

# The Public

Fifth Year.

CHICAGO, SATURDAY, APRIL 26, 1902.

Number 212.

**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 page.

A man with an "overheated conscience" is one who talks right and votes wrong.

"In life as in war," said President Roosevelt at the banquet at New York in honor of the installation of the new president of Columbia university, "patriotism and devotion are necessary; but if a man have these and also a slight tendency to run away, his usefulness is impaired." It is doubtful if Mr. Roosevelt thought of himself, except as a spectacular warrior, when he uttered those words. But they are certainly suggestive of one of his tendencies, and not a slight one either, as a character in civil life.

The wielder of the spoilsman's ax in the post office department during President Harrison's administration was James S. Clarkson. Mr. Clarkson now lives in New York, and President Roosevelt has made him surveyor of customs there. As Mr. Roosevelt had denounced him as a spoilsman, saying with reference to him in that connection that—  
there is a certain difference between being paid with an office and being paid with money, exactly as there is a certain difference between the savagery of an Ashantee and that of a Hottentot, but it is small in amount—  
some wonder is expressed at this appointment. The New York Times speaks of it as "amazing and incomprehensible." But it is nothing of the sort—not to anyone who has observed Mr. Roosevelt's career. It is on the contrary strictly harmonious.

When the Republicans were busy making up tariff schedules in the name of the American workingman but for the benefit of the American trust,

they gravely assured the public that a tax on imports is paid by foreigners. "The foreigner pays the tax," said they, with wearisome iteration, for permission to share market privileges! At last the British ministry have recognized the advantages of this method of supporting government, and have proposed taxes which will enable them to put the financial burden of the war in South Africa upon foreigners. They have long been able to get mules from America, and now they aim to get money from the same source by taxing grain and flour. According to the Republican theory, this tax must be paid by foreign farmers and millers; and if English consumers pay more for bread that is only an interesting but purely accidental phenomenon. "The foreigner pays the tax."

The labor party mayor of San Francisco has adopted a policy with regard to labor strikes, the outcome of which will be awaited with profound interest. It promises to give peculiar historical and legal value to the street car strike in San Francisco, which at latest reports had caused a complete "tie-up" of the street car service in that city. Mayor Schmitz has departed absolutely from the custom of turning peaceable strikes into riots by permitting the employers to overcome passive resistance with deadly weapons and aiding them in doing so.

As usual in such strikes, the street car managers proposed to man their cars with armed private guards commissioned as special policemen. There had been no riot, no violence of any kind, nor any indications of violence. But the managers made the plea that their non-union men refused to work unless protected by armed guards. This plea is worthless. Had the non-union men gone voluntarily to work and been molested, then there would

have been a case for criminal prosecution; and if the molestation had been general by mobs, there would also have been a case for peremptory police interference in defense of the public peace. But in the absence both of overt acts and of threats imperiling the public peace, police interference and other armed displays are insulting to peaceable strikers, and unlawful as being themselves acts calculated to disturb the public peace. The mere refusal of non-union men to work without armed protection is not a justification for such demonstrations. They can serve no other purpose than the unlawful and inexcusable one of exciting the anger of strikers and so bringing about the very injuries to private rights and breaches of the public peace which they are professedly designed to avert.

That that is the object, hardly admits of doubt. A formidable strike can always be defeated by baiting the strikers until a few respond with acts of violence. This not only concentrates general public sentiment against the strike, but it disheartens the strikers themselves, most of whom are men of peace. It is, therefore, part of the tactics of strike resistance to confront the strikers at the earliest possible moment with a display of armed force. This has been the history of all strikes against monopoly corporations. But Mayor Schmitz has taken a new departure. Not as a labor union man, but as mayor of the city charged with the preservation of the public peace, he has prohibited the arming of private guards by the street car managers. And in this he has been supported by the supervisors, who have furthermore refused to man the cars with policemen.

The laudable purpose of the San Francisco officials under the new re-

gime is simply to preserve the public peace; and they are not making this a pretense, according to the usual custom, for taking sides with one of the parties to the strike. Their admirable spirit is disclosed in the mayor's letter to the police department. A demand upon that department had been made by one of the street car companies, for permits to employ "special armed deputies" to guard its cars, and in advising the police department Mr. Schmitz wrote:

As mayor of this city I am taking part with neither side to the controversy, but what will not be permitted to the striking employes will certainly not be allowed to the employer. All violence must be discouraged and suppressed and all action on either side tending to riot and bloodshed must be stopped. It is well known that the employment of armed men to represent either side of the present difficulty would naturally result in producing conditions of violence and disorder. I therefore request and direct that during the continuance of this strike no permit to carry weapons be issued by your board and that no private detective agency be granted the right to employ and arm special private detectives for the purposes indicated. The regular municipal authorities and the regular police department are amply able to handle the situation and to do their full duty to the people in the premises. If armed men be permitted to convey cars it will naturally follow that armed men will shortly thereafter be found also among the men on strike and the result is not difficult to prophesy. Conditions are now peaceful and orderly and they must remain so.

Pierpont Morgan is reported to have set up the doctrine, while testifying last month in a lawsuit in New York in connection with the consolidation into the Northern Securities company of New Jersey, of the northwestern railroads, known as the "Northwestern merger," that men who own property may do what they like with it. To any person with a well-balanced intellect and reasonably sensitive conscience this would appear to depend upon how they own the property. If it is justly and wholly their property, unincumbered by other interests, it is true that they may do as they like with it, provided, of course, they do not

use it to the prejudice of the rights of other people. If a man owns a sulphur match, for instance, he may not use it to fire his neighbor's barn. He may use it, however, to light his own cigar with, even if somebody else wishes him to devote it to an altruistic purpose. But when a man's property is charged with a trust, he is bound to execute the trust. Consequently the question of whether a man may do what he likes with his own property depends upon whether or not a trust encumbers it. And a trust does encumber the ownership of the northwestern railroads. The highway privileges which constitute a part of those properties, are gifts from the people in trust; and one of the conditions of the trust is that there shall be no combination by or between lines traversing the same territory.

This is conceded. But a Wall street organ of high standing in its way, The Commercial and Financial Chronicle, insists that in the case under consideration—  
there is and was no combination intended or made either direct or indirect.

That is an astounding assertion, since the object of organizing the New Jersey corporation is to centralize in it the control of these competing roads. But listen to the explanation of the journalistic attorney for Mr. Morgan already quoted:

Certainly no combination can be inferred from the circumstance that a purchaser buys the stock of two competing roads in large amount, or that he sells the stock in large amounts of roads so situated to a single individual or a single company. The law is the same to all—when one sells a hundred shares or when his neighbor sells a million shares.

That is to say, though the ownership of these public highways is in trust upon condition that competition between them shall not be strangled by their combination, yet they may be lawfully combined and the trust set at naught by the simple process of selling a majority interest in all to a corporation organized for that express purpose! If courts of equity

cannot grapple with such a plain evasion of their obligations by owners in trust, those courts had better limit their jurisdiction hereafter altogether to labor strikes.

Of course the law applies alike to the purchase of a hundred shares or a million—as to beneficial ownership. But as to the due execution of the trust, it might be very different in the one case from what it might be in the other. If from a purchase of a hundred shares no combination would result, with its consequent throttling of competition, the public would have no rights in the matter for the law to operate upon. But if from the purchase of a million, or even of a hundred, or only one, the combination would result and the obligations of the trust be thereby evaded, then the public would have rights in the matter to be protected. And the latter is precisely the case in the merger transaction. When the New Jersey company buys a majority of stock in each of these competing roads it thereby effects an unlawful combination in breach of the trust with which the property is charged. The case, therefore, is not one in which the owners "may do what they please with their own." They must in good faith execute the trust.

Minnesota is in a queer state of helplessness before the law with reference to this "merger" matter, one which seems completely to discredit the old legal maxim that in the law "there is no right without a remedy." In behalf of competition her domestic policy forbids the consolidation of railroad interests. But her principal railroads have evaded that policy, expressed distinctly in the Minnesota statutes, by organizing in New Jersey the Northern Securities company, a stockholding corporation, which takes up the stock of the Minnesota roads in exchange for its own, thereby consolidating the ownership of those roads as effectually as if they were made into one by the Minnesota legislature. The purpose is obvious; the evasion is manifest. Yet the in-

jured state is without legal redress. Her own courts cannot get jurisdiction of the New Jersey corporation, for its domicile is in New Jersey. She might go into the New Jersey courts; but that would be futile, for they would doubtless decide in harmony with the New Jersey policy, which favors monopolization, and not with that of Minnesota, which favors competition. The Supreme Court of the United States, invested with jurisdiction to try precisely such cases—issues between a state and citizens of another state—refused, following an absurd decision of its own, made for the protection of the Southern Pacific Railroad company in a suit brought by the state of California a few years ago against that artificial product of Kentucky legislation, to take jurisdiction. "So there you are!" Minnesota has no judicial redress for this palpable defiance of her domestic policy, by the owners of a corporation of her own creation. Even though the state of Washington be admitted as it has been to prosecute the question in the Supreme Court, her claims rest upon different and possibly weaker grounds. Minnesota is without a remedy. If a labor question instead of a railroad corporation question were involved, it would probably be different. Some remedy would doubtless be found. But as it is there appears to be none, unless the legislature of Minnesota shall decide to "take the bull by the horns" and withdraw the Minnesota privileges of the corporations in question, on the ground that they are being abused in defiance of the laws of the state.

A few weeks ago (vol. iv., p. 801) we quoted Gen. Miles as having testified before a Senate committee that the Root army bill, now before Congress, "would seem to Germanize and Russianize the small army of the United States," and to throw "the door wide open for a future autocrat or a military despot." That Gen. Miles was right will appear upon considering one feature of the Root bill, that which provides for a general staff.

Under the present plan the technical head of the army—the major general or lieutenant general in command—rises to his position regularly through the organization of which he is part; and although he is subject to the general direction of the president as commander-in-chief, he is not subject to arbitrary appointment and removal by the president or at the behest of a political party. But that would all be changed by the Root army bill, which aims to enable the president to appoint and remove the technical head of the army at will. Instead of being a civil magistrate, with incidental military powers as commander-in-chief, the president could make himself commander-in-chief with incidental civil powers. The technical head of the army would no longer be merely his military subordinate, charged with the proper execution of lawful orders; he would be his personal puppet, able and willing to further his designs, whether lawful or unlawful, so far as the military organization could be made to operate to that end. Professional success in the army would depend altogether upon pleasing the president and his party; and every change of administration would be followed by a change in the technical head of the military machine. Perhaps there is no real danger in the bill. Possibly no president would be disposed to avail himself of the enormous power it would confer upon him to execute a coup d'etat. But if by any chance a strenuous president so disposed should come into office, what a tempting opportunity would confront him!

The true adjustment of this matter lies in the direction of the bill introduced in the senate on the 22d by Senator Hawley. This bill would place the technical direction and control of the army under a military head, subject to the general orders of the president, but not subject to his arbitrary control. It quite properly puts the president, as commander-in-chief in the same relation to the general in command that the latter is in

to his subordinates. Arbitrary dictation, obeyed in fear of removal or in hopes of retention or promotion, would be prevented; yet the president, so long as he acted within the law, would remain supreme. His lawful orders would have to be obeyed; his secret wishes would not. He could remove the general in command upon conviction of misconduct; he could not remove him at his own unbridled will. If this system places a wholesome check upon military officers of lower grade with reference to their subordinates—as colonels to captains—as it certainly does, it would not be an unwholesome check upon the president with reference to the general in command.

