

# The Public

Dr. H. J. Woodhouse  
Nov 3-00 Box 511

10377  
Third Year.

CHICAGO, SATURDAY, APRIL 14, 1900. 387008 Number 106.

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.

President McKinley has made the repulsive Spanish garrote an American mode of administering capital punishment. During the current week, this deadly instrument of torture was used in Puerto Rico, to kill five men convicted of murder. It was therefore used by American authority, upon American soil, under the sanction of an American president and the shadow of the American flag.

There is one military bill before congress which can be approved. It is a bill to provide for assigning retired commissioned and non-commissioned military officers to the public schools as military instructors. It would be an excellent thing to give all the public school boys a practical military education. This would not stimulate the military spirit especially. That spirit is apt to be strongest in those to whom military experience is a novelty. But it would qualify the great masses of the American people to fight effectively in defense when militarism shall have made revolution necessary.

If the reports from London have fairly described public demonstrations there, the British jingo is a comical brute. He goes into ecstasies of self-praise and patriotic declamation when 40,000 British troops capture 4,000 South African Dutchmen; and he tumbles into the depths of gloom when 10,000 Dutchmen begin to worry 40,000 British. If the British jingo would commune conscientiously a little more with his own soul about the wretched spirit of

conquest which has plunged his country into this totally useless and unjustifiable war, and plume himself less upon the valor of his representatives on the firing line, he might not be so comically picturesque, but he would be a wiser man and a better Briton.

A set of New Jersey officials prove their utter lack of any sense of responsibility by leasing to private parties a piece of riparian land, which is public property, for a period of 999 years at a fixed rental. As the land is to be improved at a cost of some \$3,000,000, it would be entirely proper to grant a long lease. But a lease for about the life of the perishable improvements would be long enough for all equitable purposes. No officials, no government, no people, has the right to tie up the affairs of succeeding generations further than may be necessary to preserve rights which the present generation justly acquires in the products of its own toil. A government lease of land for 999 years, like a government grant "while grass grows and water runs," is a usurpation.

Marshall Field & Co., one of the great mercantile concerns of Chicago, has listed its personal property at \$6,400,000. One-fifth of that amount, the basis of taxation under the Illinois law, would be \$1,280,000; and at the rate of 5 per cent. the tax would be \$64,000. Now does anyone suppose that Marshall Field & Co. will pay this handsome sum of \$64,000 and bear the brunt of the loss? Could any firm afford to take \$64,000 out of its profits for taxes? And whether it could afford it or not would it do it if there were any possible way of recouping? Evidently not. And as there is a way of recouping, Marshall Field & Co. will not lose this money. They will get it back in higher prices

for goods. So Marshall Field & Co.'s customers will pay that tax in the end. And what is more, they will pay Marshall Field & Co.'s profit on the tax. Yet many of these same people will speak of Field as a great tax payer and of themselves as non-tax payers.

In the Puerto Rican government bill, just passed by congress under tremendous party pressure, and which the president will certainly sign if he has not done so already, there is one exceedingly significant provision. Doubtless there are others as suggestive of loot, but this stands out prominently in that respect. The bill empowers the president of the United States to appoint the upper house of the Puerto Rican legislature. That is a scandalous provision in itself, for a republican congress to adopt. But the scandal does not stop there. This upper house, the mere creature of the president, is authorized in its own discretion, without any check upon its action, to grant franchises in the island. Reduced to its real meaning, that provision gives to William McKinley the power to distribute special privileges, thereby creating embryonic trusts, in the island of Puerto Rico. And he who doesn't believe that William McKinley will "stand by his friends" in making the distribution, little knows the true inwardness of the present occupant of the white house. Puerto Rico franchises will doubtless contribute in no small way to the \$6,000,000 campaign fund that Hanna is preparing to get together.

If the imperialists were sincere in their expressed anxiety to have the crown colony question passed upon by the supreme court they would not have prevented legal proceedings in the Jeorg Cruz case, which we reported last week. Jeorg Cruz came to

New York from Puerto Rico under a labor contract. The commissioner general of immigration, Mr. Powderly, stopped him under the contract labor law, and ordered him deported, whereupon Cruz was about to go into the courts. This would have made an excellent case for testing the question whether the constitution follows the flag. For if the constitution does extend of its own force over Puerto Rico, then Jeorg Cruz is a citizen of the United States, and Powderly had no power to send him back; whereas, if the constitution has no force in Puerto Rico, then Cruz is a mere Puerto Rican, a subject but not a citizen, and Powderly was right in deporting him. The administration should have welcomed this opportunity to ascertain from the supreme court whether or not "our new possessions" and their inhabitants are part of the United States or not. But it did nothing of the kind. As soon as Cruz gave signs of testing his rights of citizenship in the courts, Powderly had his official ears boxed by his superior for allowing the question to arise, and Cruz was turned loose to work out his contract. The administration merely reserved the right to deport him at some other time and to sue the person who had hired him. For this purpose the case was referred to the attorney general, in whose pigeon holes it will repose undisturbed forever and aye. The disposition of the Cruz case confirms the conclusion from other indications that the administration wants to keep imperialism out of the courts until one legislative and administrative act after another shall have so tangled up the question that the courts will shrink from deciding in accordance with the letter and spirit of the constitution lest their decision raise havoc with great vested interests and national and international relationships.

Hope has not been abandoned by the ship subsidy conspirators at Washington of accomplishing their purpose of looting the treasury before

congress adjourns. The subsidy bill has been amended in several particulars to avoid objections, but it is the same old steal yet. It is planned for the special benefit of the Standard Oil navigation company, known as the International, though incidentally it aims to provide luxurious ocean accommodations for European travelers and to facilitate the importation into this country of European laborers. To illustrate the tourist feature of the bill. A freight steamer would under the bill get a subsidy of \$4,740 for carrying a given cargo of American exports, while the swift passenger steamer St. Louis, of the Standard Oil line, would get, for carrying half that cargo of American exports, a subsidy of \$26,000. It is easy to see that this plan of subsidy provides for the encouragement of passenger travel and of exporting in the ratio of about \$11 to \$1.

One of the pettifogging pleas for this ship subsidy bill is the assertion that by encouraging American ship owning it would save millions to this country which are now paid by Americans to foreign ship owners in freights. Nothing is said specifically about the persons or classes to whom this expenditure would be saved. It is assumed, of course, that all American tax payers would share in the saving; else all American tax payers would not be burdened with the expense of effecting it. That is the theory. It is an assinine theory; but let it pass, while we briefly consider the notion that millions would be saved to this country in freights if we had a subsidized merchant marine. This notion was elaborately worked out by Winthrop L. Marvin in the Review of Reviews for March, in an article in defense of the subsidy measure. According to Mr. Marvin's estimates the people of the United States pay annually to foreign ship owners for freight, mail and passenger charges \$150,000,000. "No country but a very rich and prosperous one," he says, "could long do this; and such an expenditure has come to be a very

serious drain on our own immense resources." One is tempted to ask Mr. Marvin why he does not credit this amount to our favorable balance of trade. It would account for some of it. But since we avowedly receive a return in service for this outlay why consider the outlay a drain? Individuals do not regard expressage as a drain. It is a quid pro quo. And at any rate why is the freightage Mr. Marvin mentions any more a drain than our much greater balance of exports, for which we get, according to the treasury statistics, neither goods nor gold, neither silver nor service, but which is constantly referred to as evidence of prosperity?

If this shipping charge for our foreign trade is so heavy a drain, why is not the shipping charge for coastwise trade a ruinous burden upon our interstate commerce? Why is not the cost of internal waterway transportation a similar drain, only far more serious since the water freightage from Pittsburg alone is said to exceed that of New York? Why does not the item of railroad charges ruin all who have to go to railroads for transportation, especially when it is well known that some of our great railroads are chiefly owned by and controlled in the interest of foreigners to whom goes a very large percentage of the total of railroad dividends? The plundering ship subsidy bill and all the arguments for it are shining examples of protection greed gone to seed.

"We are still a debtor country," says the Springfield Republican, commenting upon the recent heavy purchase by foreigners of American stocks and bonds. "A debtor country!" Mark that. Yet our merchandise exports in excess of merchandise imports from October 1, 1834, to February 28, 1900, amounts to \$2,682,722,397. Mark that also! President McKinley says our excessive merchandise exports are all paid for in gold. But he is mistaken. During the same period of 65 years and 5

months we have exported more gold than we have imported, by \$910,427,448. It would be a mistake also to suppose that excessive merchandise exports are paid for with silver; for in the same period our excess of silver exports has come to \$552,215,142. These are the figures of the treasury reports. Instead, then, of being a debtor country, we ought to be a creditor country. Foreigners ought to owe us \$4,145,364,987, according to treasury bookkeeping. But they do not. On the contrary, they are buying up our fixed property, through the purchase of stocks and bonds; and they are not sending us either merchandise or gold or silver, for we export more of all these things than we import. They must be paying us, then, for our stocks and bonds, with what we owe them. It must be true, in other words, as the Republican says, that we are a debtor country. Of what benefit to us, that being so, is the "favorable" balance of trade about which so much jubilant fuss is made? Some of it may be offset by tourist and student expenses in Europe and by gifts to foreign friends; but how do the people at large profit by it? If we send away more than we get back, to an enormous amount—\$4,145,364,987 in 65 years and 5 months—and yet remain a debtor country, in what respect is our "favorable" balance of trade favorable?

