admiral Sampson, was as follows: "The marine battalion is in excellent health. Sick list 2½ per cent. The fleet surgeon reports that they are in better condition for service in this climate than they were when they arrived south in June. I do not think it necessary to send them north." (Telegram to Secretary Long, dated Playa, Cuba, August 6, 1898.) Almost exactly at the same time when this report was made Gen. Shafter was telegraphing the war department that 75 per cent. of his command had been disabled by fever, and eight general officers of the Fifth army corps were signing a "round-robin" in which they declared that if the army were not immediately moved north it "must perish."

Late in August it was decided that the marines should return to the United States, notwithstanding their satisfactory state of health, and on the 26th of that month they reached Portsmouth, N. H., with only two men sick. They had been gone a little more than 11 weeks—ten of which they had spent in Cuba—and in that time had not lost a single man from disease, and had never had a higher sick-rate than 2½ per cent.

In view of this record, as compared with that of any regiment in Gen. Shafter's command, we are forced to inquire: "What is the reason for the difference? Why should a battalion of marines be able to live ten weeks in Cuba, without the loss of a single man from disease, and with a sick rate of only two and one-half per cent., while so hardy and tough a body of men as the Rough Riders, under substantially the same climatic conditions, had become so reduced in four weeks that 75 per cent. of them were unfit for duty, and 50 per cent. of them fell out of the ranks from exhaustion in a march of five miles?"

The only answer I can find to these questions is that the marines had suitable equipment and intelligent care, while the soldiers of Gen. Shafter's command had neither. When the marines landed in Guantanamo bay, every tent and building that the Spaniards had occupied was immediately destroyed by fire, to remove any possible danger of infection with yellow fever. When Gen. Shafter landed at Siboney, he not only disregarded the

recommendation of his chief surgeon to burn the buildings there, but allowed them to be occupied as offices and hospitals, without even so much as attempting to clean or disinfect them. Yellow fever made its appearance in less than two weeks. The marines at Guantanamo were supplied promptly with light canvas uniforms suitable for a tropical climate, while the soldiers of Gen. Shafter's army sweltered through the campaign in the heavy clothing they had worn in Idaho or Montana, and then, just before they started north, were furnished with thin suits to keep them cool at Montauk Point in the fall. The marines drank only water that had been boiled or sterilized, while the men of Gen. Shafter's command drank out of brooks into which the heavy afternoon showers were constantly washing fecal and other decaying organic matter from the banks. The marines were well protected from rain and dew, while the regulars of the Fifth army corps were drenched to the skin almost every day, and slept at night on the water-soaked ground. The marines received the full navy ration, while the soldiers had only "hardtack" and fat bacon, and not always enough of that. Finally, the marines had surgeons enough to take proper care of the sick, and medicines enough to give them, while Gen. Shafter, after leaving his reserve medical supplies and ambulance corps at Tampa, telegraphs the adjutant-general on the 3d of August that "there has never been sufficient medical attendance or medicines for the daily wants of the command." In short, the marines observed the laws of health, and lived in Cuba according to the dictates of modern sanitary science, while the soldiers, through no fault of their own, were forced to violate almost every known law of health, and to live as if there were no such thing as sanitary science in existence.

Gov. Tanner, Gen. Grosvenor and Secretary Alger may declare that the wrecking of the army by disease was inevitable; that northern soldiers cannot maintain their health in the tropics; and that "when troops come home sick and worn, it is a part of war;" but, in view of the record made at Guantanamo bay, we may say to them, seriously and respectfully, rather than with flippancy: "Tell that to the marines!"

The record of the marine battalion, taken in connection with Gen. Shafter's admission that his command was disabled by "twenty days of bread, meat and coffee, without change of

clothes, and without any shelter whatever," seems to show conclusively that the epidemic of disease which wrecked the army was the direct result of improper and insufficient food, inadequate equipment, and utter neglect of all the rules prescribed by sanitary science for the maintenance of health in tropical regions. The question then recurs: "Why did not the army have such food, clothes and equipment as would have made obedience to the laws of health possible? Why should they have been directed by their chief surgeon to boil all drinking water, to avoid sleeping on the ground, and to change their clothing, when wet, if it was not the intention to give them camp-kettles in which to boil the water, hammocks in which to sleep, or clothing enough for a change?" The American people, certainly, are both able and willing to pay for the proper support and equipment of their army. If it had cost \$5,000,000, or \$10,000,000, to supply every company in Gen. Shafter's command with hammocks, water-proof rain-sheets, extra clothing, and camp-kettles, the money would have been appropriated and paid without a grumble or a murmur. We are not a stingy people, nor even an economical people, when the question is one of caring for the men that we send into the field to fight for us. If, then, the financial resources of the war department were unlimited, and if it had supreme power, why could it not properly equip and feed a comparatively small invading force of only 16,000 or 18,000 men? Were the difficulties insuperable? Certainly not! It is safe, I think, to say that there were 1,000 business firms in the United States which, for a suitable consideration, would have undertaken to keep Gen. Shafter's army supplied, at every step of its progress from Siboney to Santiago, with hammocks, water-proof tents, extra clothing, camp-kettles and full rations of food. The trouble was not lack of money nor lack of facilities at home; it was lack of foresight, of system, and of administrative ability in the field.