A man sits under the shadow of the gallows in Chicago who may be guilty of a brutal murder, but whose execution will nevertheless itself be murder if carried out. For this man has not had a fair trial. He was convicted under circumstances which raise a strong presumption that the jury that convicted him was intimidated.

It would be bad enough if a possibly innocent man were hanged. But that is not the worst of it. Human justice being necessarily fallible, innocent men may now and then suffer under the best possible conditions. But when human justice has been poisoned at the source, the integrity of society itself is menaced. In these circumstances not merely may an occasional sad mistake be made, but constant perversions of justice are possible, and all confidence in the law must perish.

Society should try to prevent crime, and in doing so may punish criminals. It is impossible, however, for society to ascertain guilt, except through agencies adapted to that purpose. Hence courts of criminal justice are established, with judges, prosecutors and juries. In these institutions the juries are the final arbitrators. They are relied upon by society to sift and weigh the facts and

to determine the question of innocence or guilt. So long as juries are uncorrupted and independent, any man may well say: "I cannot possibly inquire into the merits of every criminal case; but an honest and independent jury, fully apprized of the facts, has rendered a verdict, and I am justified in accepting that verdict as conclusive." But no man can say this when juries are bribed or intimidated. As fraud vitiates all contracts, so corruption or intimidation vitiates all verdicts.

And of these two, intimidation is the worse. Men may turn aside from bribery who dare not stand out against intimidation. To refuse to be bribed requires only honesty, and most men are inclined to be honest. But to cope with intimidation requires moral courage, and that is the rarest of all the manly virtues. For this reason, the murder case referred to above is one of transcendent importance. Whether the man is in fact guilty or not, if his conviction has been procured by intimidating the jury that tried him, another deadly blow has been leveled at the administration of justice in Illinois. It can be averted only by giving the convict a new and fair trial, and properly rebuking the persons guilty of this crime against justice which, even though not a crime legally, is nevertheless so dangerous to society as to be worse than corruption.

To understand the nature and force and danger of the intimidation in question, the facts about the crime and the circumstances of the conviction must be outlined. The prisoner's name is Thoms. He is charged with murdering a young woman whose body he sunk in the river, having been assisted in this secret burial by a young man who saw the crime and who became a state's witness. This young man was virtually the only witness. Without his testimony there would have been no case at all, and he does not appear to have been materially corroborated by collateral facts. The case has been twice

tried. Its merits we do not intend to discuss, for the point upon which we wish to center attention is the same whether the prisoner is in reality guilty or innocent. Whether he went upon the witness stand in his own defense or not; whether he had given indications of innocence by trying to prosecute the incriminating witness, before he had become a witness but was a fugitive, upon charges of petty larceny; whether any adequate motive for the murder was shown—these and all similar matters are immaterial to the main question, which is the intimidation of the jury that convicted.

At the first trial, two jurors refused to join in the verdict of conviction. They said that they did not believe the story of the state's witness, upon the truth of which alone the question of guilt seems to hang. This was not only their right; it was their duty. They were in that jury box to report upon the facts, not as the prosecuting attorney wanted them to, not as the judge may have desired, not as the other ten jurors saw the facts, but as they themselves saw them. If they were not corrupt, and no one accuses them of corruption, then their conclusion of "not proven" was entitled to just as much respect as the contrary conclusion of their associates in the jury box. Unless this is so, the jury system is a farce. But the jury system, however it may be perverted at times, is not a farce; and the refusal of these two jurors to agree to a verdict of guilty upon testimony which they believed to be untrustworthy, an act apparently of a high order of moral courage, is one of the events which go to prove the essential value of that time-honored system.

For having thus courageously done their duty as jurors, these men were persecuted. Mobs threatened them and newspapers held them up to scorn. Persecution of that kind, however, is to be expected. It is one of the penalties of honesty in public office, one of the conditions which

make honesty of little value when not backed up by moral courage. But this persecution was supplemented by the publication in the Daily News of the 8th, by A. C. Barnes, the assistant state's attorney, who had conducted the prosecution that failed and was immediately thereafter to conduct the one that succeeded, of the following astounding letter over his own name:

It is incomprehensible to right-thinking men how, in the face of indisputable evidence pointing conclusively to the defendant's guilt of a crime so horrible as to excite feelings of universal execration toward him, it is possible to find even one man with the ordinary instincts of humanity who would vote to acquit such a monster. Such a vote can be reconciled only with criminal instincts. It is not compatible with ideas of justice, self-respect or regard for others. It is almost a crime. At any rate the man who would cast it upon such evidence is unfit for citizenship or association with decent people. His own conduct could be governed by no rule observed by men of right impulses and normal ideas. I cannot express myself too strongly upon this subject. It is a strange anomaly that in this day of the most advanced civilization and improved methods such a man can be found in the jury box. It is not a question of denying the accused a single right. He was accorded every advantage and right our most liberal and humane laws bestow upon the accused. But none of these could change the force of facts, which no man could honestly question. Hence a vote of not guilty under such circumstances is not only a reflection upon the man who casts it, but borders so near a crime as to bring either the present jury system or the method of its selection in public disrepute. It is worse than some crimes, because such a miscarriage of justice creates disrespect for the law and its forms. In some parts of the country it would encourage lynching. Such a juror is a public enemy.

Could anything be better calculated to intimidate the jury at the second trial, which followed immediately? Under the influence of a probable repetition of that excoiation of jurors who were not satisfied with the evidence Mr. Barnes had to offer, the second jury was chosen. Is it any wonder that they decided this question of life and death almost without leaving their seats? Is it any wonder that they convicted the prisoner

in less than half an hour, and without hesitation, upon the first ballot? Can it be assumed above all peradventure that this was because the evidence was irresistibly convincing beyond a reasonable doubt? May it not have been due to fear? For, had not the jurors been semi-officially forewarned of the punishment in store for them if they refused to convict? Not only were they admonished that if they disagreed with the prosecutor they must be prepared to suffer at the hands of some hysterical mob. They were in a position also in which, if they found themselves in disagreement with him, they must stiffen their moral courage to bear up under a scathing denunciation from him in the newspapers. He came before them in the name and with the dignity of the state virtually to demand that each of them vote for conviction, regardless of his own judgment and conscience, under penalty of being semi-officially denounced as a man of "criminal instincts," as one "unfit for citizenship or association with decent people," as being guilty of "something worse than some crimes" and as "a public enemy." If any of these men saw that publication or heard of it, this second trial was a farce. Considering the denunciations of the dissenting jurors at the first trial, the menace to which they were subjected by a mob, the gratuitous and infamous public attack upon them by the public prosecutor, of all which the jurors at the second trial must have been cognizant, the verdict given was under circumstances which indicate that it was secured by intimidation. A verdict so rendered ought not to stand. If no other functionary interferes to secure a fair trial for this man, then the governor of the state should find a way of doing it. The good name of Illinois cannot bear up under too many notable instances of judicial murder.

As to Mr. Barnes, after publishing the assault upon the independent jurors which we quote above, he ought not to have been permitted to try the

case a second time. The function of prosecuting official is in some degree judicial, and Mr. Barnes was not judicial. Not only should he have been withdrawn from the case by his superior; he should have been dismissed from the prosecutor's office. His letter is a reflection upon the administration of justice in the office that continues to employ him. It is a letter the publication of which would have been in bad taste had the first jury agreed upon a verdict of acquittal, thereby releasing the prisoner finally. But in view of the fact that the prisoner had another trial to undergo, that Mr. Barnes himself was to prosecute, that it was to come on immediately, and that the jurors would be men who had probably seen and might be intimidated by the letter, Mr. Barnes committed a moral crime against good government.

Unless the administration of justice is to be completely discredited, something should be done to protect the independence of jurors, not only from prosecutors such as Barnes, but also from judges who take it upon themselves to rebuke jurors whose verdicts do not please them. Because there has been an occasional "failure of justice," consisting in an escape of the guilty through the laxness of juries, there seems to be a disposition in some quarters to follow indictments invariably not with trials but with convictions. It is to cater to this anarchistic disposition that some judges rebuke independent jurors, and prosecutors like Barnes publicly insult and libel them. The truth is that the guilty escape oftener through the interposition of judges in the higher courts than through laxness of juries. But even if that were otherwise, jurors should be encouraged to rely upon their individual judgment, and not be hounded when they do so. "Swift justice" may be a good thing, even if it is a characteristic of lynch law. But it is hardly worth having at the expense of fair trials.

One of the good signs of the times

is the growing number and expanding influence in their respective states of the weekly papers of radically democratic proclivities, such as the Star of San Francisco and City and State of Philadelphia. Another just added is the Red Wing Argus. A local paper of many years standing, the Argus has now essayed to represent the Democracy of the state of Minnesota. Its prospectus gives promise of good wholesome democratic work, as one brief quotation will show:

Democracy has principles but no programme—just the opposite of our friends the enemy. Democracy's principles are firmly established; the programme has to be hammered out in some open place. . . . Democracy is—has been—shall be—constant to equal rights, forever fighting special privilege. What can't be made to harmonize with that is not Democracy; whatever is necessary to that must be Democratic policy; whatever can be made to square with it may be Democratic programme.

No further guarantee of fidelity to this sound conception of democracy is needed than the fact that the editor of the Argus is John Stone Pardee, whose name as that of a brilliant editorial writer is already familiar in more than one state.

#### RIPPERISM.

Political movements toward industrial justice seem likely to find their starting-points in cities. Cleveland and Toledo are just now instances in point. The latest newspaper word, is the verb active to "tomjohnsonize." The answer of the plutocrat is the new expression "ripperism."

The cities which become imbued with real democratic Democracy, and show symptoms of putting it into effect in the form of laws for the municipal ownership of public utilities, or the placing on the monopolies of something like their true share of the burden of taxation, are to be disciplined and plundered at once by ripper legislation. Indeed in Pennsylvania ripperism was inaugurated for plunder rather than party advantage; and the extent of the stealings of the Quay machine, in the form of franchise grants in cities, made at Harrisburg in defiance of the wishes of the people of the cities interested, togeth-

er with the shamelessness of the robbery, has been something to excite the astonishment and horror of the civilized world.

The Republican majority in Ohio is said to be casting about for means to deprive Cleveland of local self-government by a ripper bill to balk Mayor Johnson; and a modified form of ripperism has been used in Michigan, to hold in check the progressists of Detroit.

Ripperism is based upon the idea that cities are mere creations of the state legislature, with no inherent right to self-government. Pennsylvania courts have long held to this view; and Quay and his crowd found the laws all in their favor. But in Michigan a different state of things existed.

