

The Public

Dr. HJ Woodhouse
Nov 3-00 Box 511

Third Year.

CHICAGO, SATURDAY, APRIL 28, 1900.

Number 108.

LOUIS F. POST, Editor.

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

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

The latest effort of Lord Roberts to capture 4,000 Boers with 40,000 British troops is not the brilliant success it was expected to be.

When the Whitneys and the Wideners and the Elkinse organize an \$8,000,000 company to develop Cuba, as it is reported they have done, it is time for the Cubans to begin to calculate upon how much of Cuba will be left to them in the round-up.

One of the bloodiest weeks of the Philippine war since the first, says the Associated Press, was that which closed on the 21st of this month. It estimated that at least 1,000 Filipinos had been killed. The American loss was much less, as it had always been; but comparatively small as it was, the wounded numbered 16 and the killed nine. Yet this bloody week is well on in the fifth month of that pacification which Gen. Otis reported at the opening of congress. The best information from the Philippines, corroborated by such bloody testimony as this, goes to show that those islands are no nearer pacification than they have been at any time since the people awoke to the wretched fraud that had been perpetrated upon them under the shadow of the American flag. They have never yet been pacified, nor will they be by President McKinley's murderous methods. Those people have drunk in the words of our own Patrick Henry. They demand liberty or death. And they are proving that to them this is not mere Fourth of July rhetoric.

Kate Kane Rossi, an Illinois lawyer, won laurels last week at the Chi-

cago bar, which are none the less green because it was the bar of a justice of the peace and his jury. In defending a woman charged with vagrancy, Mrs. Rossi made the impressive point that a woman cannot be a vagrant. Her reason was that woman is not made to work. And she pressed this point home with such legal learning, force, eloquence and good sense that, though she did not convince the justice, she did convince his jury. The jury concluded unanimously that under a statute defining a vagrant as "any person who is idle, remains idle, and refuses to work," a woman cannot be convicted, since it is a woman's prerogative, in accordance with the principles of our civilization, to be idle, remain idle, and refuse to work, if she wants to.

The protection instinct is strong in the selfish man. Here are a parcel of merchants in suburban Chicago towns who have actually asked the railroads to increase their rates of fare, so as to compel the people of those towns to buy of those merchants instead of buying in Chicago, where they want to buy. It is a neat substitute for a protective tariff. American manufacturers, afraid that their fellow citizens will buy foreign goods, get congress to impose taxes on foreign goods so as to make them dear. But city councils cannot levy protective tariffs in the interest of local merchants. So the local merchants ask the railroads to do it. This action of the merchants we have referred to reduces the protection theory to the level of the absurd. Yet it in no wise libels the theory.

Readers of South American news must have observed that Brazil has an "uitlander" question. The "uitlanders" there are Germans. They were invited to come to Brazil and their

section has grown to be the wealthiest in the republic; yet Brazil tramples upon their rights by forbidding their flying of the German flag. The fact is that Brazil is afraid of them, just as the Boers were afraid of their "uitlanders." Not so much afraid of them, either; but afraid that the German empire, following the South African example of the British empire, may make their cause an excuse for conquest. Should Germany do this, the attitude of the American government as now constituted would border on the picturesque. A supporter of Great Britain in her raid upon the Boers, and itself a freebooter with a Spanish commission in the Philippines, this government couldn't very well "sass back" when Germany reminded it that the Monroe doctrine is obsolete. Nor is it probable that Brazil herself would welcome American intervention, after having observed the kind of appetite which intervention stimulates in Mr. McKinley's Uncle Sam. Since our humanitarian intervention between Spain and Cuba we have lost some of our good reputation among the weaker peoples of the earth.

In his speech before the Ohio republican convention this week, Senator Hanna made this observation:

The balance of net trade in favor of the United States during the last century preceding this administration amounted to \$311,000,000. In 100 years that was the net balance to the credit of the United States in our trade with the world. In three years of the administration of President William McKinley the net balance as shown by the books of the United States treasury is \$1,400,000,000. It is \$1,100,000,000 more accomplished in those three years than had been accomplished in 100 years preceding.

And then Mr. Hanna asked:

Looking into the face of such results, do we want a change?

If such figures were laid before Mr.

Hanna in connection with his private business, we imagine that he would want a change and want it quick. Those figures do not imply that we are profiting by our foreign trade. They imply that we are losing. Excessive exportation, if continuous, is a drain upon the country that boasts it.

Consider. Mr. Hanna must assume that our excessive exports either have been paid for in gold and silver, or that they constitute a debt due this country from abroad against which we may draw somewhat as a merchant draws against his bank account. Otherwise, the excess of exports would be a dead loss to us. This is a matter of simple accounting. Neither a man nor a nation can continuously send goods away profitably, unless the goods so sent either are, or are to be, paid for. In fact, Mr. Hanna does assume one or the other or both of these conditions. But his assumption is wrong. We never have been paid for these goods in gold and silver; for our exports of gold and silver are vastly in excess of our imports of those metals, as the same treasury reports from which Mr. Hanna quotes distinctly show. Neither have we run up a credit abroad. We are a debtor country, not a creditor country, as every man in large business, Mr. Hanna included, well understands. Our excess of exports, therefore, about which Mr. Hanna brags, is in reality not an augmentation of our national wealth, but a drain upon it.

The chief reason for our great excess of exports, is payment of rents by American producers to alien owners of American lands. On the very day that Mr. Hanna bragged about our excess of exports, a transaction was reported in the press which explains the real character of continuously excessive exports. The report came from Mishawaka, Ind., and told of the purchase, by an English syndicate, of 40,000 acres of land in an oil-producing district of Indiana and Ohio. The syndicate had paid \$157,000 for the land. Somewhere,, somehow, that

amount may figure in our imports, tending to show, according to Mr. Hanna, a balance against us. For goods received, bear in mind, help to make trade balances "unfavorable"! That must be Mr. Hanna's view of it, or he couldn't call excessive exports "favorable." But pretty soon that English syndicate will draw rents or royalties from the Indiana and Ohio land. These royalties will be exports, and will tend to increase what Mr. Hanna calls our "favorable" balance of trade. In time they will more than offset the \$157,000 we now import as pay for the land; and thereafter this oil land transaction will figure as all export and no import. We shall then send rents and royalties out of the country, without getting or having got or expecting to get anything back. Nor shall we acquire any right to get anything back. The balance of trade with reference to this matter, according to Mr. Hanna's theory, will then be decidedly "favorable." We shall be getting rich by getting rid of our products without equivalent! But that is what continuously excessive exporting always means. Yet Mr. Hanna commends Mr. McKinley to the American people for reelection because Mr. McKinley has, in four years, enabled us to increase our continuously excessive exports by \$1,100,000,000; because he has enabled us, that is, to get rid of wealth without equivalent or expectation of equivalent to an amount equal to \$15 per capita for every man, woman and child in the country!

Harry Pratt Judson, professor of political science at the University of Chicago, writing for the Review of Reviews for April, makes a valuable contribution to the crown colony discussion in its constitutional aspects. Of his imperialistic conclusions, the less said the better for his position; but he renders a real service in unraveling the tangle about the power of congress to extend the constitution over territories. Of this power he says:

Saving only by the admission of new states, congress has no more

power to "extend" the constitution over a specific area than it has to square the circle by legislation or to repeal the law of gravitation. The constitution is absolutely beyond the will of congress. Wherever it is law, it is law irrespective of congress. Wherever it is the constitution it is the organic law—and that is law which congress can neither expand nor contract. In whatever area it is not of its own force the organic law, no possible action of congress can make it such.

Never was constitutional principle more soundly conceived or better stated. The essential question, according to Prof. Judson, is not whether constitutional limitations apply to territories by force of the constitution itself, but what are the limitations it imposes upon congress when legislating for territories. That proposition, also, is sound and clear.

Prof. Judson's next step is to classify all constitutional limitations as either "qualified" or "unqualified," and to concede that the unqualified limitations forbid federal legislation "under any circumstances and for any area, and hence must apply to territories as well as to states." The issue is thus reduced to the question of the power of congress with reference to "qualified" limitations. It is at this point that Prof. Judson lays the constitutional foundation for his imperialism. His corner stone is the judicial construction which gives to congress with respect to territories "both the powers of the federal government and the powers of the state." From this construction he infers that as to territories "congress has all powers not denied by the constitution." That is, as he explains, congress has all those residuary powers which, as to matters of state as distinguished from territorial concerns, are reserved to the states. In consequence, upon Prof. Judson's theory, the powers of congress over a territory are absolute, except as they may be restrained by "unqualified" constitutional prohibitions upon congress, and such "qualified" prohibitions as cover territories.

As stated, Prof. Judson's doctrine

is not thus far objectionable. It subordinates congress, in territorial legislation, to constitutional limitations; and that is all that anyone demands. Where Prof. Judson slips up is in his application of the doctrine. He concludes that the power of congress to impose customs duties upon territories is absolute and arbitrary, because the constitutional requirement that customs duties be uniform is so "qualified" as to confine the uniformity to "the United States," by which is meant the states as distinguished from territories. Likewise he holds that birth in a territory does not confer citizenship because the constitutional provision that "all persons born or naturalized in the United States" means born or naturalized in a state as distinguished from a territory. One trouble with Prof. Judson's reasoning is its excessiveness. It proves altogether too much. For if the words "United States" in the constitution refer only to the states, then congress has no right to govern the inhabitants of territories at all.

This may be easily shown. The constitution is ordained and established "for the United States of America," and for no other place whatever. If, therefore, the clauses on citizenship and customs duties apply only to the inhabitants of the states because they use the term United States, the constitution itself can apply only to the inhabitants of the states for the same reason; in which case congress, deriving all the power it has from the constitution, has no power to govern the inhabitants of territories. Though it may (under article IV., sec. 3, par. 2) "dispose of and make all needful rules and regulations respecting the territory and other property belonging to the United States," it cannot govern the territorial inhabitants—who certainly are not property—if the words "United States" in the constitution refer only to the states and not to the whole nation.