Once upon a time a Tramp was sorely in need of something to eat, and approaching a farmhouse, he spake unto the farmer, saying: "If you will give me the wherewithal to satisfy the cravings of the inner man, I will kill all the rats about the place." "Agreed," said the tiller of the soil, and he ordered his good wife to give the tramp a square meal. After the tramp had devoured everything in sight he went to the wood-pile and se-

lected a stout club, then seating himself on the porch, he said to the farmer: "Now bring on your rats."

Moral—Always have the details specified in the contract.—Our Republic.

HATS AND DOLLARS.

Pat Flynn had sixty-seven hats,
And wanted sixty more;
It was an odd, strange whim of Pat's,
For only one he wore;
But he would toil by night or day
To get a hat to lay away.

'Twas "hats" the first thing in the morn,
And "hats" at noon and night,
The neighbors laughed the man to scorn,
And said it was but right
To send such crazy cranks as he
To spend their days at Kankakee.

A million dollars Peter Doyle
Had laid away in store,
Yet late and early did he toil
To get a million more,
He could not use the half he had,
And yet he wanted "more," bedad.

His neighbors praised him to the skies,
Wherever he might go;
They called him great and good and wise,
And bowed before him low.
Is there such a difference as that
Between a dollar and a hat?
—Indianapolis Journal.

After all, Gen. Wheeler is a sarcastic kind of an old chap, but he is so deep that some of the republicans may not have understood him. For instance, in his testimony before the war commission he made the statement that there was as much sickness and suffering in the Spanish army as in our own. The pith of this may be understood when it is remembered that the Spanish were almost without medical stores, and had got down pretty close to their boots in the way of supplies or provisions.—Peoria Herald.

Compromisers, traders and neutral men never correct abuses, never found or save free institutions and never fight for human rights. They always become instruments for the enemy. Wherever they are in control the party is unworthy of the respect of mankind. Only men of conviction and courage can save this land. Only the men who stand erect ever get recognition.—John P. Altgeld.

In view of the numerous and widespread complaints of military mismanagement which our badly treated soldiers have been making, this from the Springfield (Mass.) Republican is a peculiarly happy hit:

Probably the war department had forgotten that this was a war for humanity. The mistake was a natural one under the circumstances.
—New Christianity.

The new charter of Montreal extends municipal suffrage to widows

and unmarried women who lease or own taxable property in the city. This is in line with the just principle, "no taxation without representation," but why should our friends across the border discriminate against women with husbands?—Woman's Journal.

"Oi s'pose d'the twins kape yez awake a good dale wid d'their croyin'?"

"No; yez see, aitch av 'em yells so loud thot yez can't hear d'the other at ahl; an' d'the result is dead soillence ahl noight long."—Puck.

You may build your capitol of granite and pile it high as the Rocky mountains; if it is founded on or mixed up with iniquity, the pulse of a girl will in time beat it down.—Wendell Phillips.

ANNOUNCEMENT.

From time to time THE PUBLIC will reproduce, in pamphlet form suitable for mailing in open envelopes at the one-cent rate of postage, the editorial articles of permanent interest that appear in its columns. These pamphlets will be supplied upon the following terms:

Single copies, delivered at office,	\$0.02
Quantities delivered at office, per 100,	1.00
Single copies mailed to any address, postage paid,	.03
Single copies mailed to any address, postage paid, upon orders for 100 or more, per 100,	2.00
In quantities, mailed in bulk to one address, postage paid, per 100,	1.25

The following pamphlets are now ready:

1. *A Business Tendency* (from THE PUBLIC of September 10, 1898).
2. *That Favorable Balance of Trade* (from THE PUBLIC of October 22, 1898).

FRIENDS

of this paper are requested to send us the names and addresses of persons of their acquaintance who would be interested in reading it regularly.

THE PUBLIC

is a weekly paper which prints in concise and plain terms, with lucid explanations and without editorial bias, all the really valuable news of the world. It is also an editorial paper. Though it abstains from mingling editorial opinions with its news accounts, it has opinions of a pronounced character, which, in the columns reserved for editorial comment, it expresses fully and freely, without favor or prejudice, without fear of consequences, and without hope of discreditable reward. Yet it makes no pretensions to infallibility, either in opinions or in statements of fact; it simply aspires to a deserved reputation for intelligence and honesty in both. Besides its editorial and news features, the paper contains a department of original and selected miscellany, in which appear articles and extracts upon various subjects, verse as well as prose, chosen alike for their literary merit and their wholesome human interest. Familiarity with THE PUBLIC will commend it as a paper that is not only worth reading, but also worth filing.

Subscription, One Dollar a Year.

Free of postage in United States, Canada and Mexico, elsewhere, postage extra, at the rate of one cent per week. Payment of subscription is acknowledged up to the date in the address label on the wrapper.

Single copies, five cents each.

Published weekly by

THE PUBLIC PUBLISHING COMPANY, Room 822,
Schiller Building, Chicago, Ill.

Post-office address:

THE PUBLIC, Box 687, Chicago, Ill.

SUBSCRIPTION AGENTS:

Western Reserve, Ohio, OTTO PFISTER, 140
Wason Street, Cleveland, Ohio.

Toronto, Ont., E. M. BLOOMER, 579 King St
West.