Largely through the opinions and writings of one man, Michigan's great constitutional lawyer, Thomas M. Cooley, ripperism in Michigan has to overcome the obstacle of a splendid series of Supreme Court decisions upholding the inherent right of local self-government in cities. In Pennsylvania, when it is the desire of an upscrupulous machine to rob cities, all that is necessary for the state legislature to do is to pass an act removing the mayor and common council and appointing machine parasites, either resident or non-resident, armed with the requisite license to steal. This has been done time and time again in Pennsylvania. But in Michigan, and all states following the same rule of law, some mode must be found of doing the same thing through the medium of locally elected officers. So we find the Michigan ripper bills but a faint shadow of those of Pennsylvania. Boards are reorganized by state laws, and the appointment of the new boards placed with mayor or council as one or the other happens to be for the moment "right" on the question. But the ghost of Cooley still pronounces its "Thou shalt not" against the real thing in ripperism.

For the courts of Michigan have spoken in no uncertain tones on this point. They have said that the city existed anterior to the state, and the right to build cities and to govern them is a right which men had before

any state constitution was adopted. They have said that back of the written constitution is an unwritten constitution, under which cities have the right to local self-government.

Now that the question of local self-government is coming to the front, as an important element in political progress, it is a matter of congratulation that the Supreme Court of another state, Iowa, has taken its stand in favor of the cities, and against ripperism. This vicious principle was sought to be engrafted upon the laws of Iowa in a measure which looked harmless to most people, and may have been well-intended. It was in a law for the taking from the city government of the city of Sioux City and other cities of the same class the control of their water-works, and giving it to boards of commissioners appointed by the courts. It was said that city councils were often corrupt or incompetent, and that the courts would appoint "good men" who would be superior to the wiles of the wire-puller.

The city of Sioux City made a fight against the law. The case has recently been decided in favor of the city, a new law has been enacted providing for boards of commissioners appointed by the mayor of the city, and in most cases the old commissioners have been reappointed, and are now serving as city officers instead of minions of the courts. Superficially, it might be said that nothing has been gained; but the opinion of the court, which has now become a part of the institutions of the state, shows that the gain has been great. It is declared that the control of the state legislature over Iowa cities is not unlimited; and that in the matter of owning property particularly the city cannot be divested of its proprietary rights any more than can an individual.

There is another point in this most important case, equally worthy of note. The judges who were given power to appoint the Sioux City water-works commissioners, were elected in a large judicial district embracing several counties outside of the city. Their exercise of the power of appointment was, therefore, not only an infraction of local self-government, but a delegation of the power of administration of government to the

courts. This, said Judge Deemer in the opinion, is surely not a judicial function." "If," says he, "the courts may select city officials, they may also select those who are to administer the affairs of the county; and it is not going too far to say that they may also be authorized to select state officials." This cannot for a moment be admitted as correct.

Altogether, the opinion is a notable contribution to the cause of anti-ripperism. The cities of Iowa may continue to control the property they own, and the municipal ownership cause is relieved of a grave peril. Moreover there is a healthy democracy in the opinion which is refreshing.

"The property-owning and tax-paying classes," says Judge Deemer, "who suffer most from a material point of view under mismanagement and corruption, have the remedy in their own hands, if they choose to exercise it. This remedy is not placing all municipal affairs under the control of the judiciary, but by taking the same interest in the administration of local affairs that they manifest in the conduct of their private business. All authorities seem to agree that legislative and judicial interference in purely municipal matters has tended very greatly to lessen the sense of responsibility on the part of local officials, and upon the part of communities themselves. \*\*

---

## NEWS

---

Official disclosures of American atrocities in the Philippines, the beginning of which was described last week, are the principal feature also of this week's news. Owing to the censorship over the proceedings before the Senate committee, these disclosures are not reported as fully as they might be. No reporters are allowed at the hearings except representatives of the three press associations, all of which are under the management of sympathizers with the policy of Philippine subjugation. But even these news-gathering combinations are obliged to send out reports of testimony which indicates that a barbarous policy has prevailed. They report Edward J. Davis, formerly sergeant of company M. Twenty-sixth volunteer infantry, as having testified



on the 17th that he, like the witnesses of last week, saw the administration of the water torture to the presidente of Igaras. He told, moreover, of the burning of the town, saying that—

all but about 15 houses were destroyed; and men, women and children were forced out indiscriminately.

The orders to administer the torture and to burn the town were given by Maj. Glenn, of the regular army, and were executed by regular troops. The witness added that he had talked with regular soldiers about the water torture and had been given to understand by them that its administration was of frequent occurrence. On the 21st, Grover Flint, formerly first lieutenant in the Thirty-fifth volunteer infantry, appeared before the committee. He testified to having witnessed at least 20 applications of the water torture, some so severe that the teeth of the victims dropped out. Superior officers did not expressly order but did stand by and permit its infliction. He himself regarded the torture as a proper method of procuring information. Describing the practice of burning villages, he said that the purpose was "to drive the people to the woods or to the towns and concentrate them;" and he explained that the idea had been borrowed from Cuba, where he had seen the same thing done "under the authority of Gen. Weyler."

An attempt is being made by the minority of the investigating committee to induce the committee to call as witnesses Aguinaldo, Mabini, Sixto Lopez, Judge Pio del Pilar, Gen. Torres, Howard W. Bray, and two correspondents—Robert M. Collins and Harold Martin; but the committee has not yet consented, several of the majority being opposed to obtaining testimony from these sources. It has definitely decided, however, not to call Edward Atkinson, of Boston, who was prepared to furnish correspondence from the Philippines throwing light upon the American methods in vogue there. His testimony was excluded on the ground that he could not testify to having himself seen the things described in his correspondence.

Among a mass of documents submitted to the committee on the 18th by the secretary of war, at the request of the committee, is an order issued by Gen. Bell, announcing that—

wherever prisoners or unarmed or defenseless Americans or native friend-

ly to the United States government are murdered or assassinated, for political reasons, and this fact can be established, it is his purpose to execute a prisoner of war to be selected by lot from among the officers or prominent citizens held as prisoners of war, and chosen when practicable from those who belong to the place where the murder or assassination has occurred.

There is also a copy of a letter from Gen. Chaffee to Gen. Hughes, in which the former says:

I would not trust 50 per cent, of the male population, and they must not be trusted. It is our duty to suspicion every male inhabitant in these islands, and the proof of any error in this regard must rest with them, not so much in words as by action, which cannot be misunderstood. While I do not urge inhumane treatment of any person in these islands, it is necessary that we be stern and inflexible, and both officers and men must be cordially supported in their duty in this regard.

Pursuant to the President's orders, noted last week, Gen. Smith, who was charged at the Waller court-martial with ordering the killing of all natives over ten years of age, was recalled from the transport on which he had embarked for the United States, and ordered to remain in Manula under arrest pending an inquiry into the truth of that charge. This was on the 20th. On the 21st a court-martial was organized by Gen. Chaffee to try him. It was composed of Gen. Wheaton, Sumner, Bell and Bisbee, and Cols. Chambers, McKibbin, Rafferty, Dougherty, Markle and Lee, and Maj. Harvey C. Carbaugh as judge advocate. The trial was set to begin on the 29th. These proceedings were reported by Manila dispatches to be disquieting in army circles there. It was at first supposed in those circles that only a superficial inquiry would be made, but the organization of a court-martial to try Gen. Smith excited a general feeling that the investigation would disclose the fact that nearly all the officers in command had been aware of the barbarous actions which in these circles are so freely defended as necessary under the circumstances. Gen. Smith himself is reported to have made no denial of the charges, but to have impliedly justified the inhuman orders he is sworn to have given, by pointing to the hardships which his men had encountered and the treachery of the natives. After the organization of the Smith court-martial by Gen. Chaffee, as described above, instructions were given by the Presi-

dent dissolving it and reconstructing it directly under his orders as commander in chief. He reappoints the same members. The object of this action is to subject the verdict to review by himself directly instead of leaving the review to Gen. Chaffee.

While these proceedings are pending, a court-martial is trying Lieut. Day, on charges similar to those of which his superior, Maj. Waller, was acquitted—shooting prisoners without a trial. He testified on the 18th that the president of Basey, island of Samar, was shot, as he believed, by order of Maj. Glenn. He also testified that he had himself killed a prisoner who had been shot, but not fatally, by soldiers in obedience to his orders.

Regarding military operations in the archipelago—to which our latest reference, prior to the announcement last week of the surrender of Gen. Malvar, was made at page 745 of vol. iv.—numerous reports of surrenders of small parties of Filipinos come in. But this evidence of the subsidence of resistance to American authority by the Christian people of the islands is supplemented with reports of hostility from the Mohammedans. As stated last week, Gen. Chaffee had fitted out an expedition of 1,200 men to put down insubordination on the Mohammedan island of Mindanao. An American soldier had been murdered in that island, near Parang-Parang, and treachery against other soldiers had been attempted. Gen. Chaffee demanded of the dattos or chiefs the surrender of the murderers, but the dattos refused to comply, and would not even confer with Gen. Chaffee. Consequently he fitted out the punitive expedition of 1,200, already mentioned, and put it under command of Col. Baldwin. President Roosevelt decided that this expedition was premature, feeling that a war with the Mohammedans might be avoided; and on the 21st he ordered the recall of the expedition. But Gen. Chaffee was insistent. He cabled a protest to the war department, in which he explained that the American expedition was already upon the ground and had been fired upon, and said:

The withdrawal of our forces will ruin our prestige; to withdraw part of the force would be dangerous.

He further indicated no disposition to withdraw his troops unless he should have additional instructions to do so; and the President, after consulting the cabinet, decided on the

22d that as offensive operations had already begun, it would not be advisable to interfere. Accordingly, Gen. Chaffee was given a free hand, but cautioned to avoid causing a general war with the Mohammedan tribes which number in Mindanao over a million souls.

Passing over into China we shall find what may possibly be a repetition of the "boxer" outbreak of two years ago. This new rebellion was noticed in these columns last month (vol. iv., p. 823) as having arisen in southern China and advanced almost to Nanking. A two-days' battle had been fought about the middle of March, in which the government troops under Gen. Ma were worsted; and a few days later the rebels had captured a town in the province of which Canton is the capital. On the 8th of April advices from Hongkong were to the effect that Gen. Ma and Marshal Su, government commanders, had utterly routed the rebels and driven them to the mountains; but later advices coming from Canton were not so sanguine, and on the 16th it was reported from Canton that over 2,000 government soldiers had been ambushed in a mountain defile and killed or captured. The general situation was at the same time described as alarming. It was feared that both Gen. Ma and Marshal Su had been surrounded. As yet their safety is not assured. Canton itself was in such danger that reinforcements from Peking were urgently called for. The critical character of the situation, not only to the Chinese government but also to foreigners, was indicated on the 19th by dispatches from Peking, which told of the fears of the foreign legations. An official meeting of the foreign representatives in Peking was held on that day, at which it was decided, in view of the magnitude of the rebellion and distrust of the government, to station three cordons of guards around the legations.

While in the throes of this rebellion sweeping up from the south, China is being relieved of the threatened aggression of Russia from the north; for the Russo-Chinese treaty providing for the evacuation by Russia of Manchuria (vol. iv., p. 823, and vol. v., p. 10), now officially made public, contemplates a complete relinquishment. As the treaty is summarized from Washington—  
Russia agrees to restore the civil administration of Manchuria, without re-

serve, to the Chinese empire; to evacuate Manchuria completely, so far as military or civil control is concerned, within one year from the date of the treaty; to remove her army, except a small force for guarding the Russian railway, within one year, withdrawing a part of the troops in four months, another part in eight months and the final quota in twelve months; and to surrender all claim to exclusive railway and mining privileges in Manchuria, pledging herself and China to the "open door" principle in that province.