Inasmuch as congress conceded-

ly has no power at all except under the constitution, it is in a position not unlike that of the common council of a city, which can exercise only the governmental functions permitted by its charter from the state. As any legislative act of a common council not permitted by the charter is *ultra vires*, so any act of congress which does not find its warrant in the constitution must be void. Puerto Rico, for instance, either is or is not a part of the United States. If it is, then it is part of the nation for which the constitution was established, and its inhabitants are entitled to all the privileges and immunities secured by that instrument. If it is not part of the United States, then congress has no authority to legislate for it. The truth is, of course, that all American territory, whether a state or not, is part of the United States. That truth conceded, however, Prof. Judson's imperialistic conclusions fall to pieces. But his excellent analysis of the question still remains to support his primary conclusion that congress is subordinate in all things, even in territorial legislation, to the constitution of the United States.

In one of the speeches in his Pacific coast tour, that at Los Angeles—a speech of characteristic sincerity, vigor and brilliancy—Mr. Bryan dealt with the three issues upon which, in common with us all, he expects the presidential election to turn. Beginning with the money question and passing to the trusts, he closed with an eloquent and impressive presentation of the subject of imperialism. His discussion of the money question excelled his speeches on that subject in the campaign of 1896; and what he said about imperialism must have made even the thoughtless bunting worshipers in that vast southern California audience stop and think. But there was a fly in the ointment. Mr. Bryan still clings to the unfortunate proposal for the regulation of trusts which he put forth at the trusts conference at Chicago last autumn. Not only is this proposal economically

unsound, but it is politically heretical. It flies full in the face of democratic tradition and principle. Should the federal government assume that control of the trusts which Mr. Bryan proposes, it would make one of the longest strides yet in the direction of reducing the states to the condition of counties.

This is not urged against Mr. Bryan as a candidate. Conditions are such in the democratic party to-day that no other man can be nominated by the democrats except as a reactionary step. But if Mr. Bryan continues to advocate his anti-trust proposal, which he himself describes as only tentative, something must be done to keep it out of the platform. It will be bad enough to have the democratic candidate committed to a federalistic-republican policy with reference to the trusts, without allowing the democratic platform to indorse it. Were that done, the simplest form in which it could be put would be a resolution relegating the settlement of the trust question to the republicans, with whose general policy of federal centralization the democratic party would in this particular be in complete accord. But it is to be hoped that before the time for platform-making arrives Mr. Bryan, if he cannot touch solid ground on the trust question, will have done one or the other of two things. Either that he will have fully argued to the democrats of the nation that his anti-trust proposal is not undemocratic, something he has not yet done; or, failing that, that he will let it drop.

The franchise grab of the Puerto Rican government bill, so clearly and completely explained in these columns last week by Edward Osgood Brown, is not likely to be modified materially. Some of the republicans in the lower house of congress who voted for it are trying now to clear themselves with their constituents by proposing this amendatory law:

All charters of private corporations shall provide that the same shall be subject to amendment, alteration, or re-

peal; shall forbid the issue of stock or bonds, except in exchange for actual cash or property at a fair valuation, equal in amount to the par value of the stocks or bonds issued; shall forbid the declaring of stock or bond dividends, and, in the case of public service corporations, shall provide for the effective regulation of the charges thereof and for the purchase or taking by the public authorities of their property at a fair valuation.

But it is by no means likely that the corrupt rings which secured the passage of the Puerto Rican bill will consent to any such modification. To make Puerto Rico franchises subject to amendment or repeal and to prohibit stock watering, as this amendment proposes, would divest them of some of the peculiar advantages upon which the jobbers back of Hanna and Foraker rely for rich returns. The amendment will in all probability not be enacted. It nevertheless serves to show the consciousness of those republicans who proposed it, of the political blunder they made in supporting the administration bill.

It is a chilly story, that which tells of the efforts of some of Commodore Schley's Maryland friends to secure him his place above Sampson in the list of rear admirals. As the story runs, the publisher of the Baltimore American, a republican paper of national reputation, prepared a special supplement dealing with the whole subject of the Schley-Sampson controversy and President McKinley's connection with it. The supplement was said to embody two exposures with reference to Sampson and the administration. When it had been prepared, one copy, and only one, was printed. The plates were then locked up securely for future use if needed. That single copy was afterward placed upon President McKinley's desk, and in consequence the administration promptly changed front toward Schley. This story is admitted to be true by the publisher of the paper in question, except in one particular. He denies that President McKinley was personally threatened. But he admits that the supplement was prepared, and says that its contents were

explained to an administration leader, with an admonition that unless the administration attacks upon Schley ceased and the promotion which he was entitled to under the naval personnel bill was accorded him 1,000,000 copies of the supplement would be printed and distributed. The republican leader thereupon spoke to the president about the matter, telling him that the circulation of the paper would surely make Maryland democratic next fall. There is no essential difference between the story as it first came out and as the publisher of the Baltimore American tells it. Whether a single copy of the supplement was laid upon McKinley's desk, or an intimation of its contents and ominous political possibilities was forwarded to McKinley through a friend, the transaction is in character the same. In either case it is what our language, if not the law, justly stigmatizes as blackmail.

It is no part of the business of a newspaper publisher to influence any person's action, even to do right, by preparing intimidating publications, though every word be true, which are to be suppressed if the official succumbs to the publisher's demands and to be published if he does not. It is quite as truly blackmail to resort to this method of enforcing the payment of a just debt as of blood money, and just as villainous to use it to compel a conscience-stricken public servant to make a righteous appointment as to make an unrighteous one. If the Baltimore American's publisher possesses information which the public has a right to know, it is his proper business as a conscientious journalist to print it, regardless of its effect upon Schley's chances of promotion or McKinley's possibilities of reelection. But if the public has no right to the information, the Baltimore American's publisher had no right to intimidate the president by threatening to publish it. The chief value of the incident lies in the light it throws upon the nefarious methods which a great American newspaper re-

gards as legitimate, and to which an American president silently submits as efficacious.

The question of leasing public lands for grazing purposes is a burning one in the arid regions of the west, where those lands are now an open common. There is good reason to suspect that by this means the managers of the live stock trusts seek to monopolize the stock raising industry of the country. Among those who suspect this purpose are the small ranchmen, who are to meet at Salt Lake City in August to perfect a permanent organization. Upon this occasion it is probable that the small ranchmen represented will take ground on the question of leasing. The necessity of leasing seems to be generally admitted. How to regulate it is the issue. And if the action of the Colorado ranchmen's recent convention at Denver be adopted by the general organization at Salt Lake in August, the trusts will very likely be frustrated in their principal purpose. The plan proposed at Denver by Conrad Schaeffer, and defended so well by C. E. Wantland that it commanded the unanimous support of the convention, has for its central idea a local option feature. It would give to each county in every arid state the option to lease or not to lease its lands for grazing purposes. If that plan were adopted, all the advantages of leasing might be secured without any of the burdens of monopoly.

An imperial doctor of divinity of the name of Wayland Hoyt, made an imperialist speech last week before a local organization of Christian Endeavorers in Massachusetts. Had some non-militant reverend expressed anti-imperialist views on that subject before such a gathering he would have been denounced for talking politics at a religious meeting, and Rev. Dr. Wayland Hoyt would doubtless have been among the first to complain. Yet the anti-imperialist could have justified himself with quotations from the Prince of Peace. There has been an assumption, however, among

the Wayland Hoyts of the country that in some way the church and the administration are in partnership in the new sport of hunting down little brown men. But on this occasion this particular Wayland Hoyt had counted without his hosts. The 900 Christian Endeavor delegates are reported as having looked at him with something between anger, disgust and pity; and as having, when he concluded, all united in hissing.

The plan proposed by a department store firm in Chicago of admitting its employes to an interest in the firm upon purchase of stock, is in principle economically sound. Nor is there any reason to believe that the present proprietors are acting otherwise regarding it than in perfect good faith. They sell six per cent. preferred stock to employes and others, retaining common stock themselves. The preferred stock is to draw a six per cent. dividend before any other dividends are paid; and this is to be cumulative, so that failure to pay it one year shall necessitate its payment, along with the next dividend, and these two with the next, and so on until a full six per cent. shall have been paid annually, before the common stock shares in the profits at all. After the preferred stock has drawn six per cent. the common draws three; and such additional profits as there may be are to be divided in the proportion of two-thirds to common stock and one-third to preferred. Under normal industrial conditions some such plan as this would doubtless be common and successful. It would be the accepted method of individualistic cooperation. But under the existing system, in which producers are engaged in a constant and losing contest with the monopolists of natural opportunities and resources, it is a fair prediction that the whole thing will wind up in bankruptcy.

Subsequent developments tend to confirm our judgment of last week, that the shutting down of so many plants of one of the great steel trusts

was prompted by the superior insight of its managers into business conditions. They realized that the market was overstocked with steel products at high prices. This did not, of course, necessitate a stoppage of production suddenly. But it was only by making a sudden stoppage that the managers who understood the condition could make money at other people's expense. The suddenness of the stoppage was undoubtedly for stock jobbing purposes. And it appears to have been successful, for Mr. Gates is said to have "scooped in" \$4,000,000 by it in Wall street. But what lay behind the stock jobbing performance and prompted it, was his discovery of the under-consumption of steel. Trust prices had lessened consumption until relative overproduction began to appear. This was what Mr. Gates saw, while his trust competitors and the whole iron trade and financial press were shouting "prosperity;" and acting upon his superior insight he played it in Wall street for all it was worth. That he was right in his inference as to steel consumption has since been proved by the action of his board of directors. Though some of them cursed him roundly enough for his hasty action—or if they didn't lots of victimized stockholders did—yet the board voted unanimously on the 21st to make a heavy cut in prices. They took off \$20 a ton from the price of all their products except annealed fence wire, which they reduced by \$18. Wire nails they reduced from \$3.20 to \$2.20 a keg—equal to one cent a pound, and barbed wire from \$3.80 to \$2.80 a hundred pounds. Their reduction on galvanized fence wire was from \$3.55 to \$2.50 a hundred pounds. These reductions were made for the acknowledged purpose of working off the overproduction of goods and materials on hand.