Apropos of our recent statement that "in England, as with us, the burden of war expenses is to be shuffled off, by indirect taxes, upon the same classes of people that furnish most of the food for powder," Thomas G. Shearman, who is deservedly an authority upon the statistics of taxation, writes that while it is natural so to understand the matter, owing to the muddled way in which the news comes to us from the other side, it is wholly true only of this country, and but partly true of Great Britain. According to Mr. Shearman the income tax in Great Britain has been increased by 50 per cent., so that nearly or quite \$30,000,000 will be contrib-

uted, during the present year, by the well-to-do classes toward the war expenditure. They were already contributing, by the income tax and death duties, about \$150,000,000 per annum. The expenses of the South African war, Mr. Shearman continues, will probably be \$300,000,000. The increased income tax will pretty certainly be maintained for at least two years and be only partially reduced in the third year. Therefore Englishmen having incomes exceeding \$800 a year will certainly contribute \$125,000,000 towards the cost of the war, or not less than one-third of the whole, making liberal allowance for the expense of permanent military occupation. Nor is this quite all. The remaining charges of the war have been put chiefly upon spirits and beer, and only to a small degree upon tobacco and tea. The additional taxes upon all of these things, except tea, are so small that they cannot be added to the price of spirits or beer, at retail; while the rigid inspection of public houses makes it extremely difficult for the retailer to compensate himself for the tax by reduction in quantity. The result is that at least two-thirds of these liquor taxes will come out of the profits of wholesale and retail liquor dealers. It is therefore not unreasonable to estimate that from two-thirds to three-fourths of the entire cost of the South African war is to be paid by Britons having incomes of \$800 and over. To this explanation Mr. Shearman adds:

Of course I fully agree with you that the whole cost of the war ought to be paid by the landlords of Great Britain and South Africa. But it is a great injustice, even to a tory government in Great Britain, to compare its methods of taxation with those of a republican government in America.

Examination of the full text of the recent decision of the federal supreme court in the case of the Illinois Central railway against the city of Chicago, commented upon in these columns not long ago (102-1), fails to discover in the decision that importance with refer-

ence to the land question which it seemed to possess as reported by the newspapers. The decision does no more than to reaffirm the doctrine of the same court in an earlier case, that of the same railway against the state of Illinois, the most important feature of which was this declaration in the opinion of the court:

The ownership of the navigable waters of the harbor and of the lands under them is a subject of public concern of the whole people of the state. The trust with which they are held, therefore, is governmental and cannot be alienated, except in those instances mentioned, of parcels used in the improvement of the interest thus held, or when parcels can be disposed of without detriment to the public interests in the lands and waters remaining.

That doctrine is not very important. In fact it is just a little absurd. The judges who dissented were quite just in their criticism of it when they said, Judge Shiras writing the opinion:

The opinion of the majority, if I rightly apprehend it, likewise concedes that a state does possess the power to grant the rights of property and possession in such lands to private parties; but the power is stated to be in some way restricted to small parcels, "or where such parcels can be disposed of without detriment to the public interests in the lands and waters remaining." But it is difficult to see how the validity of the exercise of the power, if the power exists, can depend upon the size of the parcel granted.

It certainly is difficult. And there is another difficulty, one to which none of the judges alluded. It is difficult to see how the validity of the power of alienation, if the power exists, can depend upon whether or not the land is under water. The true doctrine, if not in law at any rate in good morals and good sense is this, that the state has the right, restricted only by the condition that it shall not be abused, to grant the privilege of exclusive possession of land, whether in large parcels or small, or under water or above water, for adequate and continuing compensation to the public. It has no other right of alienation. The land, both dry and wet, is the people's perpetual heritage.

The recommendations in Mayor Harrison's message regarding Chicago street car franchises, are on the whole most excellent. While his advocacy of compensation based on gross receipts and his proposition that fares be reduced during rush hours are false in principle, and his suggestion that better accommodations be required is a detail, his recommendation that a provision for municipal ownership at the expiration of such franchises as may be granted be made a condition of the grant, and that no franchise be allowed to become operative until it shall have been approved by a general vote of the people, goes really to the heart of the subject, and in the right way. If franchises are to be renewed at all, it should be upon condition that they be followed by municipal ownership. And if every proposed franchise be made subject to a referendum vote, none will become operative if the people are now ready to do away with the private monopoly of their public streets.

Mayor Harrison makes another recommendation which should not be ignored. In its beneficent possibilities it is perhaps the most important suggestion in his message. Calling attention to the large amount of space under and over sidewalks belonging to the city — 1,411,947 square feet — for which adjacent landlords are charging rent, he advises that this rent, or a reasonable part of it, be taken by the city. At the low average rate of only 33 1-3 cents per square foot annually these usurped spaces would yield the city nearly half a million dollars additional revenue. To compel the squatters who appropriate the rentals of this land to turn them over to the city treasury where they belong would make a first rate beginning in the important work of lifting taxation from business and putting it upon land monopoly.

By encouraging the mobbing of peace meetings, the British ministry manage to preserve an appearance of

unanimous war sentiment in England; and by suppressing Irish papers and Irish demonstrations that are hostile to the raree-show of the queen's visit, they are able to keep up an appearance of unmitigated loyalty in Ireland. These methods of unifying sentiment have often before been effective, but they were supposed to have gone out of fashion in democratic countries.

There is good reason to suspect that pinchbeck patriotism is not such a drug in the English market as the Tories would like it to be. The people there are naturally affected by military victories and reverses, but on the whole many of them do not like the war into which their government has so wantonly plunged them. From a thorough Briton, resident in London, a man who nevertheless knows right from wrong, even when the country he loves and believes in is involved, we have a private letter from which we make this interesting extract:

I quite indorse your views of the South African war. It is a wicked war, brought about by the sordid greed of capitalists and speculators. It is sad, but it is true, that the two great branches of the Anglo-Saxon race who have been supposed to be the great champions of freedom, should to-day be both engaged in wars of aggression and spoliation; both engaged in putting down freedom in the name of freedom; and both egged on by the greed of a few speculators and capitalists. . . . Despite hating this South African war from the bottom of my soul, I cannot like to hear of disasters to our troops. These gallant fellows go to do what they are told, and lose their lives doing it, leaving sorrowing households at home. It makes me sad. But I nurse a righteous wrath against the incompetent scoundrels who have landed us in this imbroglio.

Disaster to the armies of one's country is not pleasant to hear of. Yet it is only through military disaster, as a rule, that a nation can be saved from military intoxication. Sore defeat might discourage men of the Chamberlain type. Victory has certainly multiplied them in number, in influence and in arrogance. And as to the gallant fellows who die in battle, what difference does it make

to them whether their survivors win or lose? They die anyhow.

The street car manager in Chicago who precipitated a power house strike last week had a tolerably clear apprehension of the kind of prosperity which workingmen are enjoying. He increased the wages of the men 12½ per cent., an increase which might be heralded as one of the evidences of prosperity, but which produced a strike because the manager also increased the hours of work 50 per cent. — from 8 hours to 12. If other instances of higher wages were investigated, it is not improbable that a like proportion between increase of pay and increase of work would be discovered, though the increase of work would not always, if at all, show itself so clearly. Hours of work would usually appear to have been undisturbed. But greater intensity of work as compared with higher wages would doubtless prove to be not far from the proportion of 12½ per cent. increase of wages to 50 per cent. increase of work.

In Youngstown, Ohio, similar results have been experienced, but through a reverse process. Instead of paying somewhat higher wages by the day and largely increasing the hours of a day's work, the plan there has been to pay a somewhat higher price by the piece and very largely diminish opportunities to produce. In that iron center the mills that are not closed down are working only part of the time or in only a few departments. With the rise in the price of iron, the pay of puddlers went up, under the scale agreed upon, from \$4.50 to \$6.00 a ton. But the men get fewer chances to work. The reason is that in some cases the mills are over-stocked, and in others their managers shrink from producing, at a high cost for labor, iron that may soon take a tumble in price. Here are some of the increasing indications that our "marsh light" prosperity is on the wane.

In the proposed constitutional

amendment with which republicans in congress are trying to pacify their constituents on the trust question, Mr. Bryan may see what his anti-trust proposition would lead to. This amendment would give congress control of all private corporations, co-partnerships and joint stock companies, and confer upon it the power "to define, regulate, control, prohibit, repress and dissolve all trusts and monopolies and combinations or conspiracies to monopolize any part of trade or commerce, and all contracts and combinations in the form of trusts or otherwise, or conspiracy in restraint of trade or commerce." Were that amendment adopted, centralization of power in the federal government would be complete. In so far as remedies for the trust evil along this line are sincerely proposed, they get the cart before the horse. They assume that the monopoly of trusts is due to combinations of competitive businesses, and therefore aim to prohibit combinations. But the truth is that evil trusts are combinations not of competitive businesses but of conflicting monopolies—monopolies already created by law. All other so-called trusts soon fall to pieces. The true remedy for the trust, therefore, is not legislation restraining combinations, but legislation abolishing legalized monopolies.

"Fake" interviewing is one of the worst vices of modern journalism, and unfortunately one of the most common. It is, therefore, a good thing when some man of national reputation whose opinions excite general interest falls a victim to it and makes the fact known. The latest of these victims is ex-President Cleveland. He was reported as expressing himself in the most enthusiastic way over Dewey's self-nomination for the presidency, and he denies that he uttered a word of the interview. For misinformation of this kind the reporters who "fake" the interviews are not to blame, except as men may be blamable for doing any other wrong act under duress. Neither is the ed-

itor to blame for favoring reporters who bring back interviews for which they are sent, though the interviews have to be "faked" to be got, and frowning upon reporters who fail. The blame rests upon the journalism which makes good faith with readers a matter of secondary concern or none at all. In such journalism success depends not upon industry in gathering and skill in presenting the truth, but upon aimless hustle and meretricious ingenuity in serving up sensations.

Senator Lodge made no concealment, in his speech this week at the Hamilton club of Chicago, of the fact that the administration's Asiatic policy rests on the ability of the United States to keep the Philippine islands outside of the American governmental system. He conceded the point, which we have frequently insisted upon, that the Philippines are to be made subject territory, and their people a subject people with no legal rights whatever except such as may be given and withdrawn at will by a congress in which they are to have no representation and in the choice of which they are to have no voice. If the Filipino people were begging us to assume this tyrannical relationship toward them, we ought not to comply. Its reactionary effect upon our own liberties could not fail to be prejudicial. But when we raise the strength of our army from 25,000 to 100,000 men in order to compel the Filipinos with great slaughter to accept the relationship against their will, we brand our nation as infamous beyond modern comparison.