There is, however, a reservation attached to the treaty, which declares that if the Chinese government should violate any of the terms stipulated as conditions of this evacuation—

the Russian government will not hold itself bound either by the terms of the Manchuria agreement or by the declarations previously made in connection with the matter.

Russia, herself, is disturbed by internal commotions. There are fears, apparently well grounded, that the democratic revolt which found expression 20 years ago in the assassination of the czar has revived. The cruelly oppressive and arbitrary actions of the government for the suppression of personal liberty, bore fruit on the 16th in the assassination, by a student named Balsahonstt, of M. Sipraguin, the Russian minister of the interior. At first this was believed to be only an ordinary crime, but the conduct of the Russian authorities indicates that they believe it to have been political, and this is the belief also of persons familiar with Russian affairs and who are in sympathy with the victims of Russian autocracy. Following the assassination of the minister of the interior comes reports of the attempt upon the life of the governor of Warsaw, and also stories of peasant revolts in the south. But the censorship of the press is so much more perfect in Russia than in other countries that no really trustworthy or adequate reports of conditions there are obtainable.

Supplementing the vague reports of democratic conspiracies in Russia are reports of open defiance to her authority in Finland, a country which she has undertaken to assimilate (vol. i., No. 48, pp. 4, 9; No. 50, p. 11; vol. ii., No. 54, p. 10; No. 57, p. 6; No. 58, p. 1; No. 59, p. 7; No. 61, p. 10; No. 69, p. 1; No. 75, p. 10; No. 77, p. 10; vol. iii., p. 778; vol. iv., pp. 617, 666). A dispatch from Helsingfors to the Lon-

don Times, received on the 21st, reports that on the 18th, in a levy of recruits from the Helsingfors district, out of 857 summoned only 56 appeared. The remainder absented themselves as a demonstration against the Russian army edict. On the same day, for some venial offense of the populace the Cossacks charged the public in the Senate square and in the adjoining streets. They used their knouts indiscriminately, and the chief sufferers were cripples, aged persons and children. Some men resisted the Cossacks and many persons on both sides were wounded.

The disturbance in Belgium, explained last week, is reported to have completely subsided. The debate in parliament on the proposed reform in suffrage qualifications, to abolish plural voting and establish manhood suffrage on the principle of "one man one vote," which began on the 16th, was continued on the 17th. There was very little excitement on the 16th, but on the two following days the excitement was intense. A move was made on the 17th to close the debate on that day, but this was so violently resisted by the Socialists that the conservatives receded, and it was unanimously agreed to fix the hour of closing debate at six o'clock on the 18th. When that hour arrived a vote was taken, and the proposal to revise the constitution by abolishing the plural vote, which gives the conservatives control in the government, although numerically they are a minority of the people, was defeated. As the vote was 84 against revision to 64 in its favor, it would appear that the Clerical or conservative party, which has 85 votes in the chamber, was practically a unit against the reform; and that all the other parties—having an aggregate of 67 votes in the chamber—were one with the Socialists in its support.

Immediately after the commencement of this vote a riot occurred at Louvain, 20 miles from Brussels. The strikers there appear to have thrown up barricades and to have invited an attack by the military, which was made with fatal results. But this occurrence and one somewhat similar at Bruges were the only indications of a serious disposition to convulse the country in civil war. The principal leader of the Socialists, M. Vanderfelde, a member of the chamber of deputies, urged pacific methods, saying that an unarmed people could not



contend with a fully equipped military force. He and other leaders of his party were waited upon on the 19th by the leaders of the Liberal party, who urged an abandonment of the general labor strike which had been called in furtherance of the suffrage movement. The suggestion was favorably received, and on the 20th the general council of labor issued a manifesto to the workmen, advising that the strike be abandoned. Accordingly work was generally resumed on the 22d. At this time some 300,000 men had struck work. The spirit of the movement and the significance of the termination of the strike are best indicated by this quotation from a newspaper interview on the 18th with M. Vandervelde:

The defeat in the chamber is a triumph for the country. What the government has arbitrarily refused today will be realized by the Belgian people to-morrow. The Catholic party ignores the popular will, and if the King be wise he will show that he is King of the Belgian people. The days for street barricades are over. We rely on moral force, and therein lies our strength.

Across the channel, and still the wearisome story of arbitrary government goes on. The English ministry have revived the old-time drastic British policy of governing Ireland. A disturbed condition in Ireland was indicated a month ago (vol. iv., p. 809), in connection with a debate in parliament on Irish landlordism. At that time, although the ministry were evidently disposed to put down the United Irish league, the opinion prevailed that coercion should be avoided until it could be seen whether the new land purchase bill which they were then putting through parliament would have a conciliatory effect. They seem now to have changed their policy. The chief secretary for Ireland, Mr. Wyndham, admits that there is comparative absence in Ireland of crimes against the person; but he asserts that intimidation and boycotting are intolerable. For that reason, the British government caused the lord lieutenant of Ireland to "proclaim" nine Irish counties and the cities of Cork and Waterford as under the coercion act. This he did on the 16th. It means that in these places public meetings are forbidden and trial by jury is suspended. Autocratic domination takes the place of constitutional government.

John Redmond, the Irish leader,

speaking in the commons on the 17th, denounced this action as a step in an infamous conspiracy in England to foment crime in Ireland where none now exists. He entreated the ministry to recede from their arbitrary policy, but warned them that if they continued it they would be met face to face and with blow for blow. A call for sympathy and support from the Irish in America has been made by Redmond and Dillon.

Even at home the British ministry threatens unjust exactions and is arousing in consequence a widespread bitterness of public sentiment. For one thing the education bill now before parliament would compel non-conformists to pay direct taxes for the support of denominational schools. To protest against this measure an enormous mass meeting was held at St. James's Hall on the 14th, at which prominent men, including clergymen and members of parliament, declared their determination to resist if the measure passes.

But the tariff tax on breadstuffs, proposed by the ministry, as reported last week, is creating most excitement throughout the country. On the "budget," which included this measure, the ministry applied the closure in the Commons on the 23d, and the bill was thereupon passed by a vote of 283 to 197. In the course of the debate the chancellor of the exchequer predicted that the advance in the price of bread, which had been from one cent to two cents a loaf higher since the budget announcement, would decline as soon as trade had adjusted itself to the new conditions.

Peace negotiations in the South African war, for the prosecution of which these food taxes in Great Britain are imposed, have come to no conclusion beyond a decision of the Boer leaders to submit terms of peace to their followers in the field. Press dispatches—which, however, cannot be relied upon, owing to the British censorship—told on the 17th of a hitch in the negotiations at Pretoria. The same untrustworthy source of information gave out on the 18th that Great Britain had refused on the 16th to modify its offered terms, and that on the 17th a basis of peace was agreed upon. It then came out authoritatively on the 18th, through Mr. Balfour on the floor of the Commons, that arrange-

ments for a Boer referendum had been made. Mr. Balfour said:

In conformity with the pledge I gave to the House a day or two ago, it will be proper for me to say that Lord Milner and Lord Kitchener, while refusing an armistice on military grounds, have agreed to give facilities for the election and meeting of representatives of the various commandos to consider the position. The Boer leaders have left Pretoria to carry out this plan. It is not expected that communication will be resumed in less than three weeks.

The Boer leaders left Pretoria at nine o'clock at night on the 18th. Their departure is regarded in Boer circles in Amsterdam as evidence not of a coming settlement through the referendum, but of a collapse of the peace negotiations.

Meanwhile military operations are not stayed, except that the British say they are obligated not to attack the Boers on the days set apart for the referendum. A fight is reported on the 11th in which the British lost 1 killed and 4 dangerously wounded. In two others, on the 20th, their loss was 6 killed and 17 wounded. A large inclosing movement by Gen. Hamilton was reported on the 22d as having been concluded, but results were not given.

The investigation into the facts regarding the British army supply post at Port Chalmette, near New Orleans (p. 9), which Col. Crowder of the U. S. army began about two weeks ago, under orders from President Roosevelt, was concluded on the 19th; and on the 21st Col. Crowder made an informal report to the President. He is understood to be preparing his official report. The nature of his findings has not been disclosed. It has been variously reported, in some papers as in favor of the British and in others as against them.

Another gigantic trust, in process of formation for more than a year (vol. iv., pp. 56, 73, 697), is authoritatively announced as completed. It is a combination of six of the leading trans-Atlantic steamer lines—the White Star, with world wide connections; the Dominion, to Liverpool London and the Mediterranean; the Leyland, to Liverpool; the Atlantic Transport, to London; the American, to Southampton; and the Red Star, to Antwerp. The organizer, of course is Mr. Morgan. The merger was predicted

early in the year, but the Cunard line, which was then named as part of the combination, has not been secured. The negotiations were interrupted in March by the British government on the basis of its subsidies; but on the 18th of April the accomplishment of the plans was announced. In addition to the lines actually in this combination, The Hamburg-American and the North German Lloyd have entered into a harmonious agreement, while maintaining their independent management. The capitalization of the trust as announced on the 22d is to be \$60,000,000 preferred 6 per cent. stock, \$60,000,000 common stock, and \$50,000,000 4½ per cent. bonds. Its general plan is to be similar to that of the steel trust, each line managing its own internal affairs and the general policy of all being directed by a central corporation organized in New Jersey and owning a majority of the stock in each of the subsidiary corporations.

American politics, in so far as the subject is of general interest, centers for the moment in Ohio, where the Republican majority in the legislature is passing what are known as "ripper" bills. The object of these bills is to limit local self-government as much as possible, especially in Toledo, under Mayor Jones, and in Cleveland, under Mayor Johnson. By this legislation Mayor Jones has been deprived of his authority over the police department and had his mayoral functions in other respects curtailed. Prior to the passage of the "ripper" bill he said in an open letter to the people of Toledo:

The people of Toledo have indorsed by their votes, as plainly as they can, the management of the police department, but it is not satisfactory to the machine politicians and the elementary school men of politics, and finding themselves unable to subvert the will of the people at the ballot box it seems that they now seek to do so by resorting to the legislature. But their efforts will fail there as they have failed at the ballot box, for if this bill becomes a law the people will see that the machine and the men responsible for it are incompetent to serve them in a public capacity and are therefore retired to the narrower walks of private life.

Upon retiring from police management after the passage of the "ripper" law, Mayor Jones addressed the police force. Referring to this law he said:

The statement that the change was made to take the department out of

politics is such a cheap bit of fraud that it will not fool anyone. But good will come out of this assault on the people's rights. Home rule seems to be dethroned, but it is only for a time.