To point to these facts as indications of the passing of prosperity would be trifling with language. There has been no prosperity to pass, in any general or substantial sense.

Speculative prosperity there has been. Trust prosperity there has been. Prosperity for some people and in some spots there has been. There has also been a general demand for goods to fill the shelves that a long period of acknowledged depression had slowly emptied, just as on one or two other occasions during that period such a demand has sprung up. But with the average man the same industrial conditions exist now that existed four years ago. There has never been a day when it did not require a microscope to discover individual prosperity outside the trust area; and as to general prosperity it has existed nowhere outside the headlines of yellow newspapers and the editorials of party papers and trade organs. The possibility of keeping up the fraudulent cry of "prosperity" is daily weakening, and of this fact the steel trust affair, with its stoppage of production and cut down in prices, must be to some a startling bit of proof.

At a Christian Science lecture in Chicago a few days ago, one criticism of medical scientists was made which, in part at least, is just. The lecturer said:

If instead of devoting so much time to the study of bacteriology and pathology doctors would study man as a moral, spiritual and intellectual being, not merely 'so much liver, lung, integument,' they would begin to discover what has so long been hidden from the scientific gaze, namely, God's man, endowed with limitless powers and possibilities, having embodied in his true consciousness all needed remedies, because he is the reflection of God.

While it is not so evident that the study of bacteriology and pathology could be wisely abandoned, nor that all needed remedies for disease are embodied in man's consciousness, it certainly is true that the most important fact in the universe—man's moral and spiritual qualities—is neglected by "scientific" materialists. They do not regard it as a fact. The lecturer we quote was right in intimating that physicians of this sort, by thinking of man as only so much liver, lung, integument and so on, are blind to the existence of the real

man. Their "scientific" conception of a man is in hardly any essential respect different from what it would be of a galvanized corpse.

It is argued that the Puerto Ricans are unfit for self government because Gen. Davis says that "whichever local party prevails, we may expect a corrupt government, administered solely in the interest and for the aggrandizement of the party in power." Upon that theory, neither the people of New York nor those of Chicago are fit for self government. Whichever party prevails in those cities, the other expects—and so far has never been disappointed—"a corrupt government, administered solely in the interest and for the aggrandizement of the party in power." The same application might be forcibly made to the people of New York state and Illinois. And what should we say of the people of the United States, if this were the test of capacity for self-government? Though some of us did indeed expect better things from the Hanna-McKinley party, what has it given us in fact but "a corrupt government, administered solely in the interest and for the aggrandizement of the party in power?"

Ex-Judge Dittenhoefer, of New York, the attorney for the Puerto Rican "contract laborer" whom Mr. Powderly ordered deported as an alien, but was overruled from Washington, raises a point on the treaty which impresses the Springfield Republican not only with its novelty but with its force. The point has reference to the 9th clause of the Spanish-American treaty. It is there provided that "Spanish subjects, natives of the peninsula," who remain in the "relinquished" or "ceded" territory and fail for a year after the exchange of ratifications of the treaty to preserve their allegiance to Spain by recording a declaration deciding to do so—

shall be held to have renounced it and to have adopted the nationality of the territory in which they may reside.

The Springfield Republican argues,

apparently following ex-Judge Dittenhoefer's line of reasoning, that the use of the word "nationality" in this connection, makes American citizens of all Spanish subjects who reside in Puerto Rico and fail to preserve their Spanish allegiance. That it does so by Spanish subjects who reside in Puerto Rico but are natives of the Spanish peninsula is doubtless true. But it is more than doubtful that the Republican is right in supposing that the native inhabitants of Puerto Rico also are therefore American citizens; especially as the same 9th clause of the treaty concludes:

The civil rights and political status of the native inhabitants of the territories hereby ceded to the United States shall be determined by the congress.

Taking the whole clause together it appears to intend that the civil rights and political status of natives of the Spanish peninsula shall be determined by their own election. They may elect to remain Spanish subjects or, by adopting American nationality, to become American citizens. But as to natives of Puerto Rico, their civil rights and political status are to be at the mercy of congress.

That will, as we believe, be the construction the courts will put upon the 9th clause of the treaty; and we have no doubt it is precisely what the framers of the treaty intended. Spain's commissioners cared nothing for the civil rights and political status of native Puerto Ricans, so long as native Spaniards were protected; and the American commissioners were willing to accord citizenship to native Spaniards, provided they could secure freedom to the president and congress to make a crown colony of Puerto Rico and subjects of her native inhabitants.

If the question of imperialism is to be determined by the treaty, that question is settled. Whatever else they were, they were not fools who concocted that treaty. Every line is alive with the spirit of imperialism. Nor would much be gained to the principles of American

liberty were a flaw found in the treaty which might obstruct the imperialistic policy. If Americanism is dependent upon treaties it is a frail thing indeed. Any knave of a president, aided by a pliant senate, could by treaty barter away every liberty we claim, if treaties were superior to constitutional safeguards. This question of imperialism, to be settled safely must be settled upon the principle that only those treaties are law of the land which are in harmony with the constitution of the nation.

Is it not nearly time for imperialistic pettifogging about the acquisition of Louisiana to cease? To say that American imperialism was begun not by McKinley in connection with Puerto Rico and the Philippines, but by Jefferson in connection with Louisiana is to ignore the simplest and most familiar facts. Without for the moment considering anything else, let the inquiring reader reflect upon the difference between the two treaties. Mr. McKinley's treaty, the character of which he dictated and the ratification of which he jammed through the senate, ceded Puerto Rico and the Philippines to this country without reservation as to the native inhabitants. It distinctly gave to congress full power, not only over their political status, but over their civil rights. One congress can take away and another give and yet another take away again, every right whatever of these people, in its own shifting discretion from time to time, unless the constitution forbids. And according to Mr. McKinley the constitution forbids nothing with reference to American territory outside the states. That is McKinley imperialism. Behold how radically it differs from what the pettifoggers call Jeffersonian imperialism. The treaty under which the Louisiana purchase was made by Jefferson stipulated that—

the inhabitants of the ceded territory shall be incorporated in the Union of the United States, and be admitted as soon as possible, according to the principles of the federal constitution,

to the enjoyment of all the rights, advantages and immunities of citizens of the United States; and in the meantime they shall be maintained and protected in the free enjoyment of their liberty, property and the religion they profess.

The intelligence of that man is to be pitied who sees no essential difference between Jefferson's policy, which thus recognized constitutional rights in the inhabitants of the ceded territory, and McKinley's, which denies to them all constitutional rights.

Much ado is made in Chicago just now about the vast areas of disfiguring bill boards that face the city parks and force their flashy announcements upon the attention of the public. It is a just complaint. But the plans proposed for getting rid of them are more objectionable than the bill boards. Yet they could be driven out of sight as easily as last fall's leaves. It will be observed that these bill boards are erected either along vacant lots or against the dead walls of buildings that overlook vacant lots. If the lots were properly built upon, there would be no bill boards there. Now, if no one cared to build upon those lots, the bill board problem would remain. In fact, multitudes would really like to build there. Two causes prevent them. And neither of these causes is the trade union trouble. One cause is the excessive prices at which the lots are held; the other is the excessive taxation to which good buildings would be subjected every year from the time the cellar was dug till the structures had decayed or been removed. These conditions could be avoided by simplifying our system of taxation and making it more just as well as more simple. To exempt buildings from all taxation would remove one cause; to cast this tax burden upon lot values, thus reducing their selling price, would at least minimize the other. If taxes were levied upon the monopoly value of building lots, and buildings were exempt, there would be no bill boards in any part of Chicago where they now flourish so offensively. Appro-

prate buildings would take their place.

When bankers want an act of congress facilitating the issue of bank notes they assure the public that there is really no profit in the issue feature of banking and that their sole purpose is to serve the people by furnishing them abundantly with currency. But when banks have got the act about as they want it, indiscreet financiers sometimes "give the snap away." Here, for instance, is the firm of Price, McCormick & Co., of 71 Broadway, New York, which sends out a business circular full of enthusiastic praise of the national bank bunco bill which has recently been enacted. A peculiarly interesting feature of this circular is a table which shows the profit a bank can make out of the issue privilege. It is not the work of some moon-eyed greenbacker, but has been put together in simple though suggestive form by a firm of financiers, in order to stimulate two per cent. bond purchases at a premium of 6 per cent., for the purpose of organizing national banks:

"TWO'S" AT 106.

Table showing the per centage of income realized on the actual cash investment.

\$100,000 "Twos" would cost at 106	\$106,000
Less circulation issued against same	100,000
	\$6,000
Actual cash investment.....	\$6,000
On which income would be received as follows:	
Interest on \$100,000 "Twos" per annum	2,000
Less tax ½ per cent.....	\$500
Less sinking fund to retire premium to be improved at 4 per cent.....	107
Less expenses, cost of printing etc.....	100
	707
Net income	\$1,293
Equivalent to 21.55 per cent. on investment of \$6,000.	

This table clearly shows, it will be observed, that under the new gold standard banking law, a national bank can exchange \$100,000 of its capital for \$100,000 of its own notes, made universally current by government endorsement, doing so at a cost of only \$6,000, and net \$1,293 a year by the transaction. In what legitimate business could \$6,000 be put to such safe and profitable use?