After exciting a week's mirth, the Dewey sensation has subsided. Before it had wholly disappeared, Admiral Dewey made a choice between the two political parties, selecting the democratic for the favor of his leadership. But this seems to have been prompted less by political principle than by a conviction that McKinley has a cinch upon the republican party. For upon being asked if he

would accept the democratic nomination, Dewey replied:

I certainly would. The other is fixed, I take it. President McKinley is sure of renomination; his friends have the machinery all in motion.

And yet the admiral, who has discovered that there is one step higher in the line of promotion and wants to take it, does announce himself as a democrat, and the constitution as his platform. This, however, is hardly definite enough. In these days, when a man calls himself a democrat it is necessary to know his brand. And as to the constitution, why McKinley stands upon that. He has even sworn to support it. And it will soon be unrecognizable if somebody doesn't pull him off. There is nothing reassuring any longer about a promise to stand on the constitution.

#### COLONIES, CONGRESS AND "BOSSSES."

We have no reason to be surprised that congress makes sad work of trying to take hold of the duty placed upon it by reason of our new colonial policy. It is probable that no such task was ever before imposed upon such a body. No wonder that its wisdom is most apparent when it gives up the idea of proceeding in accordance with the methods of civilized governments, and in sheer desperation, following mediaeval methods, turns everything over to the president's discretion. For the part assigned to congress in our scheme of national government, and the way its members are chosen, make it impossible that it should successfully legislate for territories which are not there represented. It is a body of delegates. There is no pretense that it is a selection of the wisest and best, nor from the wisest and best. Each member of the lower house is a representative of a part of the sovereign people, and was selected to represent his own constituents and for nothing else. Naturally he feels specially charged with a duty to his constituents, but when we expect him to be animated with equal zeal on behalf of our new subjects, we are demanding too much of human nature. It is no more the duty of one member than it is of another, and no more the

duty of the house than of the senate, to provide needed legislation for the colonies; and a one-four-hundred-and-forty-seventh part of a responsibility has never been known to cause anyone very much uneasiness.

We go greatly astray if we consider our congress as occupying towards our new possessions the same position that the legislative bodies of other countries which enjoy representative institutions do toward their colonies. Our system of government is peculiar in that it does not admit the officers who are to administer the laws, to take part in the initial steps of legislation. Our executive officers share in legislation only through the exercise of a more or less qualified veto power, after the passage of measures by the legislature, which gives them little or no control over their form. Our laws are framed by those who are to take no part in administering them and are to have no responsibility with respect thereto; who are officially ignorant of the operation of the existing laws; who are in most cases actually ignorant of the evils to be remedied and at best know of them only as they are informed by the administration; who are not at all dominated by a sense of duty or responsibility to the whole people, but are justified in taking the position that they must work into each measure as much as possible for the special interests of a part of the people, their own constituents; and who too often are really dominated by an honest or dishonest interest in the effect a measure is to have upon a very few influential individuals. Then most important legislative measures over which a great difference of opinion exists, are usually so modified and twisted in their course through the legislative bodies that neither the individual legislators who drafted them nor any other individuals can be held responsible for their form. At best we try to fix responsibility upon a party, which, however, can always plead as an excuse the revolt of convenient traitors.

The other great governments of the world practically reverse this procedure. They have their legislation framed by those who are to be responsible for the administration of the laws after their enactment; who

have official and personal knowledge of the evils to be remedied; who can command the services of experts who best understand the practical effect of each provision; whose official duty is to the whole people and not to a small constituency; and upon whom is fixed the responsibility for the practical operation of the law after its passage. In England, France and Italy a member of the administration brings in its proposed measures; defends them; modifies the form of proposed amendments and agrees to such changes to meet objections as he deems wise; and in the end the legislature either consents to their passage in the form agreeable to the administration or rejects them. If a measure deemed to be important is not passed by the legislature or is amended in spite of the administration's opposition, the cabinet either resigns or dissolves the legislature and sends the representatives back to their constituents for a new mandate. In Germany the administration does not, to be sure, usually resign when its proposed measures fail to pass, but no legislation can be effected without its concurrence.

A natural consequence of our peculiar method of framing legislation is that our federal government is hampered by absurd laws limiting the discretion of the executive in the most trifling details of department routine, while in other ways the door is left open to the greatest abuses.

Examples are not far to seek. The salaries of most of the employes of the government are fixed by law. The deputy collector, who practically runs the custom house at the port of New York, receives the same compensation as employes whose single duty it is to sit on a bench and take depositions — something that any clerk in a real estate broker's office does in connection with his other duties upon receiving an appointment as notary public. The collector cannot apportion his appropriation, as justice and efficient administration would suggest. Thousands of bonds are every year executed by importers, which have been officially held to be worthless and upon no one of which in the history of the government has a prosecution ever been based. The

secretary of the treasury continues to spend a large part of his time signing his name to documents which he by no possibility could find the time to read over, and which could just as well be signed by the subordinate upon the faith of whose check the head of the department appends his name. Some time ago a dry dock was found to be endangered by a leak or flow of water, which might be stopped by an expenditure of some \$1,500. The damage, if not checked, would soon amount to several hundred thousand dollars. An opinion was requested by the attorney general as to the legality of spending \$1,500 for such a purpose. The reply was that to do so would constitute a crime. Congress had not foreseen the leak and there was no appropriation available to stop it. The post office at New York collects a large part of the postal revenues. If we had better postal facilities, such as are to be had in every European capital, it would in the opinion of experts pay much better. Yet congress cripples its service by insufficient appropriations. But there is no need of multiplying instances. Many such examples will come to the mind of every one who has ever had to do with the federal service. To complain of such conditions to congress has always been as ineffectual as if the prayers for relief were addressed to the gods of the ancient Greeks. Congressional committees pay not the slightest attention to the repeated requests of the departments for relief, be it ever so much needed.

It is the greatest proof of the ingenuity of our public officials that notwithstanding the crudities and inconsistencies which characterize all congressional legislation, they take hold of each new administrative law and somehow make it work. In the last extremity, the meanings of certain provisions are explained away by an opinion of the attorney general, or deliberately violated; and government property which cannot be legally saved is allowed to perish.

But it must be remembered that the federal government has for us here at home but a limited number of functions and that most of the matters affecting our commercial, social and political life which call for the action of the government belong

to the states. The disadvantages of our system increase as the so-called business ends of government become of greater importance; and it is somewhat appalling to consider the increased range of subjects with which congress will have to deal if it bears to our new colonies the relation which our state legislatures bear to our state and city governments. For even in our state governments we see the same cause producing the same effects. The interference of the legislature with the administrative details of state and city governments furnishes a fresh scandal at each session.

The great power of our legislative bodies, independent of and uncontrolled by the executive, is balanced by the equally independent position of the executive in administering the laws after their passage. This feature of our system serves as an additional obstacle to efficiency. Especially is this the case in the state governments where the laws are for the most part administered by locally elected officials. So, not unfrequently, the spirit in which certain laws shall be enforced becomes a principal political issue at elections. Thus state laws regulating or prohibiting liquor selling are administered in one part of the state rigorously and in the other parts with the greatest laxity. The law may require property to be assessed at its full value for purposes of taxation, but the local officials cheerfully make oath to the correctness of assessments which are notoriously undervalued; and the civil service laws are often openly violated with the tacit approval of the executive. But without stopping to weigh the advantages and disadvantages of this system of checks and balances, it is obvious that the price paid for the advantages is a very inefficient and wasteful administrative system, in which the correction of abuses, even when seriously attempted, is a long and difficult process. For instance, many efforts have been made to control large corporations and monopolies, but with little or no results. The legislatures pass laws for the purpose, but they have always proved impossible of enforcement for one reason or another. Even if an ade-

quate and effective statute were finally passed, it must be applied by an attorney general who may not be in sympathy with it.

Now, so far as this system of ours involves evils and embarrassments in the management of our domestic affairs, where the legislators that frame laws and the president and governors who execute them are all directly responsible to the people who experience the results of their works, such evils and embarrassments must become infinitely increased when the laws so framed and passed are applied among a people unrepresented in congress, of whose habits, customs and needs its members are ignorant, and whose approval or disapproval will have no effect upon elections. Governmental stupidity or carelessness or ignorance may be of comparatively small importance when the result is felt at home and the power of correction lies with the persons who suffer from it; but it becomes intolerable when its victims are a subject race. How many things we pass over lightly, feeling that we are ourselves to blame, which it would be scandalous for any people to submit to from a foreign power. Foreign paramount powers have their own faults, but our peculiar fault would be tyranny.

Where the business ends of government are of such great importance as in our largest cities and states, the increased difficulties encountered in carrying on the administration with the executive and legislative branches of the government, independently of each other, has resulted in some curious developments which have a certain bearing on the subject we are considering. In our states we may observe the tendency to increase the governor's practical influence over the legislature; by giving him, for example, the power to veto particular items in appropriation bills without vetoing the whole measure. In our city governments, which have but insignificant political but the most important business functions, the legislative branch has been made comparatively harmless by being deprived of all practical power, while the authority of the mayor has been correspondingly increased. But even the

increased importance of the governor and mayor has not been enough to meet the demand for greater efficiency, and in response to the demand for still greater harmony between the two branches there has developed a position to which is attached greater practical powers than those of either the governor or the legislature, although the incumbent of the position has no legal responsibility nor are his powers defined by law.

Let those who object to the "boss" as such, consider whether our legislatures would be improved if freed from his restraining influence. He is a natural product of our system. By furnishing the missing link needed to unite the executive and the legislature in harmonious and mutually helpful action, he supplies a long felt want. How quickly the natural antagonism between the mayor and the municipal assembly manifests itself when the incumbent of that important position in the actual government of the city of New York betakes himself away to England to enjoy a few weeks of much needed rest. How quickly all friction ceases under the sobering influence of his expected presence when it becomes known that he is on his way home. Even so vigorous and strenuous a character as New York's present governor finds it necessary to make frequent trips from Albany to New York to visit the leaders of his party and to arrange over the breakfast table what he, the governor, and the legislature are to do. We owe the greater efficiency of our state and city administrations to the increased powers of the governors and mayors and above all to the influence of the "boss." Thus has been overcome the extreme jealousy of the executive on the part of the legislature, which still characterizes congress, but which had to yield in our largest cities and states when their growing requirements made it necessary for them to have a more efficient and skillful administration.