Similar hostility has been displayed toward Cleveland since Mayor Johnson has been in office. That city is organized on the federal plan (vol. iv., p. 579), with a mayor and a cabinet of his own selection, all having a voice but not a vote in the city council, and each member of the cabinet being the responsible head of a city executive department. This system has been in operation for ten years or more, but now it is attacked in the Supreme Court by the attorney general, Mr. Sheets, as unconstitutional. The case has been advanced by the court and unless postponed will be argued in a few days. Collateral to this court proceeding are several "ripper" bills in the legislature, none of them introduced by a member from Cleveland or even of Cuyahoga county, in which Cleveland is situated. One of these bills aims to abolish the local taxation machinery, which the mayor now controls, and to place Cleveland taxation under the control of a board to be appointed by the state board of equalization, which is composed of the attorney general and other state officials. Another would take the city parks out of the hands of the city administration and place them in the control of a special board to be appointed by county officials. On the 16th the Democratic caucus of the lower house gave notice to the Republicans that unless the various "ripper" bills were withdrawn the Democrats would vote against the appropriation bills. As a two-thirds vote is required to pass the latter, this threat, carried out, would defeat them. On the 17th the general appropriation bill was so defeated; and to this the Republicans responded by passing the Cleveland park board "ripper" bill, refusing by a strict party vote to insert a referendum clause referring the question to the people of Cleveland. At present the contest has developed no further.

#### NEWS NOTES.

—Frank R. Stockton, the novelist, author of "The Lady or the Tiger," died on the 20th at Washington at the age of 68 years.

—It is estimated that 500 persons were killed in Guatemala last week by earthquakes which shook the whole republic.

—An explosion of tons of dynamite in a military barracks at Managua, Nicaragua, on the 20th destroyed the building and every officer and soldier in it—from 100 to 200.

—The Liberal Democratic Party has been organized in New York and is to hold a state convention at Cooper Union, New York city, June 7. It opposes the Democratic leadership of ex-Gov. Hill.

—Clarence Moeller, well known in Chicago for many years in connection with the single-tax movement, died on the 22d of blood poisoning resulting from the lancing of a carbuncle. He was 45 years old.

—The City of Pittsburg, bound from Cincinnati to Memphis, with 100 passengers and a crew of 75 on board, burned to the water line in less than half an hour on the 20th near Cairo. From 60 to 70 lives were lost.

—The annual conference of the Women's National Single Tax league of the United States is to be held in New York city June 12, 13 and 14. The preliminary arrangements are in charge of the president, Mrs. John S. Crosby, 7 West 108th street, New York.

—An immense Altgeld memorial meeting was held in the Auditorium at Chicago on the 20th. George A. Schilling presided, and the other speakers were Capt. W. P. Black, Bishop Spalding, Clarence S. Darrow, Lee Meriwether, of St. Louis, and John J. Lentz, of Ohio.

—The application of the state of Washington for leave to bring suit originally in the Supreme Court of the United States to restrain the merger of the northwestern railroads (p. 27) was granted on the 21st, and process will be allowed returnable at the opening of the next term, in October.

—The suit brought by the state of Minnesota in her own courts to restrain the merger of the northwestern railroads (p. 27) was removed on the 18th by the railroads to the United States Circuit Court. A motion to remand it is to be made by the state, upon which it is expected to secure a decision on some technical questions of jurisdiction and thus free the case of all obstacles to a trial on its merits.

—The statistics of exports and imports of the United States for the nine months ending March 31, 1902, as given by the March treasury sheet, are as follows (M. standing for merchandise, G. for gold and S. for silver):

	Exports.	Imports.	Balance.
M ...	\$1,090,596,263	\$678,361,132	\$402,237,131 exp
G ....	42,664,049	44,646,724	881,675 imp
S ....	38,384,206	22,421,043	16,563,163 exp
	\$1,163,246,518	\$745,327,899	\$417,918,619

—The Supreme Court of Nebraska sustained on the 23d a mandamus proceeding requiring the city council of Omaha, acting as the board of tax equalization, to increase the tax

valuations of the street railway, gas, electric light and telephone companies so as to equalize them with the tax valuations of other property. The market value of corporate stock having a market value is referred to as the basis for arriving at the taxable value of intangibles. The proceedings were instituted by the Omaha Real Estate exchange.

### PRESS OPINIONS.

#### THE PHILIPPINE ATROCITIES.

Duluth News-Tribune (Rep.), Apr. 21.—It is impossible to be bound by the rules of civilized war in fighting such savages as slaughtered our defenseless soldiers in Samar.

Columbus Evening Press (Dem.), Apr. 18.—Tardy justice is at last becoming aroused to the atrocities committed in the Philippines in the name of "Christian civilization," but which are really murder by wholesale.

Omaha World-Herald (Dem.), Apr. 18.—The fact is the American people have been deliberately and persistently deceived concerning affairs in the Philippine islands. More and more it becomes evident that if half the truth were known a very general protest would be made against the Philippine policy.

Chicago Evening Post (Rep.), Apr. 23.—The conditions of Philippine warfare may or may not be understood here. It is more essential that the conditions here shall be understood at Manila. The American people will not tolerate Weyerism, torture and savagery. No "conditions" will be held to justify these.

Johnstown Democrat (Dem.), Apr. 15.—The people of this country are not properly represented by the person occupying the White House nor by the pliant tools of his who have joined in the conspiracy of silence to keep from public gaze the story of infamy contained in the official dispatches from the Philippines.

The Nation (Ind.), Apr. 17.—Mr. Root is greatly mistaken if he thinks the airs of a Russian bureaucrat are in place, or will be tolerated, in the conduct of his department. It is not for him to decide what information it is advisable for the American people to be allowed to have, in making up their minds on this whole question.

Farmers' Voice and National Rural (agr.), Apr. 19.—The stories of atrocities committed by American troops in the Philippines which are coming, not from the enemies of the army, not from anti-imperialists, but from army and navy officers themselves, are of a nature so revolting and so terrible as to be beyond belief were they not so well authenticated.

San Francisco Star (Dem.), Apr. 19.—The fact that the great dailies are just beginning to tell the truth about the use of torture in the Philippines, and that the Senate committee has only now begun to investigate the horror, should not make good men and women forget that the matter has been exploited for months in the press of every country in Europe.

Buffalo Enquirer (Ind.), Apr. 15.—Hereafter we shall not be able to protest, with good grace, against the savageries perpetrated upon weak races by monarchies and empires. We have shown to the world that we can not only prove false to our traditional constitutional principles, but can kill and burn as ruthlessly as the nations over which we have always assumed to be superior in mercy and morals.

Buffalo Courier (Dem.), Apr. 16.—While a few overzealous newspaper advocates of expansion are attempting by a sophistry which offends all moral principle to justify the murder of prisoners and the practice of torture in the Philippines, the gov-

ernment shows that it recognizes and fears the storm of public indignation which has been caused by the recent lifting of the veil which covered the horrors of the iniquitous war in those islands.

Dubuque Telegraph-Herald (Dem.), Apr. 21.—The Senate committee's investigation of the Philippine war is bringing forcibly to the public mind the inhuman cruelties practiced on the Filipinos, the gross negligence attending the conduct of the war, the exorbitant expenditures made for the transport service, and the utter uselessness of our effort to saddle on an unwilling people a yoke of government they have battled against for upwards of three hundred years.

City and State (Ind.), Apr. 17.—After the terrible disclosures of the past week—the unearthing of the long-buried Tayabas report, with its story of unreported famine, torture, disease and death—no less radical a step than the retirement of the high official who is directly responsible for keeping the country in ignorance of such facts and for the bold, unhesitating denial that any such existed, will satisfy the conscientious and thinking voters of the country when they come to a full knowledge of what Secretary Root has done and the significance of his conduct. He will be too heavy a load for any administration to carry on its shoulders when it goes before the country for approval of its course, and asks a new four years' lease of power. We teach our boys that truth and candor are the first and most necessary elements of an honorable and solid character. We must not reverse that principle when we deal with a high and exceptionally able public official.

#### PRESS CENSORSHIP AT MANILA.

Los Angeles Herald (Rep.), Apr. 17 (weekly ed.).—The editor of the Daily Freedom was arrested for sedition because he republished an article from an American periodical with which his own opinions agreed. He also charged that the Philippine commission had appointed to high office Filipinos who are notoriously corrupt. The editors of the Volcano were arrested for demanding the removal of a certain judge. These editors may have been wrong; the conditions are different from those prevailing in the United States; but we are departing too far from the fundamental principles of liberty when officials appointed by our government at Washington are permitted to exercise such despotic authority.

#### PEACE IN SOUTH AFRICA.

Manchester Guardian (Lib.), Apr. 12.—The abandonment of the idea of independence and separate national existence is, we take it, the primary condition of any terms of peace; that one point conceded, the English people are prepared to go far to secure peace. We have still to see whether the Boer leaders will go so far; if they do, we ought not to let minor questions hinder the final settlement which we are so anxious to reach. Almost every other point is of minor significance in comparison with this fundamental concession: on the part of the Boers—the abandonment of their ideal of separate national existence in South Africa.

London Daily News (Lib.), Apr. 2.—Are we prepared to offer terms which will secure "peace with honor" for both sides? Or shall we continue in the old, bad way of peace plus humiliation for the enemy? If, defiant of all past experience, we choose the latter, we must make up our minds to the continuance of the dreary tragedy through another year. . . . There is a special reason why the government should seek to bring hostilities to a close without delay. The coronation is approaching. It should be a time of national rejoicing; but the spirit of joy cannot coexist with the spirit of war.

#### CUBA.

Springfield Republican (Ind.), Apr. 18.—It is not independence, but "autonomy" that

Cuba will get, although independence was promised. And "suzerain" is the right word to describe the relations to exist between the two governments after May 20. But a country that has a suzerain isn't an independent nation by a good deal. The actual conditions may as well be recognized.

#### DAVID B. HILL.

Kansas City World (Ind.), Apr. 20.—Not since the days of Thurlow Weed and the Albany regency has there been in this land a more perfect adept in the art of machine politics, not excepting Boss Platt, than David B. Hill. It is entirely fit that such a man should be the idol of the reorganizers. They are little more than galvanized Republicans. People who think in the main with Bryan would prefer an out and out Republican president to Hill or Gorman.

#### OHIO POLITICS.

Cleveland Waechter and Anzeiger (Dem.), Apr. 15.—Rev. Herbert S. Bigelow, of Cincinnati, one of the foremost reformers of the state of Ohio, has the support of Mayor Johnson for the Democratic nomination for secretary of state. He has ours as well. The Democratic party of Ohio, in so far as it really wants to bring about reforms, could not wish for a better man.

### IN CONGRESS.

This report is an abstract of the Congressional Record, the official report of congressional proceedings. It includes all matters of general interest and closes with the last issue of the Record at hand upon going to press. Page references are to the pages of Vol. 35 of that publication.

Washington, April 14-19, 1902.