Seattle is having useful lessons in the tendency of land values to rise

under the influence of prosperity to a point which stops the prosperity. So marked is the lesson that even the highly conservative Post-Intelligencer is constrained to cry out. It seems that in one instance, an instance that might in character be duplicated in almost any growing place, a great manufacturing concern was prevented from locating its plant at Seattle because the owner of the vacant land it wished to use charged more for it than the manufacturing concern could afford to pay. So the concern put its plant elsewhere. For his lack of public spirit the dog-in-the-manger land owner whose greed brought this thing to pass is read a sharp lesson by the Post-Intelligencer, which warns the landlords of Seattle that the commercial supremacy of that city of the Pacific coast will be overcome if they are foolish enough to drive away population and business by insisting upon unreasonable prices and rentals for Seattle land. But what is the use in belaboring individual land owners. Being human they will ask what they can get, or sometimes a little more, and will suffer with the rest when their demands check local development. The way to free a city from such checks is altogether to exempt improvements from taxation—which would invite people and business to come; and to tax land owners in proportion to the value of their land, whether used or not—which would compel them to sell vacant land at reasonable terms and thus keep down all land prices and all rents to a reasonable level.

TREASON BY TREATY.

The senate committee on Pacific islands and Puerto Rico officially declares that the insertion into a treaty of a provision that "the congress shall determine the civil rights and political status of the native inhabitants" of territories ceded to the United States by such treaty, of itself abrogates, as to such territories, limitations placed by the constitution upon the exercise of the legislative power, without regard to the place or the people for whom the legislation in a given

case may be intended, and empowers congress to deny, by legislation, the "personal privileges, immunities and guarantees" which, but for the existence of such treaty provision, congress could not deny to the inhabitants of such new territories.

The committee's sole argument for this portentous conclusion is the one which it insinuates in the following observation: "A treaty is part"—mark that well—"of the supreme law of the land, made so by the constitution itself" by a provision which "does not say that all treaties made in pursuance of the constitution, or consistently with the constitution, but all treaties made under the authority of the United States, shall be, together with the constitution and laws enacted in pursuance of it, the supreme law of the land. As to all matters, therefore, with which it properly deals, a treaty is an instrument of equal dignity with the constitution itself." Ergo: A treaty provision that congress shall legislate as to a certain subject, annuls, to that extent, the express limitations of the constitution upon the exercise of the legislative power by congress.

This is logically a non sequitur; legally, a solecism; politically, an insidious attempt to enable our official servants to release themselves, practically at will, from the essential conditions upon which alone they are authorized to speak for the American people. In a word, it is treason by treaty.

The particular treaty provision to which the committee appeals—that congress shall determine the civil rights and political status of native Puerto Ricans—does not really itself involve any disregard of the constitutional prohibitions. It does not dictate to congress how it shall determine the rights and status in question; and a determination by congress to an effect absolutely consistent with the constitution would fully, in spirit and letter, comply with and carry out the provision of the treaty. That provision, accordingly, no matter how valid or binding in itself, cannot be deemed to relieve congress from the obligation to legislate only in accordance with the constitution's essential principles as to legislation, any more

than it could relieve that body from the obligation to legislate according to the parliamentary procedure prescribed by the constitution. As well might the giving to the courts the power to determine cases, be held to authorize those tribunals to determinations inconsistent with the constitution and the laws.

It happens, furthermore, that the supreme court has deliberately and unanimously held that under the clause on which the committee professes to rely, treaties are of no greater legal obligation than acts of congress, and that "no paramount authority is given to the one over the other." This decision will be found in the one hundred and thirtieth volume of the United States reports, page 600, and it is cited as good law in the one hundred and fifty-eighth volume at page 579 and the one hundred and sixty-third volume at page 230. The same court has held, ever since Marshall's famous decision in *Marbury versus Madison*, that, because the supreme court justices take an oath to support the constitution, they must declare void every act of congress which is not in accord with the constitution. Treaties, being "of no greater legal obligation than an act of congress," must, like the acts of congress, be held void if inconsistent with the constitution, which, and which alone, the justices are sworn to support.*

The fact is that the "supreme law" clause, of which so much is now sought to be made at the expense of all the rest of the constitution, was evidently introduced only by way of contradicting the national from the state sovereignties; and of asserting the supremacy of the former in all its forms—constitution, constitutional laws, and constitutional treaties of the United States as against or over the constitution and laws of any state.

Take the text as a whole, noticing the punctuations:

This constitution, and the laws of the United States which shall be made in pursuance thereof; and all treaties made, or which shall be made, under the authority of the United States, shall be the supreme law of the land; and the judges in every State shall be bound thereby, anything in the consti-

tution or laws of any State to the contrary notwithstanding.—Art. VI., par. 2.

Surely, the spirit, scope, and essential function of this provision are perfectly apparent to any candid and intelligent reader. The purpose was simply to declare the national government, within the sphere assigned to it by the constitution, "supreme" or paramount as against the state governments; and the mention of all the three forms in which the national authority may be embodied, is no more to be taken as intended to define anew the relative or comparative dignity or authority of those three forms themselves, than the equivalent mention of the two forms of state authority—state constitutions and state laws—is to be looked to as itself determining the relative authority of those two forms as between themselves. This part of the constitution determines no question of comparative rank or authority, except that it asserts the supremacy of the national forms of authority (the constitution and constitutional laws and treaties) over the state forms (the state constitutions and state enactments).

The treaty-making power, and the legislative, executive, and judicial powers created by the constitution, all alike exist only for the purpose of the constitution, and are absolutely limited by the restrictions imposed by the constitution upon their exercise. The grant of each finds ample scope and use in the making of treaties, laws, executive orders and judicial decisions, consistent with the constitution. There is, therefore, no occasion for seeing in such grant authority for the bringing about, directly or indirectly, of results inconsistent with the constitution. By expressly providing for its own amendment in certain specified ways (all of which proceed upon a recognition of the original creators of the instrument—the states—as distinguished from mere federal officials created by it, as alone authorized to alter it), the constitution effectually prohibits its own amendment in any way not specified; and certainly, the incidental mention of "treaties" in the "supreme law" clause, as one form of the national authority proclaimed "supreme" over

state authority, is not a specification of the making of treaties as a method by which the constitution may be amended. No power of attorney can sanely be supposed to authorize the agent whom it appoints, to enlarge his own authority inconsistently with the express provisions of the power.

It is well that this is so, in view of the sort of treaties which some of the opera bouffe "sovereigns" allowed at large by that solemn farce, "International Law," would cheerfully make, "dirt cheap," to please their "great and good friend" at Washington, and which enough senators could be "persuaded" into ratifying, to please their great and good dispenser of embassies, commissions, judgeships, and other "good things." Were it really to be held the law that anything so created into a "treaty provision" (though it contravened the express prohibitions of the constitution, and professed to remove the limitations imposed by that instrument upon the powers granted by it and as a part of the very definition of those powers) must be submitted to and obeyed as a "supreme" law overruling and destroying the fundamental charter, why—and this may as well be understood now as later—that impudent pretense by our faithless servants would not be accepted by their masters, the people, but would be branded and punished as simply "treason by treaty." Those Americans who are not degenerates would, under loyal leaders, see to it that the republic received no harm.

CHARLES FREDERIC ADAMS.
New York City.

NEWS

Lord Roberts is reported now as having begun a great forward movement. All his divisions, except one and a single brigade of another, are in motion. They number some 40,000 men. But instead of moving north toward Pretoria, they have moved southeast toward Wepener. The Boers caused this diversion by attempting to secure the ripened harvests to the east and southeast of Bloemfontein. They extended a line southward, by way of Thaba N'Chu, from Brandfort, which is somewhat to the north of Bloemfontein, to Wepener, through these rich grain dis-

tricts, and at the latest authentic reports had maintained open communication the whole distance. This line menaced Lord Roberts's right flank and compelled him to turn his front from north to east. Considerable fighting occurred in the neighborhood of Wepener during the week, but reports regarding it are meager as well as contradictory and confusing. Nothing important and authentic has been reported at the hour of this writing (April 26), except that on the 25th the British had entered Dewetsdorp, a few miles northwest of Wepener, without loss or opposition, and that the investment of Wepener had been abandoned by the Boers upon the approach of Lord Roberts's army. They have, however, made good their retreat, in spite of Lord Roberts's plans to entrap them. It now appears that their force at this point, instead of being 20,000, as was supposed, was hardly more than 4,000. The Boer retreat is over the Ladybrand road along the Basuto border.

Lord Methuen's operations west of Bloemfontein were suddenly and almost disastrously checked on the 20th near Boshof. He was moving north toward Hoofstad, when he received orders to return to Boshof; and in making this retrograde movement he barely escaped a trap in which he would have lost his entire convoy. Three days later Boshof, to which Methuen withdrew, was reported as under bombardment and investment by the Boers; and on the 24th the Boers reported that it had been recaptured by them and that the British were retreating to Kimberley.

The condition at Mafeking appears to be unchanged. It is still invested; and Warrenton, the most northerly point that the Mafeking relief expedition from the south has yet been able to reach, is being savagely attacked by Boers. A British force which has leave to pass through Portuguese territory (see page 9), has arrived at Beira, on its way to the relief of Mafeking from the north. There is no news of importance from Natal, except that the Boers are mysteriously active.

The American war in the Philippines has been exceptionally bloody of late. In fights occurring during the week that ended on the 21st, 378 Filipinos and nine Americans were killed. The Filipinos were then aggressive, says the Associated Press

correspondent at Manila, in almost every province of Luzon. This indicates a revival of organized fighting. For official mail advices of January 1, given out at Washington on the 24th of the present month, announced the complete collapse in the region of Manila and the provinces north of it, of organized resistance to American control. These advices told, indeed, of the occupation at that time of the southern provinces of Luzon by a Filipino army equal to any that had been organized for the Filipino cause; but said that it had subsequently been disintegrated. Such severe fighting, therefore, as the unusual casualties of last week imply, would indicate that the war has broken out afresh. Later news tells of further fighting, and of an American proclamation giving warning that unless guerrilla warfare ceases all the towns that harbor guerrillas will be burned.