We have not yet developed the "boss" as an adjunct to the federal government, but during the past few weeks we have seen both president and congress bend to an outside influence which is not unlike what we are accustomed to in our state and local governments, and if ever congress actually attempts to provide an admin-

istration, and to pass appropriation bills, and to set up local governments, and to grant franchises for the eight millions in the Philippines we may reasonably expect to evolve out of the scandals and embarrassments to result from its mistakes, either a "boss" or some other institution which shall be effective to carry through colonial bills. We can scarcely expect congress by itself, when it comes to legislate for colored men on the other side of the world, to show greater wisdom, solicitude and knowledge than it does when it legislates for its own constituents, or than it did when it once before tried to set up a government in a conquered territory, and reconstruct the southern states, or than has been shown by our state legislatures when dealing with matters affecting their own states. If we undertake to govern dependencies from Washington, either congress must become submissive to the executive, or absorb the executive by admitting cabinet officers to the floors of congress who will direct its deliberations and administer its laws in accordance with the will of the majority, or both branches must become the tools of a great party "boss."

HENRY DE FOREST BALDWIN.  
New York City.

## NEWS

Our report of the South African war closed last week with the announcement that Lord Roberts was making active preparations to withstand an investment at Bloemfontein. The Boers had a few days before won a victory at Koornspruit, not many miles east of Bloemfontein; had captured and were still in possession of the Bloemfontein water works; and were otherwise pressing upon the town from the south and east. This pressure has continued during the week now closing, causing the British to concentrate so as to be ready to face an attack from any direction; and some fighting has occurred.

One of the fights was a small affair at Boshof, a place in the Orange Free State a short distance to the northeast from Kimberley. A British force of nearly 700 surrounded a Boer force of 65, and after four hours' fighting killed 7, wounded 8, and captured the rest. Only three of the

prisoners were Boers; the others were uitlanders — Frenchmen, Germans and Russians. Among the killed was Gen. Villebois Mareuil, known as "the Lafayette of South Africa," a French officer who was the Boer chief of staff.

This British victory would have offset in some degree the stinging defeat of Koornspruit, reported last week; but it was itself more than offset by the capture, reported by Lord Roberts on the 5th, of three companies of the Royal Irish fusiliers and two companies of the 9th regiment of mounted infantry, at Reddersburg, by a supposedly superior but unknown Boer force. Reddersburg lies a little east of the railroad and as far south as Edenburg. Gen. Gatacre at once went to Reddersburg; but although he arrived within two hours after the fight, he could get no news either of the captured detachment or their captors.

On the 11th hard fighting was reported at Wepener, an Orange Free State point 45 miles directly south of Thaba N'chu, and on the border of Basutoland. Gen. Brabant commands a British force of from 2,000 to 3,000 at Wepener. As early as the 6th the Boers were observed to be gathering in force, and owing to the bad condition of Brabant's horses it was believed that he would have to act strictly upon the defensive. Surrender of the place was demanded on the 7th, and on the 8th the garrison was reported as isolated. The Boers had invested it on the three Orange Free State sides. On the same day the attack began and the battle was still under way on the 11th, when the last report from Wepener was received.

From Boer sources on the 11th there came reports of hard fighting and a Boer victory at a place called Meerkatsfontein, in which the British lost 600 in killed and 900 in prisoners. The British war office neither confirms nor denies this report. That, however, is not significant, as the censorship has again become very strict. But there are reasons for suspecting that the report is the Boer version of the Reddersburg affair, in which the Irish fusiliers were captured.

By reference to a map of the Orange Free State, it will be readily seen that these Boer movements are

of a highly threatening character to the British position at Bloemfontein. The Boers appear to have extended a broken line of mobile troops in a semi-circle eastward around Bloemfontein from Brandfort in the north to the neighborhood of Reddersburg in the south, where they threaten Roberts' communications; and the reports show that virtually all the Free State east of the railroad, where the British were but recently in control, is now dominated by Boers. Meanwhile Roberts is unable to move. He ruined his horses in the chase after Cronje, and has not yet received fresh ones. He is also suffering for want of warm clothing for his men. The winter is coming upon him, and his men have only the thin khaki uniforms that have served them during the summer. In London the predictions that Pretoria would be taken by May have been withdrawn, and gloom has succeeded enthusiasm.

Mafeking is still unrelieved, and fighting in that region continues. Lord Methuen has moved from Kimberley to the relief of Mafeking with the main body under his command. But nothing has been heard of his progress. The capture of a Boer detachment at Boshof, described above, may have been made in this connection. Belated British reports say that Col. Plumer, with a relief expedition from the north, came within six miles of Mafeking on the 31st, but in a battle between Ramathlabama and Mafeking was driven back with considerable loss. Col. Plumer himself was wounded in the right arm. These reports confirm earlier ones to the same effect from Boer sources.

Buller's force in Natal is being attacked by the Boers. They began their aggressive movement here on the 10th, in the neighborhood of Elandslaagte, where the earliest fighting of the war occurred. Elandslaagte is on the railroad only a few miles north of Ladysmith. Buller, like Roberts, is badly hampered for want of fresh horses and winter clothing.

The latest official report of British casualties was issued on the 11th and brings the figures down to the 7th. They are as follows:

Killed .....	2,171
Died .....	2,082
Missing and prisoners.....	3,890
Invalided home.....	5,222
Total .....	13,365

In this report the number of wounded is not given. Together with other losses since the 7th, it raises the grand total to about 23,000.

The volksraad, or legislature, of the Orange Free State met on the 4th at Kroonstad. It was opened with an address by President Steyn, who predicted an early termination of the war through the intervention of France, Russia and Germany. About the same time a ballot was being taken at Bloemfontein upon a name for the Orange Free State when it shall have been conquered by the British. Brandesia, in memory of a former president, was adopted.

The neutrality of Portugal has been brought under discussion since the Delagoa arbitration noted last week, by an extraordinary act on Portugal's part. She has consented to the passage of British troops through Portuguese East Africa to Rhodesia, north of the Transvaal. The matter having been questioned on the 4th in the Portuguese chamber of deputies, the minister for foreign affairs explained it in these terms:

The transport of British soldiers by railroad from Beira to Umtali was requested by Great Britain and consented to by Portugal because the British government thereby only exercised a right recognized in the treaties between the two countries. The outbreak of war has not abrogated these treaties, which were concluded and signed prior to the war by Portugal in a spirit of loyalty. I have informed the Transvaal of this resolution. Portugal has loyally adhered to its duties and neutrality, and its resolutions have been communicated to all interested parties.

President Kruger has formally protested, notifying Portugal that the Transvaal government considers the shipping of British troops to Rhodesia through Portuguese territory to be tantamount to hostile action.

American government in the Philippines appears to be in quite as bad condition as Agoncillo's story, published last week, implied. The Associated press reports of the 8th from Manilasay that "reports of encounters between the American troops and the insurgents continue to arrive from many points." Among these encounters was one within five miles of Manila, where a Filipino outpost in full uniform was attacked. Another occurred in Laguna prov-

ince, where an American detachment was driven for refuge into a church and held there until reinforcements arrived. There was another in Cagayan province, another in the island of Panay, and still another in the island of Samar.

The effect of this sort of constant harassing warfare is forcibly indicated by the frequent requests Gen. Young, commanding northern Luzon, has made for reinforcements. He says that his force is inadequate, that his men are exhausted by the necessity for constant vigilance, that he is unable to garrison the towns in his jurisdiction, and that the Filipinos are returning to the district and killing the American friendlies. Gen. Bell, who commands southern Luzon, makes similar representations. He complains that owing to the inadequacy of his force he merely holds a few towns without controlling the territory.

At his own request, Gen. Otis has been relieved. Private interests, he explains, require his immediate return. Gen. MacArthur is to succeed him as military governor. Regarding the situation he cables that he believes that by May 1 matters at Manila "can be placed in quite a satisfactory condition," although "a large repressive military force must be maintained for some time." Pending Gen. Otis's return a resolution has been introduced in the lower house of congress, by Congressman Levy, of New York, asking for information from the secretary of war upon which to base a congressional investigation into the manner in which Gen. Otis and the American military officers have been conducting the war in the Philippines.

A sensational report of a military murder comes from Manila, Gen. Funston being the accused. It is to the effect that the Filipinos captured three of Funston's native scouts near San Isidro, and were preparing to kill them when one escaped and found Funston near by with a scouting party. Funston followed the native to the rescue of his companions, and the Filipinos fled when Funston's party appeared. They left their prisoners behind, but Funston chased the retreating Filipinos and captured two. These he took to the village of San Isidro, and there hanged them. The hanging was without trial or legal form of any kind, and the mat-

ter has been under military investigation, with the prospect, it is reported, that Funston may be court-martialed.

American casualties in the Philippines since August 6, 1898, inclusive of all official reports given out at Washington to April 4, 1900, are as follows:

Killed .....	467
Died of wounds, disease and accidents .....	1,186
<b>Total deaths .....</b>	<b>1,653</b>
Wounded .....	2,072
<b>Total loss .....</b>	<b>3,725</b>
<b>Total loss reported last week.....</b>	<b>3,725</b>
<b>Total deaths reported last week..</b>	<b>1,653</b>

No reports of casualties have been published in the press since the 4th.