#### Senate.

Consideration of the Chinese exclusion bill (S. bill 2,960) was resumed on the 14th. Mr. McLaurin, of South Carolina (p. 4,348), and Mr. Foraker (p. 4,350) being the principal speakers on that day, and Mr. Heitfield (p. 4,410), Mr. Pritchard (p. 4,413), Mr. Gallinger (p. 4,413), Mr. Mallory (p. 4,416), Mr. Penrose (p. 4,417), Mr. Turner (p. 4,425), and Mr. Spooner (p. 4,428) on the 15th. Mr. Turner began the debate on the 16th (p. 4,467), being followed by Mr. Patterson (p. 4,470), Mr. Hanna (p. 4,471), Mr. Fairbanks (p. 4,473), Mr. Stewart (p. 4,476), Mr. Quay (p. 4,476), Mr. Mallory (p. 4,476), and Mr. Elkins (p. 4,477). Voting then began. Mr. Lodge's amendment regarding Chinese sailors (p. 4,475) was agreed to, 47 to 29 (p. 4,479). Various other amendments were voted on (pp. 4,479-4,508), and finally Mr. Platt's (of Conn.) amendment (p. 4,497), offered as a substitute for the bill as reported from the committee, as itself amended (p. 4,504-06), was adopted (p. 4,506)-48 to 33. The Platt substitute thus adopted becoming the bill before the Senate, it was passed (p. 4,509)-76 to 1. The Senate then agreed to proceed (p. 4,509) to the consideration of the bill (S. bill No. 2,236) providing a civil government for the Philippines, which, however, was temporarily laid aside on the 17th to enable the Senate to consider House bill 3,031 for the exclusion of the Chinese. This bill was thereupon amended (p. 4,540) by striking out all after the enacting clause and inserting in lieu thereof of the language of the Senate bill on the same subject as passed the day before. The Philippine bill was taken up on the 18th and read by sections (pp. 4,574 to 4,586), but there was no debate upon it. On the 19th (p. 4,652) it was temporarily considered, and a number of private bills and other measures of no general interest were disposed of. Memorial addresses (p. 4,588) on the late Senator Kyle filled out the remainder of the day and closed the work of the week.

#### House.

On the 14th, after adopting the report of the conference committee on the postal appropriation bill (p. 4,326), the House resumed consideration in committee of the whole of House bill 12,755, reciprocity with Cuba (p. 4,326), Mr. McCall (p. 4,326), Mr. Robertson (p. 4,326) and Mr. Brantley (p. 4,326) being the principal debaters. Its consideration was suspended to allow the consideration of the urgent deficiency bill (p. 4,332), which was passed; but on the 15th it was again resumed (p. 4,436), the speakers being Mr. Swanson (p. 4,437), Mr. Dayton, (4,437), Mr. Smith (4,439), Mr. White

(4,438) and Mr. Burgess (p. 4,439), Mr. Myer (p. 4,443) and Mr. Sutherland (p. 4,443). An agreement was reached on the 16th, 163 to 124 (pp. 4,457-58), to close general debate on this bill on the 18th at three o'clock, upon the announcement of which the general debate continued, speeches being made by Mr. Roberts (p. 4,469), Mr. Bartlett (p. 4,469), Mr. Patterson (p. 4,469), Mr. Corless (p. 4,461), Mr. Brownard (p. 4,461), Mr. Bell (p. 4,461), and Mr. Cochran (p. 4,461). The same debate continuing on the 17th. Mr. Jenkins (p. 4,544), Mr. De Armond (p. 4,554), Mr. Cushman (p. 4,554), Mr. Pierce (p. 4,554), Mr. Kitchin (p. 4,554), Mr. Gardner (p. 4,554), Mr. Jones (p. 4,554), Mr. Douglass (p. 4,554), Mr. Loud (p. 4,554), and Mr. Lacey occupied the day. When the committee of the whole rose a message from the President transmitting the correspondence with the governor of Louisiana relative to shipments of British war supplies from New Orleans was received and referred to the committee on foreign affairs (p. 4,555). On the 18th the Cuban reciprocity bill was again under discussion in committee of the whole, Mr. Richardson (p. 4,592), Mr. Fordney (p. 4,592), Mr. Norton (p. 4,592), Mr. Hepburn (p. 4,594), Mr. Tawney (p. 4,595), Mr. Dalzell (p. 4,595), Mr. Payne (p. 4,591), Mr. Littlefield (p. 4,602), Mr. Grow (p. 4,602), Mr. Richardson (p. 4,602), Mr. Grosvenor (p. 4,603), Mr. Lacey (p. 4,602), Mr. De Armond (p. 4,604), Mr. Olmsted (p. 4,604), Mr. Morris (p. 4,605), and Mr. Newlands (p. 4,609) being the principal speakers. The bill was reported favorably at the end of the debate (p. 4,610), and when it came before the House (p. 4,610) an amendment, changing the tariff on all refined sugars was adopted, against the opposition of the dominant party, by a vote of 199 to 105. As thus amended the bill passed (p. 4,611) by a vote of 247 to 62. The fortification appropriation bill was passed on the 19th (p. 4,679), on which day also the conference report on the legislative, executive and judicial appropriation bill was agreed to (p. 4,881).

**Record Notes.**—Speeches by Representatives Grosvenor (p. 4,313), Henry (p. 4,319), Shafroth (p. 4,443), Long (p. 4,369), Prince (p. 4,390), McCall (p. 4,394), Bell (p. 4,515), Sutherland (p. 4,560), Smith (p. 4,562), Meyer (p. 4,618), Cushman (p. 4,621), Douglas (p. 4,629), Lacey (p. 4,632), and De Armond (p. 4,633), on reciprocity with Cuba; by Senators Pritchard (p. 4,462), and Stewart (p. 4,511), Representatives Cromer (p. 4,338), Foster (p. 4,514), and Olmsted (p. 4,518), on Chinese exclusion; by Representatives White (p. 4,455) and Gaines (p. 4,536) on the Philippine policy; and by Senator Morgan (p. 4,523) on the isthmian canal.

An article on the Philippine policy, by Charles Denby, member of the first Philippine commission, is printed at page 4,336; and a letter from Wu Ting-fang on Chinese exclusion, at page 4,363. This letter is followed at page 4,465 by a petition on the same subject from the American Federation of Labor. At page 4,490 there is a long extract from Smith's "China in Convulsion," describing the events of the siege of Peking.

The text of the Senate bill on Chinese exclusion, as substituted for the House bill, appears at page 4,543.

## MISCELLANY

### CHAMBERLAIN.

Joe Chamberlain, whom just men justly loathe,  
I pity thee. Life is so short a loan  
And hard to struggling men, I pity both  
The sad-eyed herd and him who makes them moan.  
Instead of coming from this short life's span  
A glory which all after ones could bless,  
As one who clearer made the rights of man  
And lifted somewhat of their wretchedness,  
Thou hast played butcher. England made a shame  
And stench, showed naked her decayed old age,  
And torn her banner into shreds of blame;  
With others' blood writ, "Coward," on the page.

Homes burned, the helpless starved, and babes stillborn—

Time chisels for thy tomb one vast word—"Scorn!"

Truth hath a snowy wing will mount to heaven—

A crystal eye she hath to fathom hell.  
Man cannot slay her, and her sacred leaven  
Shall work until all things on earth be well.

Then in the radiance from the eyes of Truth

The world will shine; things will no longer seem,

But naked stand in neither spite nor ruth,  
And straightened be the tangle of our dream.

Then smoking veldt and burning house shall be

Again ablaze. The unkempt Boer shall stand

Above his starved wife and dead babes three,

His rough cheeks wet, Christ's Bible in his hand,

And he shall write in blood above the slain,

"Thief — Liar — Coward — Joseph Chamberlain."

Then, O my country, how shall you be shamed!

Who call yourself the "Land of Liberty,"  
Who held a strong white hand unto the maimed,

The bleeding and those struggling to be free,

Whose boast it was your soaring trumpet voice

In warning sounded as a giant's tones

Wherever chains still clanked their dreadful noise,

Or despots wrung from babes and women moans.

What will you say, my country, when all's done

And God himself upon the sky doth write  
Your just decree as falls the angry sun?

How will you hide your hands, no longer white?

Are you made coward by your guilty wrong,

Or shame? Was Spain so weak? Is England strong?

Let not some crazed fanatic strike him down

For God is sure though slow his dials turn,  
And surely bring they, in resistless round,  
To each what wage his little life hath earned.

Let him live on. The fleshless hand of Time

Shall taint upon his forehead, black as night,

Great letters telling his ignoble crime,  
Then thrust him forward in historic light  
Where all the world may read and none forget

These words: "He tried to hide his guilt,  
he swore

Most false. He plotted war. His hand was wet

With blood. The harlot's golden crown he wore.

He stabbed at Freedom's breast. He planned to rob

A people of their hard-built homes, their lives.

With Bloody Kitchener made one great sob

Go up through all the land from babes and wives."

Thus Chamberlain the thief is crucified,

And thus shall hang—till time itself hath died.

England, I marvel for that you should pour  
Your treasure and your blood for common thieves

Like Chamberlain and Rhodes. The sturdy Boer

You may subdue, but bound in bloody sheaves

Will be a harvest you shall surely reap  
Of retribution, wasting moans, and blood;

For though the laws of justice seem to sleep,

They never sleep, but like the ocean's flood

They creep up to the water mark of God,  
And when they ebb there is but silent slime.

There waits above thee, England, brand and rod

Held in the iron fists of frowning Time,  
Biding in patience when the blow shall fall,

And through the gloom I see a nation's fall.

—C. E. S. Wood, in the Boston Pilot of April 6.

### CECIL RHODES'S GIFT—WASHINGTON'S WILL.

Cecil Rhodes in his last will and testament bestows upon the young men of America that which, to a superficial reader, seems to be a most magnificent gift. To each state and territory in the United States he gives two scholarships in Oxford university, England; states the conditions plainly in estimated order; places third in order, below the accomplishments of "cricket, football and the like," the qualities of manhood, truth, courage, devotion to duty, protection of the weak, etc., to young men capable of meeting the conditions named in the will.

The gift means simply this: Foreign education for the flower of American youth; an imbibing of alien ideas, customs and rules for living; being saturated with all foreign prejudices, thus to return home to disseminate and put in practice those monstrous, Old-World traditions it has cost this country so many years, so much bloodshed and money to overthrow; casting America backward into the yoke of four centuries ago.

Cecil Rhodes aimed at the very heart of things in this cunning and dangerous gift. Such deep and profound subtlety is seldom known. Such bold temerity in extending so unique and enticing an offer as that contained in the "document" is without a precedent.

It is safe to say, he would not have made such a preposterous proposition to take effect during his own lifetime, and every right-thinking and feeling American should at once denounce and reject the gift as a bold and unheard of affront to our immortal Washington whose will is therein assailed and insulted.

The great President, who loved his country better than life itself, thus speaks on the present subject, which was of colossal importance to his mind. Extract from will:

In the name of God. Amen.

I, George Washington, of Mount Vernon, a citizen of the United States, and lately president of the same, \* \* \* do make my last will and testament. It has always been a source of serious regret with me to see the youth of these United States sent to foreign countries for the purpose of education, often before their minds were formed, or they had imbibed any adequate ideas of the happiness of their own; contracting too frequently, not only habits of dissipation and extravagance, but principles unfriendly to republican government and to the true and genuine liberties of mankind, which thereafter are rarely overcome, etc., etc.

Under these impressions so fully dilated, I give and bequeath in perpetuity the 50 shares which I hold in the Potomac company toward the endowment of a university, to be established within the limits of the District of Columbia, etc. The hundred shares which I hold in the James River company, I have given and now confirm in perpetuity, to and for the use of Liberty hall academy, Virginia, to which the youth of talent from all parts may be sent for the completion of their education in acquiring knowledge in the principles of politics and good government, and as a matter of infinite importance, in my judgment, in associating with each other and joining friendships in juvenile years, etc.

Mr. Washington is dead, and cannot confront so menacing a calamity as the gift of the late Cecil Rhodes, but there should be some in his stead who could reject it for the future well-being of our American education and perpetuity of our present government.