American casualties in the Philippines since August 6, 1898, inclusive of all official reports given out at Washington to April 25, 1900, are as follows:

Killed	473
Died of wounds, disease and accidents	1,225

Total deaths	1,698
Wounded	2,092

Total loss	3,790
Total loss reported last week....	3,770
Total deaths reported last week.	1,678

The presidential campaign in the United States is noticeably advancing. In Illinois on the 24th the middle-of-the-road populists nominated a ticket upon a platform declaring that "land, labor and money constitute the three fundamental principles of national life and greatness," and advocating the initiative and referendum and the imperative mandate. The republicans of Ohio met on the same day. They were addressed by Senator Hanna in a speech asserting the purpose of the administration to take no backward step in the policy regarding the "island possessions;" and on the following day the ticket was nominated, and a platform, previously prepared at Washington, was adopted, with the exception of an anti-trust plank, which the convention inserted, and a Puerto Rican plank, which it struck out. The democratic state committee of New York has called the state convention of that party to meet at New York city on the

5th of June. In Indiana the republican convention met on the 25th. The republican convention of Wisconsin also met on the 25th. It indorsed the administration and reaffirmed the St. Louis platform of 1896. On the same day the republican convention of Pennsylvania met, and besides the routine business and the indorsement of the administration, declared for the election of United States senators by popular vote. The Kansas populists, who met on the 25th, instructed their delegates to the Sioux Falls national convention to support Bryan for president.

On the 24th the United States senate settled the question of seating ex-Senator Quay, as senator from Pennsylvania. By a vote of 33 to 32 it decided that he was not entitled to the seat. Mr. Quay's term in the senate expired more than a year ago, and the Pennsylvania legislature, in session at the time, proceeded to fill the vacancy. But a deadlock ensued which lasted until the 19th of January, 1899, when the legislature adjourned without making a majority choice. The vote on that day stood 93 for Quay, the regular republican candidate; 69 for Jones, the anti-machine republican; and 85 for the democratic candidate. (See Public No. 55, p. 10.) At this time Senator Quay was on trial in the criminal courts, charged with embezzlement. He was acquitted on the 20th, and on that day the governor appointed him to fill the senatorial vacancy (56-10). The governor assumed to act in the matter under the authority of that clause of Article 1, section 3, paragraph 2, of the federal constitution, which provides that—

if vacancies [in the senate] happen by resignation or otherwise, during the recess of the legislature of any state, the executive thereof may make temporary appointments until the next meeting of the legislature, which shall then fill such vacancies.

But the objectors to seating Quay held that this clause does not apply to a vacancy which happens or exists during a legislative session and which the legislature refuses or neglects to fill. This was the point in controversy in the senate. By voting to deny the seat to Quay a majority sustained it. The Pennsylvania vacancy will therefore remain until it is filled by the legislature. Senator Hanna paired with the majority against Quay. At the republican state convention on the 25th Quay was named to

head the Pennsylvania delegation to the national convention, and recommended to the next legislature for reelection to the senate.

The startling shutdown of plants belonging to the steel and wire trust, reported last week on page 24, appears now to have been due primarily to underconsumption caused by excessive prices. After a long meeting on the 20th, held at New York by the directors of the trust, public announcement was made that the directors had unanimously agreed to allow the executive committee to authorize temporary reductions in prices, for the purpose of relieving the market and making it possible to resume work in the idle plants. Accordingly, at the close of the directors' meeting, the executive committee met and voted a cut of 30 per cent. on all the trust's products, to take effect the next day. But the closed down mills are still closed. Not only that, but the number has been increased; the closing of the steel and wire trust's mills already reported being followed on the 23d by the closing of the three rod mills at Joliet which belong to the federal steel trust. A lull in demand for their product was assigned as the cause.

NEWS NOTES.

—The czar celebrated the Russian Easter at Moscow on the 22d with unusual pomp and magnificence. The festivities lasted three days.

—Destructive forest fires have been raging in Manitoba, south of Winnipeg. Over 100 lives have been reported as lost, including the crew of a rescue train. The property loss will exceed \$1,000,000.

—George Douglass Campbell, duke of Argyle, who was famous also as a scientific and religious controversialist, died in London on the 24th, aged 77 years. He was the ranking peer of Scotland.

—From Manila comes the report of 14 more deaths from bubonic plague during the past week, making the total number of deaths from plague at Manila 185. A majority of the plague victims were Chinamen.

—The New York Merchants' association, representing 1,400 New York business firms, and 30,000 other business firms distributed throughout the United States, petitioned congress on the 20th for the repeal of the stamp tax clause of the war revenue act.

—Two Puerto Rican appointments were made by President McKinley on the 23d, the appointees being Prof.

J. H. Hollander, of Johns Hopkins university, Baltimore, and John R. Garrison, of the United States treasury department, to be treasurer and auditor respectively of the island of Puerto Rico.

—The ecumenical missionary conference of 2,000 delegates from all parts of the world began its sessions in Carnegie hall, New York, on the 21st with ex-President Harrison as presiding officer. President McKinley and Gov. Roosevelt were also present to welcome the delegates.

—Louisiana and Mississippi have been visited by a flood which is proving more destructive even than the terrible flood of 1871. For several hundred miles along the Mississippi towns are under water and the crops are a total loss. New Orleans is almost completely shut off from railroad communication with the north, as the lines along the river have been washed away in a great many places and are under water for hundreds of miles.

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 17-23, 1900.

Senate.

On the 17th the Alaska civil government bill was again considered. Senator Hoar delivered an impressive speech on the Philippine question, which appears in full at page 4561. A message from the president transmitting copies of captured official documents of the Filipino republic was read on the 18th, printed on page 4649. Consideration of the Alaska bill was resumed, and was continued on the 19th and 20th. The conference report on the Hawaiian civil government bill also was considered on the 20th, and among the resolutions agreed to on that day was one offered by Gallinger requesting the secretary of the treasury to communicate to the senate an itemized statement showing the amount of revenue derived from the war revenue law. Several unimportant resolutions were introduced on the 21st, among them being one by Jones, of Arkansas, calling on the attorney general for information regarding his course of action in the case of Jorge Cruz, the Puerto Rican contract labor immigrant. It is printed on page 4861, and was agreed to. Another resolution was submitted by Bacon asking for information regarding the extra pay of army officers in Cuba and Puerto Rico (printed on page 4861), which also was agreed to after long discussion. A resolution submitted by Culberson requesting the president to inform the senate regarding the commissions appointed by him since March 4th, 1897, and the total expenses of each was objected to and went over under the rules. Perkins spoke on the resolution regarding the seating of M. S. Quay as senator from Pennsylvania on this day, and the Quay resolution was again discussed on the 23d.

House.

On the 17th consideration of the naval appropriation bill was resumed and con-

tinued on the 18th, 19th and 20th. The naval bill was passed on the 21st. It carries an appropriation of more than \$61,000,000 and provides for the construction of two battleships and three armored cruisers of the first class. On the 23d consideration of the post office appropriation bill was begun.

MISCELLANY

SAINT HELENA.

For The Public.

An Isle that symbols vain regret,
Long rest by haunting dreams beset,
Where seabird's cry and billow's fret
Lend voice to isolation.

A fortress nature fain had kept,
And in its brooding silence slept,
Where human wrong had never crept
With fearful desecration.

There fierce ambition died away,
Through what long anguish who can say?
Or if its sunset cold and gray

Was flushed with dreams of slaughter.
The fevered breath of homesick pain,
The inborn pride so slow to wane
Passed long ago, but left a stain
Swept not by wind or water.

On that lone isle, his gaze afar
With thoughts amid the thick of war,
Where trusted life-long comrades are,

By wave and rock-wall guarded,
Sits sullen Cronje, coarse and grim,
As captors fond of trappings trim,
Triumphantly have pictured him
Whose face no search rewarded.

No eye could pierce that alien mask,
No friend or foe had need to ask
If well performed his mighty task

That sought no meed of glory.
But never could that awful day
When 'mid the wreck of deadly fray
He stood like royal beast at bay,
Fade from his country's story.

Not that with fatal end in sight
He foiled the blow as best he might,
But that he fought for freedom's right

When only blood availed it.
Before him rose his native veldt
Where first in fervent prayer he knelt
For guidance of the zeal he felt,
When greed of might assailed it.

Yet there are those who deem it shame
That loyal Cronje's humble name
Should stand by his, whose olden fame

Rings through the world's arena.
Not till we try by truer test
Than surface thought has ever guessed,
May we decide which honored best
The prison of Saint Helena.

D. H. INGHAM.

THE COST OF MATERIAL AND LABOR.

A concern located in Pennsylvania recently made the following detailed statement of the increased cost of materials entering into their line of manufacture. They make vises, machinists' and plumbers' tools, etc., and their statement is as follows:

"The following percentages show the actual increase in costs of raw materials which enter largely into the manu-

facture of our lines, over prices current in the spring of 1899: Pig iron, 125 per cent.; steel, 100 per cent.; copper, 81 per cent.; tin plate, 76 per cent.; wire, 132 per cent.; nails, 170 per cent.; lumber, 87 per cent.; bolts, 111 per cent.; asbestos, 31 per cent.; pipe, 184 per cent.; pipe fittings, 111 per cent.; rivets, 110 per cent.; oils, 100 per cent."

As nearly as we can judge, the rate of wages paid for labor has advanced about ten per cent., although this, of course, does not mean that labor costs have advanced in the same proportion, because the work of increasing labor's efficiency has been going on continually, and we think it perfectly safe to say that the labor cost of most lines of machinery has been reduced at least ten per cent. annually for several years past; we mean, of course, in those shops that have been under the influence of modern progress and have kept themselves up to date.—American Machinist of March 8.