A further step in the direction of the American crown colony system was taken in congress on the 11th, when the senate amendments to the Puerto Rican tariff bill of the lower house, amendments which made it a full government bill, (See No. 105, page 5), were concurred in by the house. The subject was first disposed of by the republicans in caucus on the 5th. As the caucus was to be binding, the republican members who oppose a tariff between the states and Puerto Rico remained away. They are McCall of Massachusetts, Littlefield of Maine, Lorimer of Illinois, Crumpacker, of Indiana, Heatwole of Minnesota, Lane of Iowa and Warner of Illinois. At a conference held by them they decided not to recede from their former position. At the party caucus a motion to concur in all the senate amendments was adopted with only two dissenting votes. The principal objection made by the two dissentients—Cooper of Wisconsin and Moody of Massachusetts—was to the provision inserted in the bill by the senate requiring all the members of the upper council of the Puerto Rican legislature to be appointees of the president and clothing them with the power to grant franchises. The republican caucus having agreed to support the bill as it came from the senate, the ways and means committee decided on the 10th to report it without amendment. This it did on the 11th. On the same day the rules committee reported a special rule for the bill, cutting off debate at 5 o'clock that afternoon. The vote on this rule was 158 in the affirmative and 142 in the negative. After a sharp debate, the bill was

passed by a vote of 161 to 153. The affirmative vote was a solid republican vote with the exception of the republicans named above, and H. C. Smith, of Michigan. The democrats voted as a unit against the passage of the bill, the only exceptions being Sibley, of Pennsylvania, who has been renominated for congress by the republicans of his district, and Davey and Meyer, of Louisiana, who were paired in favor of the bill.

While congress makes a crown colony of Puerto Rico, it is in a fair way to making an American territory of Hawaii. In the lower house, on the 6th, an enabling act was passed as a substitute for one previously passed by the senate. The two bills are alike as to the general scheme of government proposed, and differ only in details which a conference committee is expected to have no difficulty in adjusting. The Hawaiian bill went into conference on the 11th.

Of American political news, aside from proceedings in congress, there is little important to report except that on the 5th the democratic convention of Pennsylvania, following the example of the Utah convention on the 1st, unanimously instructed its delegates to the national convention to support Bryan for presidential candidate. In New York the Chicago platform democracy has issued a call for a state convention to be held at Albany on the 21st of May, to choose delegates to the national convention. This movement is in hostility to the "regular" democratic organization of the state, which is charged with being opposed to Bryan and the Chicago platform.

The Kentucky imbroglio, the last report of which in these columns appeared in No. 102 at page 10, has been decided by the highest court of the state in favor of Beckham, the democrat, who was a candidate for lieutenant governor on the ticket with Goebel. The court held that the action of the Kentucky legislature in passing upon the report of the contest board was final and that the court has no right to overrule it. What is especially remarkable about the decision is the fact that it was concurred in not only by all the democratic judges, but also by two of the republicans. Only one judge, a republican, dissents. The case has now been carried to the supreme court of the United States for final adjudication.

It is a long jump from American to Australian politics. Since the agreement of the Australian colonies to form the Australian commonwealth, and pending the consummation of that act, federal political parties have been forming. The protectionists were first in the field. Two colonies (states as they will be called), were represented in the protection convention. Then the labor party met, with delegates from three colonies. Finally the free traders had a convention at Sydney in which all the colonies but one—Tasmania—were represented. This was held on the 14th, 15th and 16th of February. On the tariff question the free trade conference adopted the following:

That the first federal tariff should, as far as the exigencies of the several states will permit, embrace a number of duties somewhat similar to those in force in Great Britain, with the intention of as soon as possible establishing a free breakfast table; any deficiency of revenue in such latter case to be made up by direct taxation.

Though it has been supposed that all the obstacles to Australian federation had been overcome, a new one has arisen. The proposed constitution or enabling act of the Australian commonwealth, which is to be an act of the British parliament, establishes a supreme federal court for Australia and provides that there shall be no appeal from its decisions to Great Britain in matters affecting the interpretation of the constitution or of the constitutions of the several states. This provision is objected to by the British ministry, which regards it as amounting to a severance of the commonwealth from the mother country. The ministry wants one court of final appeal for the whole British empire. But the Australian commissioners, now in London, charged with procuring the passage of the enabling act, are opposed to any alteration. The bill is now as the colonies have agreed upon it, and the commissioners insist that they have no authority to consent to a change.

NEWS NOTES.

—Frederick E. Church, of New York, the famous artist, died on the 7th, aged 74.

—Five Puerto Ricans were put to death by means of the garrote at Ponce on the 7th. They had been convicted of murder.

—Cecil Rhodes arrived in London on the 6th, but refused to talk about the South African situation, saying

that he was in England on business of a purely personal nature.

—A temperature of 5,400 degrees Fahrenheit, which will cause steel to melt like wax, has been generated by a new chemical compound invented by Louis Dreyfus, of Frankfort-on-Main, Germany.

—The Ohio statute prohibiting an employer from discharging a workman for being a member of a labor union has been declared unconstitutional by a Toledo court as being class legislation.

—The Irish-American ambulance corps which left Chicago February 10 for service with the Boer army arrived at Pretoria on the 5th, where it received an enthusiastic welcome. Michael Davitt was among the spectators.

—A New York district messenger boy sailed from New York on the 11th en route to Pretoria bearing a message of greeting and sympathy to President Kruger signed by over 20,000 schoolboys of New York, Philadelphia and Boston.

—The United States senate committee on privileges and elections agreed on the 10th by a unanimous vote to report a recommendation depriving Senator Clark, of Montana, of his seat on the ground that he had secured his election by bribery.

—For the nine months ending March 31 the United States treasury report of receipts and expenditures is as follows:

Receipts .....	\$427,163,762 23
Expenditures .....	372,861,832 96
Surplus .....	\$54,301,929 28

—The official report of the cash in the United States treasury for March is as follows:

Gold reserve .....	\$150,000,000 00
Available cash balance .....	156,792,995 55
Total cash balance .....	\$306,792,995 55
On hand June 30 .....	281,380,468 73
Increase since June 30 .....	\$25,412,526 82

—E. Benjamin Andrews, superintendent of Chicago public schools, was elected chancellor of the Nebraska State university by the state university board of regents on the 11th. The election was made on the assurance that Superintendent Andrews would accept.

—A remarkable terrestrial upheaval occurred near Mount Baker, Washington, on March 27. What was formerly the valley and bed of the Nooksack river is now a mound 70 feet high and nearly a quarter of a mile square, in the center of which is a small lake. There are many large cracks and fissures in the mound and the upheaval was accompanied by loud rumbling and the odor of sulphur.

—The great dam at Austin, Tex., was washed away on the 7th, causing the death of 17 persons and the

destruction of several million dollars' worth of property, including the municipal lighting and power plant, upon which Austin was dependent for its transportation, water and sewage service. The dam, which was a quarter of a mile in width and 70 feet in height and over 18 feet across the top, formed a lake 25 miles long. When the dam broke a wave 50 feet in height rushed down the valley sweeping everything before it.

### IN CONGRESS.

This report is an abstract of the Congressional Record, and closes with the last issue of that publication at hand upon going to press.

April 2-9, 1900.

#### Senate.

On the 2d the Porto Rican bill was under consideration, and Senators Cullom and Spooner spoke in its favor.

Consideration of the Porto Rican bill was resumed on the 3d, Senator Mason speaking in opposition. An amendment offered by Senator Davis to the effect that internal revenue laws of the United States be extended to Porto Rico, was defeated. The bill was passed by a vote of 40 to 31. Not voting, 16.

The resolution relative to the seating of M. S. Quay as senator from Pennsylvania was discussed on the 4th and consideration of the Alaska civil government bill was resumed.

Nothing of importance was done on the 5th, and on the 6th consideration of the Indian appropriation bill was begun.

Consideration of the Indian appropriation and the Alaska civil government bills was resumed on the 9th and the Quay resolution was discussed.

#### House.

On the 2d no important bills were considered. A resolution offered by Payne, of New York, calling on the secretary of the treasury for information as to whether the present war revenue law creates a surplus, was agreed to.

The consideration of a bill to provide a civil government for Hawaii was begun on the 3d.

Consideration of the Hawaiian bill was resumed on the 4th and continued on the 5th and 6th, to the exclusion of all other important business.

On the 7th memorial resolutions on the late Richard Parks Bland, of Missouri, were adopted, and on the 9th consideration of the agricultural appropriation bill was begun.

## MISCELLANY

### EASTER MORNING SONG.

For The Public.

A step upon the sea — a breath from heaven blown,

And all the waters flush like God-made wine,

While seed in darkness sown

Springs into life eternal and divine.

A tremor !' the clouds—a flood-tide from the skies,

And all the land is breaking into flower;  
Love calls—Arise! Arise!

And leaf and bud obey the living power.

Awake, beloved, awake! A song is !' the air.

And Nature's heart with sweetest rapture thrills,

While without fear or care

She loyally the law of life fulfills.

Oh, endless round of life, in which there is no death,

(For so-called dying is but higher birth),

We breathe Love's vital breath,

And walk with joy to-day in the new earth.

ANNIE L. MUZZEY.

### ANOTHER RISE IN PRICES.

In consequence of the recent conference held in Chicago at which it was decided to increase the prices of wagons, carriages and other road vehicles, manufacturers at Racine yesterday announced a 20 per cent. advance, effective at once. It is said the makers of materials raised their prices, necessitating the present advance.

"This will not affect our firm or any other which makes fine vehicles," said a representative of C. P. Kimball & Co. last night. "The new schedule will be adopted probably by all makers of heavy wagons and cheaper grades of carriages, buggies, etc." — Chicago Chronicle, of Mar. 27.

### A RED TAPE STORY.

It is the red tape which makes the strain heavier than it would otherwise be. After we had been for weeks shut up in Kimberley—not at the best the most cheerful place in the universe—our hearts became specially fixed on our portion of the British army—the relief column. By accident we learned that it had reached the Modder river, after a sharp engagement at Belmont.

Eagerly we awaited news from Lord Methuen. Men and women scanned the horizon nights to seek the first flash from his searchlight.

All night long our three searchlights sent their long streams of fiery light past the rugged fortresses of Scholtz' nek and the rocky kopjes of Spytfontein to the two rivers, on whose banks our preservers were encamped.

"Md, Md, Md," they called, but no answer came. Only the big stars could be seen, and the southern cross seemed to whisper "patience." At last, one night far from the south came the welcome flash. "Kb, Kb," it said. High up in the tower sat Lieut. Col. Kekewich and his staff officers, with picked men from the signal corps. Anxiously they deciphered the first message from their honored chief. It was this: "Ascertain number on forefoot of mule, omitted in Cape Town return."—Kimberley Correspondent of the London Standard.