—Evelyn Baker Dodd, in Louisville Courier-Journal of Apr. 13.

#### OLEO-SHODDY.

For The Public.

To the Editor: I am stirred up to the point where I must ask your opinion about the pending shoddy bill.

I am moved to this indiscretion by a communication received by me a few days since from my friend, Ol. Gawl, who lives out in the sheep districts.

In order to get a clear understanding of the matter, and not to miss any fine points, it will be well to say that Gawl came from one of the first families and started out to be a lawyer. He came very near graduating from the high school, but a difference of opinion as to the matter of spelling between him and the authorities drove him from the schools out into the distant suburbs, and the sheep business. To illustrate his sterling independence, in some things, it would be well to say that he always spells his name All. Gall, and when he writes about the shoddy business, he says it is a

F-R-O-D. That's what stirred me up to look into the matter of shoddy.

If he had been of a meek and subservient disposition and spelled things out in a conventional way I should not have been affected at all, but when I learned that the laboring classes were not paying as much for their wool as they ought to pay on account of this shoddy F-R-O-D, my indignation was at once aroused and I looked into it.

It is astonishing to me to find out what the laboring people will endure, without complaint.

According to Gawl the shoddy people take all sorts of old woolen goods and tear them up and work them over and put them through an acid bath and a scouring tub and other "Frodyulent" processes, until there is nothing left but some pure clean wool, and then they take this wool and card it over and mix it with some new wool, and make it into some cloth that is so like the cloth made from new wool and new cotton that even the expert is puzzled to tell the difference.

And this shoddy cloth looks about as well as other kinds of cloth and wears pretty near as well, and don't cost near as much as the cloth that is all new wool and half cotton. Here is where the F-R-O-D comes in. The laboring classes get some clothing cheaper than they ought to get it, and the wool industry is thus "defrodded" of a large part of the protection that the tariff laws designed to give them.

The remarkable thing in the matter is the utter indifference of the laboring classes about shoddy.

We can't learn that a single anti-shoddy meeting has been held by workmen anywhere, or that a single resolution has been passed by a trade union condemning this F-R-O-D on them and the protective tariff. They seem perfectly contented to wear some cheap and warm clothing, even if it prevents the wool men from growing as big and opulent as the federal steel and the sugar trusts.

But Ol. Gawl says they will be saved from this disgrace of wearing cheap clothing in spite of their indifference. A wise and benevolent congress sits at Washington to look out for just such things as this. If there's any industry with sufficient political influence, threatened with a diminution of profits, all that is necessary for it to do is to present to their beneficent intelligence in congress such a law as they want and they get it.

In this case Ol. says they want the F-R-O-D labeled. They want it labeled, however, for the benefit of the

laboring classes, and not for the increased price and increased demand that they expect to come to the wool industry. There never was a greater libel written anywhere than the libel which attributes mercenary motives to the advocates of the shoddy label bill and the oleo tax bill. It is possible that the advocates of a tariff on steel and sugar and lumber and a few other things are somewhat mercenary. It is likely they are. Human nature is weak, and might naturally fall and stumble when it comes to see the profits in steel and sugar and lumber tariffs, but when it comes to the shoddy and the oleo business the motives are absolutely pure, and the design of this kind of legislation is the prevention of F-R-O-D upon the laboring classes.

But Ol. Gawl says the shoddy bill does not go far enough. There is no doubt in his mind of the power of congress to make men honest by passing a law. The trouble is to get the law strong enough.

He wants the manufacturers forced to weave their own condemnation right into the cloth. Labels with percentages of shoddy may be removed, and percentages may be wrong, but if they are compelled to weave the word F-R-O-D right into the body of the cloth the job is done.

Then F-R-O-D would be imprinted all over the man that wanted to wear a cheap coat on a cheap pair of trousers. Even a tramp would disdain to go around the country with F-R-O-D stamped on his coat collar, or on the broad part of his trousers. Thus the pride of even the poorest of our people would come to the assistance of the Wool Growers' association in promoting honesty and wiping out F-R-O-D.

But the thing that touches my heart and revives my faith in humanity is the pure benevolence and the absolutely disinterested philanthropy of my friend Ol. Gawl and his patriots in the wool districts.

I have never heard of anything like it—not since the days of Robin Hood, who distributed the spoils taken from the rich travelers among the poor of England. Yours very respectfully,

JACKSON BIGGLES.

"Well, it wouldn't have made any difference even if the Middle-of-the-Road Populists hadn't already become extinct."

"How so?"

"Why, by this time they would all have been run over by automobiles."—Life.



## OUR TIRED IMPERIALISM.

Chancellor Von Buelow alluded deprecatingly the other day to what he called the "China-fatigue" (Chinamuedigkeit) which he said had become almost epidemic in Germany. There are signs that our own imperialistic Titans are in like manner growing weary. They are "tired" of the Philippines. To talk to them about Cuba makes them look around for a spring tonic. Ask them how their permanent army of 200,000 men is getting along, where their big navy is that was going to be able to whip Germany with one hand, just how much of the Nicaragua canal is dug, in what seas are the subsidized American steamers that were to invade all markets with American goods and bring back the spoils of the ends of the earth through the open doors of our custom houses—and "that tired feeling" is painfully visible on their faces. They may be a world-power, but they look uncommonly like a world-weariness.

Such reaction and disappointment, after a gorgeous paper programme of imperialism, were inevitable. The dreams which our old men dreamed, and the visions of our young men, immediately at the close and in consequence of the Spanish war, were truly grandiose, but to translate them into reality—there was the rub. We have now been more than three years about it, and what have we to show? We think that an honest and observant foreigner, taking a survey of the United States now, and comparing it with his estimate of five years ago, would say that the more we had changed, the more we had remained the same old thing. We talked, indeed, he would say, of having entered upon a "new era," and cast off our "swaddling clothes," but there we were, in fact, just the busy and argumentative democracy we ever had been; disputing over every new step; standing up vehemently for local against imperialistic interests; and offering a dead weight of inertia in the shape of long and jealous discussion and infinite delays, for an impetuous imperialism to dash itself against vainly and in despair.

There is nothing strange or vexing about this except to those who did not foresee that it would be impossible to commit the American democracy to the new policy in a year. In reality, a decade will not suffice, nor a lifetime. Some philosopher has said that it is the common "solecism of power" to think to attain an end without employing the necessary means. Exact-

ly that was the blunder of the creators of our new world of imperialism. They had magnificent conceptions. Did not their stump-orators and their editors and platform designers construct for us a splendid course of empire? Why, we could already see the Oregon bursting through the isthmus, Manila an entrepot greater than Liverpool, and our happy colonies sending their products into the wide and free market of the United States! But they reckoned ill who left out the conflicting interests, the many congressmen of many minds, only by whose appeasing and harmonizing could the star of empire move at all. Schiller said that he could write a drama in five acts more easily than he could keep house for one day; and our imperial playwrights have found out that it is easy to sketch the plot and plan the scenario of a grand production of "Uncle Sam Emperor," but that the drudgery of the necessary governmental housekeeping is far harder.

No one need regret that the wheels of the imperial chariot have thus driven heavily. We speak not as anti-imperialists, but as plain American citizens. No matter what the sweeping new policy proposed to our people, it is a good thing to know that it takes a long time to instruct and persuade them; that they are very inquisitive, and will insist upon having their questions answered; are very cautious, and will desire to wait to see whereto this thing may grow; yes, and are very selfish, too, and will want to know where John Smith out in Ashtabula is going to be advantaged by a splendid scheme of world-empire at Washington. While we have only condemnation for the obstinate attitude of the beet sugar representatives to-day, we cannot fail to see in it a wholesome reminder to our empire mongers. Their large and easy plans of greatness have got to satisfy the vast mass of the people, the veriest "country wittlings and chaw-bacons," before they can come to enactment. It is all very well for the American orator or statesman to urge the launching of our ship of state upon proud new seas, but there will always come to him the troublesome inquiry from each of a hundred exigent local interests, in the words of the tailor to Cowper:

Say, shall my little bark attendant sail,  
Pursue the triumph and partake the gale?

It is not surprising that our extemporized imperialists are growing weary of this continued rising of

the petty interests of locality to thwart their noble schemes for the nation. Their chosen instrument, the republican party, has been for many months little more than an organization to show how not to do it, "doing nothing reduced to a system." One reason for this cooling after the first flush, this stagnation after the early energy bent on doing all in a day, is that the whole imperialistic policy now suffers from the misfortune—it has been said to be one of the greatest misfortunes of a statesman—of having appeared only "temporarily magnetic." If an orator makes only a first pleasing impression, but cannot command a long hearing, nor endure the test of meditation on his words, he can never be a leader of men. For a few months imperialism seemed to cast a glamour over the minds of Americans, but its charm diminished on examination, and its feeble and discredited operation has now well-nigh completed the disillusionment. From being weary of it, the people will soon come to think the best thing to do will be simply to "write off" the losses incurred by that folly, and begin a fresh account.—New York Evening Post, of March 17.

## MAYOR JOHNSON'S WAY.

## A RAILROAD BROUGHT TO TIME.

Mayor Johnson stated yesterday that he had received a communication from the Erie railroad to the effect that the Union street grade crossing matter had been brought to the attention of the directors, and that some action would be taken in the near future.

All former attempts of the mayor and the grade crossing commission to obtain any answer from the railroad company have been entirely futile. The matter was entirely disregarded. Recently the Erie has applied for the right to lay a switch track over old River and Seneca streets. Monday night this ordinance passed the council, but Mr. Johnson announced his intention of refusing to sign it until the Erie took some steps or made some reply in the Union street matter.

It seems that Mr. Johnson has carried his point.—Cleveland Plain Dealer of Apr. 16.

## MR. JOHNSON ON MR. HILL'S HARMONY SPEECH.

David B. Hill's harmony speech at the Jefferson dinner in New York does not meet with the approval of Mayor Johnson. The ideas of har-



mony entertained by the two Democratic leaders are greatly at variance, and when questioned upon the subject yesterday Mr. Johnson did not hesitate to state his objections to Mr. Hill's views. Mr. Johnson further stated that he considered Henry Watterson's attempt to make President Roosevelt a personal issue in the next presidential campaign to be ill advised.

"Mr. Hill's remarks in reference to limiting the capitalization and dividends of corporations is absolute folly," said Mayor Johnson. "No such method as this could be made effective in handling the great corporations. The best way to get at them is to compel them to pay their just share of the taxes, in proportion to the special privileges which they enjoy.

"In addition to this no more special privileges of any kind should be granted by the people to these corporations, unless the people can be adequately protected, and the privileges already granted should be properly regulated. Nearly all these privileges are enjoyed merely by the tacit consent of the people, and they should certainly look out carefully for their own interests in any bargains with the corporations. Mr. Hill is not favorable to these methods, and his dismissal of them as 'mere factional controversies over details,' show his hostility.

"No plans for tariff reform can be successful. The Democrats must stand for the abolishment of the tariff altogether, or else must take no steps whatever in the matter. Mr. Hill will be unable to dismiss the differences within the party as 'mere factional controversies over details.' They are grave questions of policy, and must be satisfactorily settled before there can be anything like unity.