FITTING PEOPLE FOR SELF-GOVERNMENT.

The cant that other races are not fitted for self-government, that the Cubans, the Puerto Ricans and the Filipinos must wait until the countrymen of Quay and Platt and Croker and Lodge decide that they are competent, is food for universal mirth. Aguinaldo's judgment on American capacity to govern would have equal force. Mr. Beveridge will not be disturbed if we do not concede self-government to our subjects for a hundred years. He would have "a free hand." Freebooters ask nothing more.

No nation ever learned to govern itself until it had the chance to try. No master of another race or nation ever decided that it was fitted to look after its own affairs. In the nature of things, where no voice is allowed, no self-constituted keeper will heed its plea for freedom. I share in the belief, recently uttered, that bad self-government is better than good government by another, and hold, with John Hay, in his "Castilian Days," before Washington days had destroyed his faith in liberty: "There are those who think the Spaniards are not fit for freedom. I believe that no people are fit for anything else." Wisdom comes through failures and mistakes. Only an enemy would prevent a people from making them. And a benevolent despot is rare and short-lived.—William Lloyd Garrison, at Providence, R. I., April 7.

Fortune sometimes favors the brave, and sometimes she leads them into a trap.—Puck.

WHAT JEFFERSON WOULD DO IN REGARD TO TRUSTS.

An extract from an address on "What Jefferson Would Do," delivered by the Hon. John P. Altgeld before the Albany Bimetallic League at Albany, N. Y., April 16.

How about trusts? Jefferson would abolish all monopoly and all special privileges. This much we know, for he has told us. If this were done, there would not be a trust left in America. But how would he do it? In my judgment, and I speak only for myself, there is only one way, and that is to have the people own and operate all necessary monopolies, such as municipal utilities and transportation. This done, most of the others would dissolve. There would be no private monopoly in this country. Leave everything possible to individual enterprise, and where that will not suffice, let the people do it in their collective capacity, for they are all equally interested.

But is this not opposed to the principles of Jefferson? On the contrary, it is in harmony with them.

Government in his day was something distinct from the people, and he wanted that government to meddle as little as possible with their affairs.

But he always labored to have everything possible left directly with the people. He had confidence in them, and wanted them to govern directly. He and Lincoln were alike in regard to having confidence in the people.

Experience has shown that a corporation standing between the people and the state will, when possible, plunder the one and debauch the other, and is therefore a constant menace to free government.

Having confidence in the people and making their welfare his guide, I believe he would have them keep everything possible in their own hands, and not put it in the power of any set of men to plunder them.

But no matter what the method of procedure, we know that he would enforce the law, and no attorney general from New Jersey would be paid a salary by the government to find out how not to do it.

PRETORIA BEFORE THE WAR.

Extracts from an article with the above title, by Howard C. Hillegas, published in Harper's Magazine for March.

At the station there is a scene which is so plainly the opposite of that which presented itself at Johannesburg that it is difficult to imagine how two such widely different cities could exist side by side and under the

same government. There in the Golden city were thousands of foreigners, from every country on the globe, jostling and running and climbing over each other in their pursuit of gold; here in Pretoria are the hundreds of easy-going, methodical, religious Boers, discussing affairs of state, driving lumbering ox wagons or attempting to conciliate an aggrieved uitlander. There were the cries of the stock brokers, the noise of the pounding stamp mills and the braggadocio of the gambler; here are the calm of the Christian home, the solemnity of a body of men in whose hands is the destiny of a republic, and the air of righteousness. There was Bedlam; here is the City of Peace.

Stretching away from the center of the city, where the statesmen, bankers and business men had their workshops, were the residential streets, the glory of Pretoria. There the clear mountain water, coursing in little rivulets between the sidewalks and the dwellings, fed the roots of the willows and the rose bushes, and vivified the landscape with the vari-colors of nature. Every cottage, with its rose fence and its smoothly cropped lawn, was a painting, and every Boer housewife's collection of flowers and plants was in an imaginary beauty contest, in which the admiring pedestrians were supposed to be the judges. Inside the cottages the tidiness and cleanliness that distinguished their Dutch ancestors furnished material evidence against the ruthless misrepresentation of the Boer's habits. Young women whose grandmothers assisted husbands and brothers in fighting against the savage tribes that attacked the pioneers, and who themselves were educated in European or South African colleges and seminaries, displayed their talents in the baking of bread, and the playing of pianos and other musical instruments. Young men fresh from European universities appeared, and with equal facility and knowledge discussed the latest phases of the eastern political question or the most recent advances in irrigation methods. The enjoyment which the old-time Boer, circumscribed as he was before the advent of telegraphs and railroads, found in the shooting of game, the young Boer of to-day finds in the same channels as the youth of other countries. He is a patron of the arts, loves open-air sports, dances, and, above all things, is an expert with the rifle.

"Do you know Gabbleby?"

"Well, I have a listening acquaintance with him."—Puck.

THE OTIS BRAND OF PEACE.

Judge Thomas Canty, of Minneapolis, arrived in Minneapolis from Manila, April 18. The Minneapolis Journal of April 20 contained an interview with Judge Canty, from which the following is taken:

I believe that it would take 500,000 men ten years to put down that insurrection, and that even then it would not be permanently done. The original cause of the insurrection was official tyranny and unscrupulousness and the attempt of Spain to put down the Kaputin organization, which had been formed with a membership of 100,000, chiefly among the Tagalos, to suppress them. It continues because the Filipinos have absolutely no faith in our word. The difficulty is not to defeat the forces of the islands in open battle, but to keep them driven when they have once been driven. This is impossible. By the time the pursuing force is back in quarters, the pursued and ostensibly defeated force is also back ready to resume guerrilla fighting.

When I went to Manila I asked Gen. Otis whether he considered that the war was about over, and he assured me that it was and that in a very limited time order would be restored. Acting on this theory, I began tramping through the islands, going out short distances from the towns, only to be halted on each occasion before I got outside the city limits, as you may say, by our own sentries.

The sentries assured me that if I went any further I should be knifed by the "niggers." This astonished me. I understood that the enemy had been decisively defeated and that there surely would be no danger to life in the immediate vicinities of the principal towns. I explained my ideas to the sentries, who assured me that the enemy had been defeated again and again, but that he was an enemy who would not stay defeated. He always came back again. This sort of thing happened on Laguna de Bay and in several places close to cities. The soldiers told me that the people making the trouble were ladrones, which is Spanish for thieves. Then I noticed that all the most pretentious houses in the towns were empty and that the small bamboo huts were inhabited. In other words, that the wealthy inhabitants had fled to the mountains, while a large proportion of the poorer element had remained. I asked the soldiers how this was, and they replied, referring to the wealthier class of natives who were missing from their homes, that they, too, were ladrones.

This and a number of other things brought me face to face with a conclusion that the wealthy class of Fili-

pinos were the ones running the war. I found this condition in all the principal towns outside Manila. The wealthy Filipinos and halfbreeds are ostensibly on the side of the Americans, but really are assisting to conduct the insurrection.

Our native secret service corps, for which we are paying a pretty penny, is engaged in rounding up ladrones, and in this service it does good work, being honestly assisted by the Filipinos of the better class themselves. In other words, we are doing police work for a people at war with us. But these secret service agents never discover anything of value concerning the actual movements of the enemy. If they do, they seldom report it. The fact is that if such a report was made the man making it would either have to remain thereafter in the American barracks or be assassinated.

In my opinion, the only progress that we have made in the Philippines is the substitution of guerrilla for regular warfare. Of course, our forces have opened up the railway and obtained possession of some cities where municipal governments with native officials have been set up. These officials are not loyal to us. Their existence is a continuous panorama of deceit.

TRUSTS IN GREAT BRITAIN.

Surveying the wide area of British industry in general, it cannot be said that we suffer in any appreciable degree from combinations of producers to keep up prices. That "trusts" exist in free trade countries as well as in protectionist countries is undeniable; but while in the former, the economy in production which results from their promotion goes to benefit the consumer in the shape of reduced prices, in the latter they are identified with high prices to the consumers and large profits to the producers. Our American friends are just now receiving a short lesson in the principles of free trade. They have built up high tariff walls in the interests of high prices. If the American workingmen want high prices, by all means let them have them, but surely it is a little illogical for them to complain when the "trusts" and combines have raised the prices to the limit allowed by the tariff. The "trust" in itself is a harmless institution; it is the tariff—the element of monopoly—that makes it harmful. If they want to cripple the power of the trusts they must attack them through the tariffs.

We Britishers believe in cheapness. If we could get goods for nothing we would not be ashamed to take them. We are not ashamed to swallow the

bounty-helped sugar of France and Germany which we can buy for three pence (six cents) per pound, cheaper than the retail price in the country where it is produced. British sugar refiners have suffered thereby, but the confectionery, biscuit, jam, marmalade and sweet drink industries have received an immense stimulus owing to the cheapening of sugar. With the sugar which France sends us under cost price, and the cheap fruit she also sends us, we make jam, which we again export to her at a handsome profit. If we had a tariff of 40 per cent. on imported sugar that industry would be all gone, and we should no doubt have a "sugar trust" to control prices, as they have in America, under similar conditions. Under the natural regime of free trade we gain in one industry what we lose in another.

The protectionist looks at one trade alone—the one in which he is interested. It is like looking at only one wheel in a complex piece of machinery where there may be thousands of wheels that depend on each other. The final result of the working of the machinery is the one thing to be considered. We look to the whole world to supply our wants, and in a country whose commercial system embraces so wide an area it is absolutely impossible for a clique of capitalists to capture our industries and impoverish our people.