### AN AUSTRALIAN VIEW OF THE AMERICANS IN MANILA.

A letter from an Australian in Manila, published in the Sydney (N. S. W.) Daily Telegraph of February 14.

As you know, the Americans are considered in other parts of the world to be rather a smart go-ahead people. What they are really like in America I do not, of course, know, but the 50,000 or 60,000 troops sent out here consist of the roughest drunken scoundrels that it would be possible to band together anywhere. They have now been here about two years altogether, and it is just a year since the native rebellion broke out, but the country remains in much the same position. It is true that they have now reopened the provincial ports which have been closed during the past year, and that business may now increase owing to fresh supplies of commercial products which support Manila, such as leaf tobacco, hemp, shells, coffee, copra, indigo, etc., but the whole country is still under military government, and the system of taxation being a continuation of the old Spanish highly protective tariff, combined with some additional duties imposed and added by the American authorities, makes everything very dear.

Rents are simply enormous. Licenses for hotels within the city boundary have been raised to 1,200 dollars mex, or £120 per annum, with £40 per annum extra for Sunday serving. You have to pay a license for any kind of shop or business. If you import you must have an importer's license, and if you export you must pay export duty. The curfew system is still maintained. Anyone found on the street after 8:30 p. m. is arrested, locked up all night, and fined 10 dollars (£1) in the morning. The police courts are run by the military, mayors, etc., who are judges pro tem., though they know nothing of law, and positively smoke cigarettes on the Bench.

The form of government here is far worse than the much-abused Transvaal. If you go on the street after 8:30 you may be shot by a sentry, one or two Spaniards and Chinamen having actually met with this fate.

### PUBLIC TELEGRAPH SERVICE IN NEW ZEALAND.

Of great interest is Senator Bucklin's account of the telegraph service which he found. When he came from Tasmania to New Zealand he landed at the extreme southern point of the "south island," at a port called Bluff. He desired to inform his friends in Auckland of his arrival. Auckland

is over 1,100 miles north of Bluff, but the charge for 12 words was sixpence—12 cents—although a part of this line is a cable running under Cook strait, from 50 to 75 miles, of course involving a large additional amount for construction. Besides this, the line is for much of the distance through a very thinly populated country, and, New Zealand being some 1,200 miles from the nearest Australia port, there is no amount of through business to compare with all American lines. Moreover, New Zealand's population is quite sparse. But even at this low price and with these disadvantages, the profits on the lines are so large that at the next session a bill will be brought in to reduce the rates, it being contrary to the general policy of the New Zealand and Australian governments to make any considerable profit from public utilities.

Now for the contrast with our privately owned lines. When Senator Bucklin landed at San Francisco he telegraphed to his wife at Colorado. The distance was the same that the telegram was sent in New Zealand, about 1,100 miles. The charge was more than six times the price charged in New Zealand, or 75 cents, as against 12 cents. The line here, for the most part, runs through a well-populated country, is all by land except the cable under San Francisco bay and has a large amount of through business. All who know anything of telegraph business are aware that the cost of service is very much lessened by a large business, as it costs less to keep lines in repair in a densely settled than in a sparsely settled country, and of course an operator must be kept at every station, whether the business is much or little. Nothing could more strongly set forth the disadvantage which the private ownership of telegraph lines of this country lays upon the business of the country.—Joseph Leggett, writing of Hon. J. W. Bucklin's recent visit to Australasia.

#### ANTI-MONOPOLY WORK IN MINNESOTA.

For The Public.

1. For nearly 30 years all unused railway lands were absolutely exempt from all state and local taxes. For eight years the railway companies were able to defeat every attempt at change. Finally the people amended the constitution so that all such lands are now listed for state and local taxation, the same as farm land around them. The railroads are hustling to

sell their lands and offering them at half the former price.

2. For over 18 years all mineral lands so long as unused, were also wholly exempt from all taxes. A statute law (probably unconstitutional) secured the exemption. Through the efforts of a few active single taxers and others the law was repealed and mineral lands are now taxed—not as they ought to be, but more justly than before.

3. Through the efforts of Alderman Joseph L. Kiichli and Hon Frank C. Brooks (since elected judge of the district court) a decree of the court was secured, in mandamus proceedings, declaring that the Minneapolis Street Railway company has no franchise or privilege in the streets greater than the usual or ordinary rights of any hack or drayman, and that the company is at all times subject to all reasonable regulations of the city council.

4. The supreme court in the case of Stunerson vs. Great Northern Railway company (reported in 72 N. W., page 713) has rendered the most advanced decision that has ever come from any court in the civilized world. The court held that:

Reasonable rates are to be determined "by ascertaining what, under all the circumstances, is a reasonable income on the cost of reproducing the road at the present time."

"The burden is on the railway company to show that the rates fixed by the commission are unreasonable."

A reasonable net income on the cost of terminals is 2½ per cent. per annum.

A reasonable net income on the cost of other property is five per cent. per annum.

Unprofitable business on portions of the road outside of Minnesota cannot be used to increase rates in Minnesota.

Cost of operating unprofitable feeders and extensions is no part of reasonable rates.

With these two decisions as a basis, any railway or other service corporation, can be brought to reasonable rates just as soon as the people determine that they will have such rates.

C. J. BUELI.

Land, which nature has destined to man's sustenance, is the only source from which everything comes, and to which everything flows back, and the existence of which constantly remains in spite of all changes. From this unmistakable truth it results that land alone can furnish the wants of the state, and that in natural fairness no distinctions can be made in this.—Emperor Joseph II., in *Oestreichische Geschichte fur das Volk*, Vol. XIV. (Vienna, 1867).

#### THE MISSOURI.

I.

Between low brinks of ragged clay  
The rapid river takes its way.

Its heavy, tawny waters flow  
As if their road they did not know;

Swirl off in loops, spread out in lakes,  
Whose sandy shoals trail sluggish wakes.

They gnaw away the tumbling banks,  
Mow down their leafy willow ranks;

They dwindle, till the dust blows round  
Where fishes swam and men were drowned;

Then flood the bottoms miles away,  
Fence, barn and house their scattered prey;

But yet, far back, the hills remain,  
Which all their wanderings restrain.

II.

O mighty river, we may see  
Our new democracy in thee.

No Rhine art thou, by cliffs beset,  
With castles on each parapet;

No Thames, of placid, even tide,  
With glass lawns edging either side;

But strong, and turbid, and perplexed,  
By frequent whirls and eddies vexed—

At times an overwhelming fall  
Of brute destruction—yet through all

Large wealth bestowing—grain and woods  
Upspringing where once swept thy floods.

And so we know, whate'er thy force,  
God's hills will hold thee to his course.  
—Cameron Mann, in *Century*.

#### THE DEMOCRATIC PLATFORM.

How would it do to have a new style of platform to get a little heart in it, and say: "The democratic party pledges itself to the cause of human freedom, freedom from all oppressions at home and to render justice and the right of self-government to all people; to defend the constitution and suppress monopolies." Stop right there. ("Every drop of water after that spoils the punch.")

Then go to the people; ask them if they want a large standing army that can be used by the president as he likes, and sent to the other side of the world by his order. Ask them if they will have a republic, under the constitution, or an executive officer who, of his own will, brings on war, invades foreign lands, appoints commissions to do his bidding in governing conquered people; regulates by his order the customs and revenues of such people, and orders the violation of the mails and the suppression of information for his personal political advantage. Ask them if they believe it accords with honor, justice, Christianity, to kill, burn the houses and devastate the country of a people because they claim only the right to govern themselves. Ask them if they approve of the expenditure of two or three hundred millions of their mon-

ey to subjugate the Filipinos, who never did them the least harm in the world. Ask them if they will have war, glory and high taxes and depend on the brute force of a large army and navy; or peace and prosperity and depend on justice and moderation. Ask them if they will have entangling alliances which will embroil them in the affairs of other nations. Ask them if they are willing to be taxed in order that large subsidies may be squandered on a few rich syndicates, for instance, Hanna & Co. (Who is the Co.?) Ask them if they will depend for the suppression of monopolies on the party which has been legislating for 40 years to create them.

Depend upon it, answers to all these questions will surely come. If they come through you, you will march on at the head of a triumphant host, inspired with a sincere love of our country—Independents who place honor and justice above party fealty and party spoils—democrats determined to defend the constitution, and who revere the teachings of the fathers.

If these answers do not come through you, but in spite of you, so much the worse for you, that is all. History will write the epitaph of the party you have led to destruction—"Weighed in the balance and found wanting."—Hon. John V. Le Moynes, in the March Jeffersonian Democrat.

#### MILITARISM.

For The Public.

The horrors of war have never lacked graphic depiction. Shakespeare has flashed upon them his genius. Vereschagin has flung them on his canvas. Sherman has summed them in three words. But to the absurdities and dangers of the military spirit, the root whence war springs, too little attention has been paid. In compliance with the specious maxim that peace is best maintained in preparing for war this spirit ever finds favor with many who hate its ripened fruit. Hence, partly, the popularity in America of brass buttons and striped seams, the liking for military titles, and the too ready acquiescence in martial absolutism as something that has a right to override and supersede civil law whenever trouble threatens. Befeathered militia officers thus strut prodigious, the very Sunday schools put wooden rifles in their youngsters' hands, and when official murder flames forth at Hazleton or Coeur d'Alene no adequate roar of protest follows and its authors go scot free.

And yet with the evils of militarism as it exists in Europe, turning nations into armed camps, impoverishing their people, and threatening every year to burst into such holocausts as Napoleon kindled, we are perhaps sufficiently familiar. We err in thinking, because so far we have escaped the compulsory service and the huge establishments idle in barracks, that therefore militarism in America is something different in essentials and not merely in degree. On the contrary, our military system is modeled upon that of Europe, with its rigid discipline, its servility enforced upon the rank and file, and its denial to them of the right to their own brain and conscience—so that they are compelled to surrender their reason, their ideas of right and wrong, of prudence and duty, and to become blindly obedient to others, mere automata in their hands, so much raw material for tactics and food for powder.

In Europe the system is synonymous with snobbery, arrogance and tyranny. Our freer institutions may check the growth of this brutal spirit, but there are evidences all too plenty in our military academies, in our regular army, and even in our militia, that they do not prevent it.