"The real issues of the next campaign will be internal issues. We are not so much interested in the Philippines as we are in the regulation of special privileges and of reform in taxation. I am opposed to imperialism, but I am not favorable to any plan to divert the attention of citizens to outside issues when the real issues are to be found right here at home.

"This seems to be the plan of Henry Watterson in his recent statements. I think he mistakes the real issue of the time. An attempt to make one man the issue of a campaign seems to me to be unworthy, when there is so much that is more important. Mr. Watterson's

designation of President Roosevelt as the 'man on horseback' seems to me to be not entirely inapt, but it is not just now the matter of the most vital importance. It would be a small campaign which would have a man for its main issue."—Plain Dealer of Apr. 16.

#### THE WATERWORKS A PAYING INVESTMENT.

Superintendent Bemis' annual report, which will go to the printers in a few days, contains much interesting information in regard to the success of municipal ownership as exemplified by the Cleveland waterworks department. The superintendent has gone at length into the statistics to prove that the waterworks department has been a paying investment for the city, in spite of oft-repeated statements to the contrary.

Mr. Bemis set out to ascertain just how much the department has cost the city since it has been in operation, and to what extent its expenses have been paid through taxation. He finds that during the 40 years of the life of the department the city had to pay all interests on the bonds up to the year 1891, exclusive only of \$298,950.04, which was paid from the earnings of the department. The amount paid by the city prior to 1891 was \$3,940,000.

This amount practically represents the entire cost to the city of the waterworks department. As an offset to this sum Prof. Bemis shows that the money value of the water received free of charge by the city since the establishment of the department more than counterbalances this expense.

In making this calculation, Mr. Bemis lays great stress upon the water furnished for fire protection. Water used in public buildings and in schools also forms a small item.

There are a number of cities, including San Francisco, Memphis, New Orleans, Indianapolis, and Omaha, where the waterworks are not controlled by the city, but are owned by private corporations, as commercial ventures. In Indianapolis the water company charges the city \$45 for each fire hydrant per year, and in Memphis, New Orleans and Omaha, the municipality is charged \$60 for each hydrant. From all information that he could obtain, Mr. Bemis came to the conclusion that \$45 per year would be a very moderate charge in Cleveland for each hydrant.

At present there are 6,462 fire hydrants in the city. Counting up the number of hydrants the city has had yearly in operation since the establishment of the department, the superintendent estimates the number as very

close to 88,000 for one year. Multiplying this number of hydrants supplied with free water by \$45, the fair charge which would have been allowed to a private company, Mr. Bemis obtains as a result \$3,960,000, which the city has been saved in fire protection by the municipal waterworks.

During the entire 45 years the department has cost the city only \$3,940,000, so that the city, according to these figures, has been benefited directly to the extent of \$20,000 by the department. This makes no account of the free water used in public buildings and schools, which would bring the total much higher. Mr. Bemis makes the unequivocal statement that the free water used by the city is more than the equivalent of the amount paid by the taxpayers as interest on bonds. The entire maintenance of the department is always paid from its earnings.

In Detroit, where there is a municipal waterworks department, the city pays the department a fixed sum for its fire protection and other water used by the city. This enables the department to fix lower rates for private consumers. Mr. Bemis is in favor of the Detroit plan, and believes that the city should pay the waterworks department for water used for public purposes. He also advocates the placing of meters in school buildings in order to put a stop to the waste now prevalent from this source.

The superintendent estimates that the waterworks plant of Cleveland is, at the lowest calculation, worth something over \$5,000,000. There are outstanding bonds to the extent of \$2,687,000. This would reduce the total value of the plant to the neighborhood of \$5,313,000. Yet another subtraction would be for bonds to the extent of \$925,000 cancelled by the city in the years 1878-1881. Calculating the interest on this amount up to the present day, makes the amount come to \$1,739,000. Subtracting this from the \$5,313,000 total value of the plant, leaves \$3,574,000 as the absolute minimum for the present market value of the waterworks.

In making this estimate Mr. Bemis has not allowed for the taxes which would have been paid to the city by a private corporation, but, he says, judging from the amounts paid by the street railways and the gas companies this would form a very inconsiderable item.

Mr. Bemis concludes that the great advantages of municipal ownership of the waterworks are two in number:

First—It enables the city to furnish

the water at lower rates and is a paying investment for the city.

Second—It has lessened the temptation for the corruption of the city government.

"A great franchise in private hands," says Prof. Bemis, "causes a constant tendency to corrupt the council. To protect its interests the corporations constantly seek to secure the election of weak men who may be controlled or purchased."—Plain Dealer of Apr. 20.

**RUBAIYAT OF MOVING DAY.**

The moving-van man comes, and having hit

The mirror on the door a little bit  
He passés on—nor any paste or glue  
Can ever make a good glass out of it.

At drowsy twilight cometh one who saith:

"Th' scrubbin's done, an' I am tired to death!"

What is that subtle perfume in the air?  
It is the cook, with onion on her breath.

The singer of the daffodil has sung,  
And from his music barrel pulled the bung.

The joke about the bonnet has appeared,  
And thus we know that gentle spring has sprung.

—Baltimore American.

Rimer—Did you read the quatrain of mine in "Scribbler's"?

Dubley—Why—er—I didn't get time to read it all, but the first part of it was very clever.—Philadelphia Record.

I am not aware that any community has a right to force another to be civilized—John Stuart Mill.

**BOOK NOTICES.**

In "Ocean to Ocean" (Chicago: A. C. McClurg & Co.), J. W. G. Walker, U. S. N., takes advantage of an opportunity, offered him in 1898 by a trip to Nicaragua made in the service of the Nicaragua Canal Commission, to describe the Nicaragua country, its physical conditions and history, and incidentally to bring out the adaptability to canal purposes of the Nicaragua route. The geographical descriptions are assisted by several small maps on a large scale; and by weaving the information he gives into a narrative of his trip and personal experiences, the author augments the readableness of his book. A very full and clear idea is given of the conditions with reference to the desirability of the Nicaragua route for the great canal. Among other things there is an

**Volume IV. of The Public**

Complete Volumes, including index, sent post paid at Regular Subscription price, \$1.00.

BOUND VOLUMES, PRICE, \$2.00, will be ready for delivery about May 1. Express charges to be paid by consignee. Address, PUBLIC PUBLISHING CO., Box 687, Chicago.

account of all the Isthmian canal projects past and present, together with minute descriptions of the Nicaragua route and lucid explanations of the diplomatic problems relating to the subject. Besides an outline history of the people, an extended story of the career of William Walker the filibuster, is given. Entirely apart from its value as a contribution to popular knowledge on the canal question, "Ocean to Ocean" is worth reading simply as a book of travel in Central America.

While also interesting as a story of travel, Henry I. Sheldon's "Notes on the Nicaragua Canal" (Chicago: A. C. McClurg & Co., 3d ed. with new preface) is an extended brief in general advocacy of an Isthmian canal and in particular support of the Nicaragua project. It is notable for its high commercial flavor. "Art for the sake of art" has here its complement in the field of business—"commerce for the sake of commerce." Doubtless Mr. Sheldon, somewhere in the recesses of his inner consciousness, realizes that commerce is a means to an end; but his readers will not be apt to suspect it. All his emphasis appears to rest upon the idea of commerce as an end in itself. He is an enthusiastic connoisseur, with commerce as his art and the Nicaragua canal as its concrete expression. It is needless to say that a book written with so much enthusiasm, by a personal investigator whose mind never wanders from the main question, is an interesting production, nor that it is a valuable one if the fact of its enthusiastic partisanship be kept in view when consulting it.

**PERIODICALS.**

—The Whim (Newark, N. J., box 228; Price, 50 cents annually), the little monthly magazine of which Ernest Crosby and Benedict Prieth are editors, is an interesting and helpful publication, principally, we suspect, because it departs so thoroughly from the policy it lays down for itself. When anything, magazine or man, determines "to confine itself to no particular set of ideas" but "steadfastly to seek after Light and Truth even if it grope and stumble in so doing," much groping and stumbling and fumbling and but little Light and Truth may be expected of it. But the Whim belies its declaration. It goes straight for a particular set of ideas, a good set, too—as any magazine edited by Ernest Crosby would have to—and it neither "seeks" nor "gropes" nor "stumbles," nor fumbles, as the April number amply testifies. Notwithstanding the precept it lays down for itself, it acts upon the wholesome principle that no one has a call to do his thinking out loud. It is only when he has a truth or thinks he has, when he sees a star or thinks he does, that he has any business to bother other people with his gropings about the matter. Magazines may be useful as vehicles for editorial thoughts, but there is no place for them as instruments for editorial ruminating; and in its practice Whim acts fully up to this doctrine.

**PEACE OR WAR IN SOUTH AFRICA.**

This able non-partisan book by a London publisher, A. M. S. Methuen, which was referred to in a note at page 3 of this year's PUBLIC,

**WILL BE SENT FREE**

TO ANY SUBSCRIBER TO

**THE PUBLIC**

on receipt of 5 cents to cover postage and other mailing expenses. Address:

THE PUBLIC, Box 687, CHICAGO, ILL.

**WANTED**—Foreman for factory making general Builders' Mill Work. High-Grade Interior Finish, Bank Office and Store Fixtures. Must have experience and references. Address J. S. MAOLEAN, Columbus, Ohio.

**The Public**

is a weekly review which prints in concise and plain terms, with lucid explanations and without editorial bias, all the news of the world of historical value. It reads the daily papers and tells its readers what they say. It is also an editorial paper. Though it abstains from mingling editorial opinions with its news accounts, it has opinions of a pronounced character, based upon the principles of radical democracy, 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.

**TERMS.**

Annual Subscription . . . . .	\$2.00
Semi-Annual Subscription . . . . .	1.00
Quarterly Subscription . . . . .	.50
Trial Subscription (4 weeks) . . . . .	.10
Single Copies . . . . .	.05

Free of postage in United States, Canada and Mexico. Elsewhere, postage extra, at the rate of one cent per week.

PUBLISHED WEEKLY BY

**THE PUBLIC PUBLISHING COMPANY**  
1501 SCHILLER BUILDING  
CHICAGO, ILL.

All checks, drafts, post office money orders and express money orders should be made payable to the order of THE PUBLIC PUBLISHING CO.

Payment of subscription is acknowledged up to and including the first issue of the month printed on the wrapper. The figures following the month, refer to the year in which the subscription expires.

Subscribers wishing to change address must give the old address as well as the new one.

POST OFFICE ADDRESS:

THE PUBLIC, BOX 687, CHICAGO, ILL.

**ATTORNEYS.**

Chicago.

**CHARLES H. ROBERTS,**  
ATTORNEY AT LAW,  
ESTATES, CLAIMS, PATENTS,  
614 Roanoke Building, Chicago.

Houston.

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

New York.

**FRED. CYRUS LEUBUSCHER,**  
COUNSELLOR AT LAW,  
BENNETT BLDG.,  
80 Nassau St., Borough of Manhattan,  
Tel. Call, 1258 Cortlandt. Rooms 1011-1012.  
NEW YORK.

**BINDERS FOR THE PUBLIC:**

Emerson Binding Covers in which THE PUBLIC may be filed away week by week, making at the end of the year a reasonably well-bound volume, may be ordered through this office. Price, 80 cents, postpaid. tf