We are behind America in some forms of political freedom, but we are far ahead of her in industrial freedom. The adoption of the free trade policy in the middle of the century gave us freedom of distribution. The free and independent voters of America have surrendered their industrial freedom and independence. They went to bed thinking that they had shut the foreigner out; they are waking to find that they have only shut themselves in. They are ruled by a gang of commercial dictators in the prison house they have built for themselves. Whether the descendants of the men who fought at Bunker Hill and Lexington, at Gettysburg and Richmond will be equal to the destruction of the new tyranny remains to be seen. But, surely, if political liberty was worth fighting for, industrial liberty is worth voting for.—Thomas Scanlon, of Liverpool, England.

"Dobley has just bought the Century Dictionary for his wife."

"Yes; he said something might come up she'd want to know about some time when he didn't happen to be at home."—Life.

CAPITAL AND LABOR.

At the Vine Street Congregational church, Cincinnati, Sunday evening, April 8, the pastor, Herbert S. Bigelow, delivered a lecture on the labor problem. What follows is an extract.

The deliverances of the pulpit on the labor problem may be boiled down to this: "Masters love your slaves; slaves obey your masters and keep sober."

The average preacher, if he is interested in the labor problem, thinks that the labor problem is only another name for the liquor problem. That is one good thing which prohibition might accomplish; it might demonstrate to the satisfaction of certain good folk that poverty has its roots, not in the drink vice, but in monopoly.

The real controversy is not one between capital and labor. It is between man and monopoly. It is all surface talk for a man to say that capitalists ought to give their workmen higher wages. If capitalists have the power to withhold from their men what is due them, then their men are slaves, and the remedy is to appeal to the voters to abolish the slavery, and not to appeal to the capitalists to be generous. But capitalists unless they are also monopolists have not the power to pay higher wages. They are in the position of the man described in the Bible: "He that departeth from evil maketh himself a prey." If the ordinary employer were to pay his men anything like a just wage, his business would be in the hands of a receiver in a month, unless he had a fortune to spend in charity. Charity is not what we want. We want reforms that enable men to be just without making a prey of themselves.

The labor problem will never be solved by preaching love in the pulpit. It can be solved only by practicing justice in the halls of legislation.

We must say to both labor and capital: "Confine yourselves to legitimate activities." When labor makes a pair of shoes, that is a legitimate activity. When labor employs itself going through another laborer's pocket, that is not a legitimate activity.

The great lesson for us to learn is that capital is doing things which are just as menacing to society as it would be if labor were allowed to employ itself in the highway business. Here is an illustration: Beneath one of the prominent business houses of our city there is a strip of land 16 feet in width which is owned by a woman who receives \$3,000 a year in rent for 20 years. Her contract binds her tenant to pay all the taxes during the term of the lease, and at the end of the 20 years the building erected on the ground reverts to her. She does not do a stroke of

work. Capital invested in a machine is capital invested for the purpose of aiding industry, and will perish if it is not useful. Capital invested in those 16 feet of ground is capital invested in the legal privilege of taxing industry and robbing the industrious to pension the idle. Wait until the people once see that. They will take the tax off from industry. They will put an end to that use of capital. They will stop this trafficking in man's right to live and work upon the earth. They will outlaw the capital that is engaged in the business of holding men up and robbing them of their wealth before permitting them to employ their labor and capital is useful employment.

Direct legislation will destroy the monopoly of the governing power. A scientific paper money will yet be found to abolish a monopoly of the money power. The nationalization of public utilities will abolish the railroad and telegraph monopoly. The single tax will abolish the land monopoly. That is the royal road of the reformer—to destroy monopoly; to break every yoke. Then, who knows, even the loftiest dreams of the socialist may blossom into being.

WHAT WE OUGHT TO DO FOR THE FILIPINOS.

Extracts from speech of Hon. William J. Bryan, in Los Angeles, Cal., April 10, as reported by the Los Angeles Herald.

There is a difference between expansion and imperialism. Expansion is the extension of the limits of a republic without a change of its character.

Imperialism is the policy of an empire. We have expanded before; we never had imperialism before. We expanded when we took in Florida; we expanded when we took in the Louisiana territory; we expanded when we took in Texas and New Mexico and California. But to-day it is not expansion. It is not taking in land that can be settled by American citizens and built up into American states. It is going across an ocean to get not land for settlement, but races for subjugation. Heretofore we have extended the area of the republic and every citizen has enjoyed the protection of the flag and the constitution, but the republican party now wants this nation to enter into a career of imperialism.

It wants the flag to be supported by the strength of the army, but it does not want the constitution to follow the flag when it goes into a distant clime.

What defense have you ever heard

of imperialism? I have heard of three defenses: First, that there is money in it; second, that God is in it; third, that we are in it and can't get out. Have you ever heard any others? I will give you the substance of every republican speech you hear in defense of imperialism. The speaker will start out by telling that the republican party didn't do this at all; that it was God's work; that God opened the door, pointed to a career of conquest, and commanded us to proselyte by the sword and spread the blessings of civilization through bursting lyddite bombs, and after the speaker has laid it all on Jehovah, he lowers his voice and says: "And it will pay, too." It is philanthropy and five per cent. That is what Secretary Gage called it a year ago last December. He said he thought philanthropy and five per cent. would go hand in hand. They have traveled together in all wars of conquest. Philanthropy chloroforms the conscience of the conqueror, and five per cent. picks the pocket of the conquered; and whenever philanthropy gets weary and rests by the wayside, five per cent. goes right on and never feels lonesome.

You say we must stay in the Philippine islands because American blood has been shed upon Philippine soil.

I reply that American blood was shed at San Juan hill and El Caney, and yet the president told the Cubans we would get out of Cuba. You say that the flag has been raised over Manila, and that when the flag is once raised it can never be hauled down. I reply that the flag was raised over Havana a year ago last January, and yet the president told the Cubans that he would haul it down when the flag of the Cuban republic was ready to rise in its place. You tell me that the American flag cannot be hauled down. I would rather a thousand times that the American flag should be hauled down and a Philippine republic's flag hoisted in its place, than that our flag should be made the emblem of a despotism that has cursed the world. Better two flags of a republic than one flag of an empire based on force.

You cannot point to a reason for staying in the Philippine islands that would not compel you to stay in Cuba. The only difference between Cuba and the Philippine islands is that we promised the Cubans that we would get out and we didn't promise the Filipinos. But if you will read the resolution you will find that it reads that the

people of Cuba are and of right ought to be free. And if we told the truth in those resolutions, the rights of the Cubans existed before we recognized those rights and would exist whether we recognized them or not; and I dare you to draw a line between the rights of the Cuban and the rights of the Filipino. Say, if you dare, that God gave the Cuban a right to his liberty and gave to the Filipinos only the right to be an American subject without the protection of the American constitution. You cannot do it, my friends.

Do you say that the people of the Philippine islands are not capable of self-government? I tell you that that is the doctrine that kings have used in all ages of the world. Let me read you what Lincoln says about this: "Those arguments that are made that the inferior race is to be treated with as much allowance as it is capable of enjoying, that as much has to be done for it as its 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 what Lincoln says, that your argument is simply the argument that kings have used in all ages of the world for enslaving the people. Read what Henry Clay said 50 years ago. He said in defending the right of the people of South America to their liberty and independence—he said that any man who denied that any people were capable of self-government was guilty of impeaching the wisdom of the Creator. I repeat what Clay said, that God never made a race incapable of self-government.

When the ratification of the treaty came up there was a difference among our people. Some believed that it was best to reject the treaty. I believed that it was best to ratify it and correct its defects by legislation. I believed that if we would ratify the treaty and close the war and bring the volunteers home, stop the expense, we could give liberty and independence to the Filipinos quicker by legislation than we could do it through diplomacy with Spain.

I believe that we can stop the war to-day. I believe that the moment this nation announces to the world that it is fighting not for land, but for lib-

erty, that when a stable government is established that government is to belong to the Filipinos and not to us—I believe when this declaration is made, the war will stop, and it will not take 5,000 soldiers to establish a stable government. And then I want this nation to announce to the world that when this nation helps a republic to stand upon its feet, the ground whereon it stands is holy ground, and that no king shall ever set foot upon that soil.

THE KAFFIR AS POLITICIAN.

A leading Englishman remarked to me recently that he supposed the Kaffir did not concern himself much with politics or take much practical interest in the public life of the Cape Colony.

I replied, somewhat to his amusement, by telling him what an educated Kaffir said to me. "There are only two sections of the population of the colony," said this Kaffir, "which have the true political instinct—the Dutch and the Kaffirs." The English, he added, were always splitting over trifles, but the Dutch and the Kaffirs subordinated smaller issues to larger.

The Kaffir I allude to was Mr. J. Tengo-Jabavu, a Fingo.

A good many years ago Mr. Jabavu, who was educated at Lovedale, matriculated in the Cape university, afterward serving for a time in, I think, the Cape civil service. When the Kaffir newspaper *Imvo* was started in Kingwilliamstown he was appointed editor. From that time to the present he has edited *Imvo*, and he now owns it. He has recently taken into partnership the Rev. John Knox Bokwe, a Xoso. *Imvo* is the only native newspaper of any weight in South Africa. It has a couple of columns in English for English readers, but otherwise the whole paper, including advertisements, leading articles, notes, telegrams, etc., is in Kaffir. It circulates among educated natives and some white people, from Cape Town to Rhodesia, and has among its subscribers such men as Mr. J. H. Hofmeyr and the Bechuana chief, Khama. Mr. Jabavu is an orator (as is Mr. Bokwe) both in English and in Kaffir, and a man of great ability and singular balance of judgment. Hardly a journalist in South Africa has, since 1896, pursued so just, fearless and level-headed a course as Mr. Jabavu, or kept so firm a hold on the essentials that underlie our present troubles.

What Mr. Hofmeyr has been to the Dutch, that Mr. Jabavu has been to the natives. He has educated them in

public affairs, and led them in that course which, while advancing their own interests, has been best for the empire. He is by far the most powerful, as well as the ablest, Kaffir in the public life of the Cape Colony. It is therefore well that England should understand his attitude and be largely guided by it.