When a soldier can be subjected to long imprisonment for addressing by letter his commander in chief without first obtaining permission from his regimental superior; when the marriage of an army lieutenant with the daughter of a sergeant brings upon him social ostracism; when citizen soldiers can be sent to jail for inability to pay fines imposed upon them by their officers, and when a colonel of militia can string up a refractory private by the thumbs and escape punishment—to cite only a few among cases of recent years that come to mind—surely even the conservative will admit that there is room for reform.

The truth is that militarism is the very antithesis and negation of both democracy and freedom. Its existence in America is irrational and absurd in the highest degree. Walt Whitman, democracy's anointed poet, saw this when he declared:

The whole present system of the officering and personnel of the army and navy of these states, and the spirit and letter of their trebly aristocratic rules and regulations, is a monstrous exotic, a nuisance and revolt, and belongs here just as much as orders of nobility or the pope's council of cardinals. I say if the present theory of our army and navy is sensible and true then the rest of America is an unmitigated fraud.

The advocates of military training lay great stress on the discipline it enforces. True, discipline is to every one a salutary experience without which life will be a failure. But to inculcate a craven fear of punishment, a fictitious respect for rank, and a blind obedience to orders regardless of right or reason is not truly to discipline. A martinet is only a bully, and the private who trembles in his presence is not an inspiring object.

Nor is such training necessary in order that there shall be ready for service a force to defend the country from invasion or internal danger should either threaten. Such wars are wars of the people, not of professional killers, and the people can be trusted to wage them and to submit to the control necessary for effective united action without having had it drilled into them in forms subversive of their self-respect for years previously. To this American history bears ample evidence.

F. C. W.

#### ABRAHAM LINCOLN ON THE DECLARATION.

The following extracts from speeches made by Lincoln were quoted by the Hon. R. F. Pettigrew in a speech in the Senate January 15.

In those days our Declaration of Independence was held sacred by all and thought to include all; but now, to aid in making the bondage of the negro universal and eternal, it is assailed and sneered at, and construed, and hawked at, and torn, till, if its framers could rise from their graves, they could not at all recognize it. All the powers of earth seem rapidly combining against him. Mammon is after him, ambition follows, philosophy follows, and the theology of the day is fast joining the cry. . . .

I think the authors of that notable instrument intended to include all men; but they did not intend to declare all men equal in all respects. They did not mean to say all were equal in color, size, intellect, moral developments, or social capacity. They defined with tolerable distinctness in what respects they did consider all men created equal—equal with "certain inalienable rights, among which are life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness." This they said, and this they meant. They did not mean to assert the obvious untruth that all were then actually enjoying that equality, nor yet that they were about to confer it immediately upon them. In fact, they had no power to confer such a boon. They meant simply to declare the right, so that the enforcement of it

might follow as fast as circumstances should permit.

They meant to set up a standard maxim for free society, which should be familiar to all, and revered by all, constantly looked to, constantly labored for, and even though never perfectly attained, constantly approximated, and thereby constantly spreading and deepening its influence and augmenting the happiness and value of life to all people of all colors everywhere. The assertion that "all men are created equal" was of no practical use in effecting our separation from Great Britain, and it was placed in the declaration not for that but for future use. Its authors meant it to be, as, thank God, it is now proving itself, a stumbling block to all those who, in after times, might seek to turn a free people back into the hateful paths of despotism. They knew the proneness of prosperity to bred tyrants, and they meant when such should reappear in this fair land and commence their vocation, they should find left for them at least one hard nut to crack. . . .

I have now briefly expressed my view of the meaning and object of that part of the declaration of independence which declares that "all men are created equal."

Now let us hear Judge Douglas's view of the same subject, as I find it in the printed report of his late speech. Here it is:

No man can vindicate the character, motives and conduct of the signers of the Declaration of Independence, except upon the hypothesis that they referred to the white race alone, and not to the African, when they declared all men to have been created equal—that they were speaking of British subjects on this continent being equal to British subjects born and residing in Great Britain—that they were entitled to the same inalienable rights, and among them were enumerated life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness. The Declaration was adopted for the purpose of justifying the colonists in the eyes of the civilized world in withdrawing their allegiance from the British crown and dissolving their connection with the mother country.

My good friends, read that carefully over some leisure hour, and ponder well upon it; see what a mere wreck; mangled ruin, it makes of our once glorious Declaration.

They were speaking of British subjects on this continent being equal to the British subjects born and residing in Great Britain.

Why, according to this, not only negroes, but white people outside of Great Britain and America, were not spoken of in that instrument. The English, Irish and Scotch, along with white Americans, were included, to be

sure, but the French, Germans and other white people of the world are all gone to pot along with the judge's inferior races.

I had thought the declaration promised something better than the condition of British subjects. But no; it only meant that we should be equal to them in their own oppressed and unequal condition! According to that, it gave no promise that, having kicked off the king and lords of Great Britain, we should not at once be saddled with a king and lords of our own in these United States.

I had thought the declaration contemplated progressive improvement in the condition of all men everywhere. But no; it merely "was adopted for the purpose of justifying the colonies in the eyes of the civilized world in withdrawing their allegiance from the British crown and dissolving their connection with the mother country." Why, that object having been effected some 80 years ago, the declaration is of no practical use now—mere rubbish—only wadding left to rot on the battlefield after the victory is won.

I understand you are preparing to celebrate the "Fourth" to-morrow week. What for? The doings of that day had no reference to the present: and quite half of you are not even descendants of those who were referred to at that day. But I suppose you will celebrate, and will even go so far as to read the declaration. — Speech in Springfield, Ill., June 26, 1857.

Those arguments that are made that the inferior race are to be treated with as much allowance as they are capable of enjoying; that as much is to be done for them as their condition will allow. What are these arguments? They are the arguments that kings have made for enslaving the people in all ages of the world. You will find that all the arguments in favor of kingcraft were of this class. They always bestrode the necks of the people, not that they wanted to do it, but because the people were better off for being ridden. That is their argument, and this argument of the judge is the same old serpent that says: "You work and I eat; you toil and I will enjoy the fruits of it." Turn it in whatever way you will, whether it comes from the mouth of a king as an excuse for enslaving the people of his country or from the mouth of men of one race as a reason for enslaving the men of another race, it is all the same old serpent, and I hold if that course of argumentation that is made for the purpose

of convincing the public mind that we should not care about this should be granted, it does not stop with the negro. I should like to know if taking this old declaration of independence, which declares that all men are equal upon principle, and making exceptions to it, where will it stop? If one man says it does not mean a negro, why not another say it does not mean some other man? If that declaration is not the truth, let us get the statute book in which we find it and tear it out! Who is so bold as to do it?—Speech in Chicago, July 10, 1858.

#### THE ENGLISH STRUGGLE AGAINST IMPERIALISM.

The greater part of an article by George W. E. Russell, which appeared under the title of "The Revival of Imperialism." in the London Speaker of February 24.

It was not until the general election of 1874 that Mr. Disraeli, then in his seventieth year, found himself in a position where he could give practical effect to his political theories. . . . It was clear that Mr. Disraeli (who became Lord Beaconsfield in 1876) had set himself in old age to realize some of the dreams of his youth. Those dreams had long before been given to the world in novels, in which genius, wit, humor, eloquence and pathos were strangely blent with sham culture and genuine vulgarity. The Sensible Men of both parties—the men who read the Times and believe in Lord Macaulay—had agreed to regard Disraeli and all his doings as a joke. His politics and his writings were likened to "a Columbine's skirt, all flimsiness and spangles." But now that the wearer of this skirt had a parliamentary majority of 50 and was evidently determined to use it, the Sensible Men began to study his books in a desperate anxiety to discover what the Columbine believed. They then learned that the two chief factors in the state were the "Monarch and the Multitude;" that the great Middle Class which they worshiped had been destroyed by the Disraelitish Reform act of 1867; that no country could be successful which was "cursed with the fatal drollery of representative institutions;" and that Great Britain was above and before all else an Oriental Power.

Let the Queen of the English collect a great fleet, let her stow away all her treasure, bullion, gold plate and precious arms; be accompanied by all her court and chief people, and transfer the seat of her Empire from London to Delhi. There she will find an immense Empire ready-made, a first-rate army, and a large revenue. Besides which, she gets rid of the embarrassment of her Chambers! And quite practicable; for the only difficult part—

the conquest of India, which baffled Alexander—is all done!

Thirty years before this, had read like a bad dream. But now the Sensible Men discovered to their horror that sometimes dreamers were doers. too; and that the brilliant Israelite who wrote Tancred was now Prime Minister of England. He would not indeed just yet "transfer the seat of Empire from London to Delhi;" but he could dispatch the heir-apparent on a pompous progress through India; could invoke the most august of names to overawe parliamentary debate; and could withstand the imagined advances of the czar on India by butting at him with an imperial crown, while a mountebank vice empress caracoled on a white elephant with gilt tusks. A white elephant with gilt tusks!—apt symbol of that costly clumsiness which its admirers call an imperial policy.

This was the first act in the drama of imperialism; and the second was like unto it. An insurrection had broken out in Bulgaria, and the Turkish government dispatched a large force to repress it. This was soon done, and repression was followed by a hideous orgy of massacre and outrage. A rumor of these horrors reached England, and public indignation spontaneously awoke. Lord Beaconsfield, with a strange frankness of cynical brutality, sneered at the rumor as "coffee house babble," and made odious jokes about the oriental way of executing malefactors. But Christian England was not to be pacified with these Asiatic pleasantries, and the country rose in passionate indignation against what were known as "the Bulgarian atrocities." Mr. Gladstone, who had resigned the liberal leadership in 1875, rushed from his library at Hawarden and flung himself into the agitation against Turkey with a zeal which in his prime he had never excelled, if, indeed, he had equaled it. He made the most impassioned speeches, often in the open air; he published pamphlets which ran into incredible circulations; he poured letter after letter into the newspapers; he darkened the sky with controversial post-cards; and, as soon as parliament met in February, 1877, he was ready with all his unequalled resources of eloquence, argumentation and inconvenient inquiry, to drive home his great indictment against the Turkish government. Of that government, Lord Beaconsfield, swayed partly by racial and partly by religious considerations, was the supereminent champion. Im-

perialism proved to be the sworn ally of barbarism. The prime minister was followed by every imperialist in England, and was backed by the financial influence of Turkish bondholders all over Europe.