How is it that Mr. Jabavu, with all his personal influence and that of his paper, is opposed to the war; and how is it that he and the Kaffirs are largely in the same political camp as the Afrikaner Bond? For it is an incontrovertible fact that, for the first time in the history of South Africa, responsible native opinion is on the same side as the Dutch, and in opposition to the so-called English.

The answer is short and emphatic. In the first place, the natives look at the war very much as the Dutch do. They consider it a capitalist intrigue, instigated and engineered by Mr. Rhodes for the purpose of seizing the Transvaal, in the same manner that war was forced on the Matabele, that their country might be seized. They look upon the war as a crime and a disgrace to England, and say that people who can treat Dutchmen so badly will treat natives much worse when they once have them in their power.

In the next place, though they have been no lovers of the Dutch, and have up till recently allied themselves with the English, yet they now say (and it is a truth capable of demonstration) that, since Mr. Rhodes came into power, the English have treated the natives worse than the Dutch have.

Like the Dutch, they have a firm belief in the English people, but the same thing is alienating both them and the Dutch—namely, the policy of those who now in South Africa arrogate to themselves the claim to be representatives of English opinion.

Now, what is it that finally alienated the political support of the natives from the English?

It is easily explained.

There are no Kaffirs or colored persons in the Cape parliament. This being the case, they seek for white champions to represent and defend their interests in the legislature of the country. In choosing any man, they ask themselves no other question than this: What is his attitude towards the native? On that alone they decide.

The two men they think most of are probably Mr. R. P. Solomon and Mr. J. W. Sauer. The other principal native champions are Mr. J. Rose Innes, Mr. John X. Merriman, Mr. J. C. Moltano,

Mr. J. T. Moltano and Mr. William Hay. All of these have been long recognized as pro-native men, and have had the support of the Kaffirs and the colored people generally.

Now, it happens—indeed, it is inevitable—that, without exception, these men are opposed to Mr. Rhodes. (It is remarkable that Mr. Sauer, Mr. Innes and Mr. Merriman were members of Mr. Rhodes' cabinet, and that Mr. Solomon, who was counsel for De Beers, was once returned to parliament by that company.) They are opposed to Mr. Rhodes—which means also to the South African league, of which he is president, and to the so-called "progressives," whose de facto leader he is—for several reasons, among them being his duplicity, his degrading influence upon public life, his oppression of the natives, his cruel treatment of the Dutch, and the harm he has done England in South Africa. When the last general election took place Mr. Rhodes and his supporters tried in every case to prevent the return to parliament of the pro-native men. But the Dutch, recognizing in these same men lovers of justice and upholders of the best English traditions—the Dutch, aided by the native vote, put the native champions into parliament. (Mr. Innes, who was, I think, elected unopposed, did not need the Dutch vote, though he would have got it. Mr. Rhodes was anxious to keep him out, but found him too strong.)

With his keen "political instinct," the native judges those to be his friends who befriend him, and it matters not to him whether those friends be English or Dutch; and here he sees the "English" (as represented by Mr. Rhodes, the South African league, and the "progressives") straining every nerve and spending thousands of pounds to keep his friends out of parliament and thus leave him unprotected and unrepresented, while the Dutch have taken them up and put them not only into parliament, but into the ministry. Of the four men who practically compose the ministry, three (Messrs. Sauer, Solomon and Merriman) are avowed and recognized native champions. Add to this that the pro-native men that were kept out of parliament at the last general election (such as Mr. William Hay and the late Mr. C. T. Jones) were in every case defeated by Mr. Rhodes' influence.

Now, the native looks these facts straight in the face; he takes the false professions of friendship of those who would keep his friends out of parliament at their true value; and, without necessarily allying himself with the

"Dutch," he draws off from the "English" and joins a party which includes the Dutch, some of the best English South Africans, and his own champions, against a selfish capitalism, masquerading under the guise of imperialism which will be as bad for him as for all the right sort of men in South Africa, whether white or black, and which is led and controlled by men who have shown themselves to be his deadly and unrelenting enemies. As between Rhodes and the Bond, the native chooses the Bond—there is the hard fact with which no vilification of the Dutch can do away. He recognizes that Dutch sentiment towards the native is changing in his favor, while, on the other hand, he sees that the same persons and forces that are killing the Dutchmen for their own selfish ends will enslave and crush and, if need be, kill him as soon as they have the power to do so. The natives on the spot, led by such cultured, disinterested and far-seeing statesmen as Mr. Jabavu and Mr. Bokwe, who are at the same time passionate lovers of that England we used to know, supported and championed by all the recognized pro-native white statesmen, are far more valuable and trustworthy witnesses than any other can possibly be.—S. C. Cronwright Schreiner, in the London Speaker of April 7.

"George," queried the dream-visitor, "what would you do if you had the battle of Manila to fight again?"

"What would I do?" responded the self-made presidential candidate. "I would postpone the event until the day before the holding of the democratic convention."

And the dream-visitor said no more, for he is sufficiently versed in worldly wisdom to comprehend the subtle allusion to the fickleness of the American people.

G. T. E.

Nutrite—Do you think the Boers will let the English army reach Pretoria?

Proboerine—They would be foolish if they did. Why, they haven't prison facilities for half so many soldiers.

G. T. E.

BOOK NOTICES.

"Japanese Notions of European Political Economy, being a summary of a voluminous report upon that subject forwarded to the Japanese government, by Tentaro Makato, commissioner to Japan to make the investigation," has just appeared in a third and revised edition. This is the little book that we described (34-6) upon its first appearance as "a unique pamphlet which may or may not be a contribution to the literature of wit, but

which, if it is, should take high rank." In the edition before us its author, James Love, confesses that the book is a satire. His explanation is that he believed that the form would merely interest the reader and not mislead him as to the origin of the work. The author was right in his supposition. The satire is evident upon careful reading. Yet it consists only in affixing a fictitious Japanese signature and giving a Japanese setting to one of the cleverest and soundest reviews of current political economy ever put into the language. The form Mr. Love has adopted, that of an official Japanese report, does excite special interest and tend to fix the reader's attention; and it does not in the slightest degree detract from the value of the book as an economic essay. Students of college economics will find it useful for clarifying purposes, and all readers will find it interesting and mentally stimulating. It is published by James Love, 627 Market street, Camden, N. J., and by the Scottish Single Tax League, 13 Dundas street, Glasgow, Scotland.

Enid Widdrington, an English woman, considers "The Moral Issues of the Transvaal Question" in an address published by S. Burns Weston, 1305 Arch street, Philadelphia. It is a defense of the Boers.

"Reconciled: A Story of Common Life" (Cedar Rapids, Ia.: Frank Vierth), the first literary venture of a woman whose name is withheld, brings into sharp contrast the social conditions of idle rich and industrious poor. The author has made a mistake in pointing the moral of her story as it proceeds. It would have been better not only as a story but as a sermon, had she cultivated the story teller's art more and the preacher's less. She has succeeded, however, in putting the lesson she would teach into a form more attractive than the essay to ordinary readers.

The "International Journal of Ethics" (Philadelphia: International Journal of Ethics; London: Swan Sonnenschein & Co., Paternoster square) opens with a paper on the nature and significance of monopolies and trusts by Prof. Richard T. Ely. It contains, also, on the subject of American imperialism from the ethical point of view, a paper on the ethics of expansion by H. H. Powers, of Cornell university, and one on the ethics of our Philippine policy by Herbert Welsh, of Philadelphia.

"A Plan for Funding the National Debt" (Chicago: Cameron, Amberg & Co.), by William A. Amberg, offers suggestions for funding the entire national debt in short term bonds, bearing competitive interest and serving as a basis for bank reserves and currency circulation. This plan, while doing away with the gold reserve, would establish a stable paper currency exchangeable upon demand for the new bonds. The bonds would be issued for nothing but this currency—not even for gold or silver. Consequently the currency would, for the purposes of investment in the bonds, be preferable to any other currency. When money was redundant it would flow into the subtreasuries for bonds; when it was scarce, bonds would flow into the subtreasuries for currency. Mr. Amberg's pamphlet is very brief but very clear, and presents a currency plan which certainly commends itself to adversaries of the present currency monopoly scheme, and to

which it is difficult to see what objection competitive banking interests could offer.

"Effective Voting the Basis of Good Municipal Government" (issued by the proportional representation committee of Ontario), explains the principles and practice of proportional representation.

"The Gold Standard in Japan," by S. Uchida, Japanese consul at New York, appears as the February, 1900, number of "Sound Currency," published by the Reform club, 52 William street, New York.

ATTORNEYS.

Chicago.

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

HARRIS F. WILLIAMS,
ATTORNEY AT LAW,
806 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.

Don't smoke with your eyes.

**EXERCISE
JUDGMENT**

There are many cigars as good looking, but few as good tasting as ours.

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

SUNDAY AFTERNOON LECTURES

BEING DELIVERED AT
HANDEL HALL, 40 E. RANDOLPH ST.,
Will be continued till June 1.
ADMISSION ALWAYS FREE!
Sunday, April 29th, 3 p. m. sharp—
EDWIN BURRITT SMITH,
"The Porto Rico Tariff."

The Public

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

Subscription, One Dollar a Year.

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

Single copies, five cents each.

Published weekly by
THE PUBLIC PUBLISHING COMPANY,
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. Price, \$2.00.
Express charges to be paid by consignee.

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

Credit is often established by the fact of having a life insurance policy. It says a good deal for its holder,—indorses for him. Investigate may what be done. Consult

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

CHICAGO SINGLE TAX CLUB

MEETS EVERY FRIDAY EVENING
HANDEL HALL,
40 East Randolph Street, Second Floor.
Program for Friday, April 27th,
HON. WILLIAM DILLON,
"The Mission of the Republic."

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