Then, as now, the sordid thirst for gold was the inspiring force of imperial policy. It is unnecessary at this time of day to trace in detail the history of a great controversy so fresh in every memory that can reach back for 20 years. For our present purpose it is enough to say that Mr. Gladstone's resolute and splendid hostility to Lord Beaconsfield's whole system of imperial policy restored him to his paramount place among English politicians. For three years he sustained the high and holy strife with an enthusiasm, a versatility, a courage and a resourcefulness which raised the enthusiasm of his followers to the highest pitch and filled his guilty and baffled antagonists with a rage akin to frenzy. By frustrating Lord Beaconsfield's design of going to war on behalf of Turkey he saved England from the indelible disgrace of a second and more gratuitous Crimea. But it was not only in eastern Europe that his saving influence was felt. In Africa and India, and wherever British arms were exercised and British honor was involved, he was the resolute and unsparing enemy of that odious system of bluster and swagger and might against right which its admirers and its enemies alike epitomized in the one word: "Imperialism." In his own phrase, he devoted himself to "counterworking the purpose of Lord Beaconsfield." As the general election approached, one and only one question was submitted to the electors: "Do you approve or condemn Lord Beaconsfield's imperial policy?"

The repudiation of that policy reunited liberalism. All shades and sections of the liberal party criticised it, reviled it and ridiculed it with an unanimity and a vigor which they had not displayed since 1832. Some (like the present writer) were men in the twenties, just beginning politics. Some, like the duke of Argyll, were veterans made splendid by past achievements and present powers. But dukes' sons, cooks' sons, solicitors and screwmakers, whigs and radicals, Gladstonians and Hartingtonians, were of one heart and one mind and one speech in hostility to imperialism and all its works and ways. Our triumph came at Easter, 1880. Imperialism was crushed; Mr.

Gladstone was again prime minister, and the godless old cynic who had scoffed at the red horrors of Bulgaria was driven forever from public life. "I don't wonder," wrote Dean Church to a friend, "at your remembering the Song of Miriam."

Just 20 years have elapsed since the last months of that celebrated strife. To remember it is a joy; to have had part in it is a pride. And to-day, as I look round me, I seem to see a revival—and not a revival only, but "the very scarlet fruitage and fullness"—of a poisonous evil which we thought we had crushed forever. We see lust of territory, lust of gold, lust of blood; the idolatry of material interests; the shameful repudiation of all moral appeals; tawdry histrionics and pot-valiant swagger. "The oriflamme hangs heavy with foul tissue of terrestrial gold," and ranged under it, to my unspeakable surprise, I see some of my comrades of the old campaign. Men who were loudest in their devotion to peace, humanity and brotherhood now discover—as much, I should think, to their own astonishment as to mine—that they were "imperialists" all the time. Perhaps it was lucky for them that Mr. Gladstone never found it out; but the shade of Lord Beaconsfield must chuckle over the discovery.

#### AFTER BATTLE.

Lord of the conquered land we gain,  
Lord of the foe our hands have slain!  
Glory to Thee amidst the dead  
That Thou hast still Thy people led,  
And shattered thus, O Lord benign,  
This people that was also thine.

Lord of our silence and our speech,  
While to Thy throne our hymns upreach,  
Surely each blackening wound that gapes,  
Here in these broken human shapes,  
Mouths but its praise of all Thy powers,  
Thou wert their God no less than ours.

Nay, we were best be mute, and raise  
No blasphemy of boastful praise,  
Scatter no incense on the air,  
Nor lift our reddened hand in prayer,  
But dig the earth our steps defame,  
And hide these trophies of our shame.  
—A. St. John Adcock, in the Echo.

#### BOOK NOTICES.

"The Present Crisis," Edwin D. Mead's splendid paper on imperialism, which was originally printed, in part, as an editorial in the July (1899) number of the New England Magazine, has been published by Ellis, 272 Congress street, Boston.

James Hagerty, of Burlington, Iowa, has issued a pamphlet entitled "No Highways—No Civilization," in which he makes a brief and interesting as well as instructive presentation of the history of highways; and in a plea for good roads and streets in this country, shows how they may be secured without expense by charging the

cost to a general fund fed by taxes upon the owners of benefited lands.

"Trusts," by Jay D. Miller (Chicago Economic Library association, 508 Schiller building), is the address, printed in vest pocket size, which Mr. Miller delivered at the anti-trust conference held in Chicago last winter. In very readable style it traces the iniquity of trusts to the legal monopolies, of which they are composed.

"The Beginnings of Banking" is one of the historical essays in finance, by Charles A. Conant, which the "sound currency committee" of the New York Reform Club publishes. It may be had upon application to the Reform Club, 52 William street, New York. The essay deals with the history of banking from its development at Rome. It brings the story down through the middle ages, touching incidentally upon the banks of Venice and Amsterdam, and after explaining the origin of the bank of France, the bank of England and the bank of Scotland, closes with an account of the historical evolution of banking and the origin of bills of exchange and discount.

WE DON'T SELL OUR

## CIGARS

FOR LESS THAN THEY ARE WORTH. WE DON'T HAVE TO. THEY ARE FULL VALUE, *NO MORE, NO LESS.*

**J. & B. MOOS,**  
95 Randolph Street, 58-64 Dearborn Street, CHICAGO, ILL.

The first thousand dollars is hard to get. After that it is easier. No better way of saving exists than through good life insurance. A few years and you have it; if you die, your wife gets it. Consult

HENRY C. LIPPINCOTT,  
Life Insurance Expert,  
921 Chestnut Street,  
Philadelphia.

**CHICAGO SINGLE TAX CLUB**  
MEETS EVERY FRIDAY EVENING  
**HANDEL HALL,**  
40 East Randolph Street, Second Floor.  
Program for Friday, April 13th.  
**HON. JOHN F. FINERTY.**  
"The Spirit of Liberty."

**OLD BOOKS!** Any obtainable BOOK, PAMPHLET, or PERIODICAL, supplied. Libraries, or small lots of Books bought Catalog free upon application.  
**H. H. TIMBY, (Book Hunter)**  
P. O. Box 927. 731f Conneaut, Ohio

**PUBLIC NOTICE IS HEREBY GIVEN THAT** at a special meeting of the stockholders of Bostedo Package & Cash Carrier Company held on Wednesday, the seventh day of February, A. D. 1900, at the hour of eleven in the morning, at the office of the Company, Room 47, Marine Bldg., 154 Lake St., Chicago, Illinois, more than two-thirds majority of the capital stock of said company was represented, and it was unanimously voted to change the name of the company from **BOSTEDO PACKAGE & CASH CARRIER COMPANY** to **BOSTEDO PNEUMATIC TUBE COMPANY.**  
Dated, Chicago, Illinois, February 8, 1900.

LEON L. LOEHR,  
L. G. BOSTEDO,  
EDMUND A. FORDYCE.  
A majority of the directors of said **BOSTEDO PNEUMATIC TUBE CO.**

## PINGREE SHOES

always dependable;  
—for a day of toil,  
or an hour of sport.  
**THEY PLEASE**  
the eye, and the  
purse.

**THEY FEEL**  
like the hand of an  
old friend.

**THEY LAST**  
longer than most  
people care to wear  
one pair of shoes.

There are Pingree Shoes for Men, Women and Children. The Men's and Women's cost three to five dollars, according to fineness. The Children's from \$1.50 to \$2.50.

Genuine Pingree Shoes always bear the name of the makers—either on the sole or the inside. Write us for where to get them.

"PINGREE SHOE TALK" is just off the press—a most interesting booklet, will send it to you free, together with a **CLEVER SOUVENIR.**

**Pingree & Smith,**  
ESTABLISHED 1866. Detroit.

## The Public

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,**  
1401 Schiller Bldg., Chicago, Ill.

Post-office address:  
**THE PUBLIC, Box 687, Chicago, Ill.**

## Volume 2 of the Public

Complete Volumes, including Index, Unbound, sent postpaid at Regular Subscription price, \$1.00.

Bound Volumes, to be Ready in a Few Days. Price, \$2.00. Express charges to be paid by consignee.

Address,  
**PUBLIC PUBLISHING CO., Box 687, Chicago.**

### ATTORNEYS.

Chicago.

**CHARLES A. BUTLER,**  
ATTORNEY AT LAW,  
Suite 616, Ashland Block, CHICAGO.  
Telephone, Main 2711.

**HARRIS F. WILLIAMS,**  
ATTORNEY AT LAW,  
805 Chamber of Commerce Building,  
CHICAGO.

**JOHNSON, McGRATH & WAAGE,**  
ALFRED T. JOHNSON,  
JOHAN WAAGE. JAMES E. McGRATH.

LAWYERS,

SUITE 908 TACOMA BLDG. Telephone Main 3644.

Houston.

**EWING & RING,**  
ATTORNEYS AND COUNSELLORS,  
HOUSTON, TEXAS.  
Presley K. Ewing. Henry F. Ring.

**ESTATE OF MARY FRY, DECEASED.**  
All persons having claims against the estate of Mary Fry, deceased, are hereby notified and requested to attend and present such claims to the Probate Court of Cook County, Illinois, for the purpose of having the same adjusted, at a term of said Court, to be held at the Probate Court Room, in the City of Chicago, in said Cook County, on the third Monday of May, A. D. 1900, being the 21st day thereof.  
Dated, Chicago, April 7, 1900.  
**SAMUEL C. FRY, JR., Administrator.**  
105, 106 and 107.

### SUNDAY AFTERNOON LECTURES

BEING DELIVERED AT  
**HANDEL HALL, 40 E. RANDOLPH ST.,**  
Will be continued till June 1.  
**ADMISSION ALWAYS FREE!**  
Sunday, April 15th, 3 p. m. sharp—  
**MISS JANE ADDAMS.**

"Wanted—An International Democrat."