

The Public

Fifth Year.

CHICAGO, SATURDAY, JUNE 14, 1902.

Number 219.

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.

The national conference of Charities and Corrections wants an investigation into the tramp problem. The tramp problem is too easy to need investigation. It is explained by the millionaire microbe. Idle luxury and idle misery always come and go together. They belong together. The millionaire hobo and the ragged hobo are products of the same cause. They are manifestations of the same social disease. They made their appearance at about the same time. Each is a parasite upon productive industry. Each is supported by the labor of the industrious. And the ragged hobo is the less virulent manifestation of the disease: he doesn't cost so much to keep.

There were good strong men in the Virginia constitutional convention, but good as they were they were not strong enough to prevent the majority from causing the convention to commit the grossest kind of breach of trust. It has overridden the limits of its authority, and while professing to be Democratic has cast democratic principles to the winds. Though required by the law that called it into being to submit its proposed constitution to popular vote, it has decided to proclaim it as the fundamental law of the state without submission. That is usurpation of power, and usurpation of power is the most malignant form of anarchy.

When a Federal judge sitting in Chicago enforced a city ordinance recently against cab drivers and in favor of a cab-driving trust based upon the concessions of a railway monopoly,

the city counsel thought it "peculiar that the enforcement of a city ordinance should be sought by injunction in the Federal court." It would have been peculiar before the passage of the Fourteenth amendment to the constitution of the United States for the protection of Negroes in the South. More, it would have been impossible. And why an amendment solely for the local protection of Negroes is ineffective for that purpose, but highly effective for the purpose of giving the Federal courts jurisdiction over pretty much every other local question, we do not pretend to explain. We only note the remarkable fact and hope the corporation counsel of Chicago will keep on wondering.

James J. Hill has made an epigram containing more good meat than epigrams very often do. He was speaking at a meeting of the Illinois Manufacturers' association, held in Chicago on the 3d, and in advocating desert irrigation, he said: "Land without population is a wilderness, and population without land is a mob." It was a keen thrust into the very heart of the social question, much keener and deeper than he suspected. For he thought only of the prairie and the desert, while what he said is quite as true of centers of population, which are even now inhabited and in some degree dominated by great mobs. Mr. Hill gave the reason for this: "Population without land is a mob." The population of our cities is without land, to the extent of 75 and 80 and even 90 per cent. or more. Yet these same cities have within their limits more idle land than any other kind. Here again Mr. Hill strikes true; for this idle land, these vacant city lots, this land without population, though congested populations surge about it, is

indeed a wilderness. "Land without population is a wilderness; population without land is a mob."

The anti-anarchy bill, as it has passed the lower House of Congress, would be a pretty dangerous law if it were enacted. Under one section, for instance, nobody could justify the execution of Louis XVI. or Charles I., without risking the possibilities of a heavy fine and imprisonment for from 1 to 20 years. For if he did so "with intent to cause"—and of this a Federal jury would be the judge—the murder of the president, the vice president, or the head of any foreign government, then he would be guilty of one of the "anarchy" crimes. What such a jury, selected by a marshal appointed from Washington, would do in time of bitter political excitement, it is not hard to guess. The editor of an opposition paper in such times would be wise to write with great respect of Louis XVI. and Charles I. He would better be discreet even about his allusions to Nero and Caesar, for they also were at the head of "a civilized government." It was openly said upon the floor of the House that this law was not intended to be enforced, which speaks well for the sense of humor of those who voted for it; but it is to be hoped that the more serious-minded Senate will conclude that a law which is not to be enforced had better not be enacted.

An astounding proposition, considering its source, was made last week by the Chicago Chronicle. It is astounding because proposed by a professedly Democratic newspaper; but inasmuch as this newspaper is controlled by one of the financial barons of Chicago, who wears the Democratic label but votes the Republican ticket, the matter is after all not so very surprising. It is nothing

less than a suggestion that the city of Chicago sell its waterworks to a private corporation. The suggestion is offered nominally with a view of relieving the finances of the city, which cannot meet its debts nor even its current expenses. Here is the argument:

If a wise man owed more money than he could pay from his cash in sight and had salable property worth twice the amount of his debts he would sell enough property to pay what he owed and start anew with clean books. He would still have valuable assets to sustain his credit. What would be business common sense for an individual would be business common sense for a municipal corporation. The same commercial rules should govern the city that would be best for one of its citizens.

The Chronicle then proposes the sale of the city waterworks to a private corporation, and naively expresses the opinion that private capital could be induced to invest in that city asset.

The suggestion may be on the whole a good one, from the business point of view, but it is certainly open to criticism in one important particular. Though a wise business man in the predicament described, would doubtless turn some of his salable property into cash, he would not sell income-producing property so long as he could find a market for unprofitable holdings. Why should not this example of the wise business man be followed by a municipal corporation if it is to imitate him at all? Of course it should be. Then the property for the city of Chicago to sell is not the waterworks, which yield a net annual revenue of \$3,000,000. It is the public parks, which not only yield no revenue but are the cause of heavy annual expenditures. They would be quite as salable as the waterworks. Purchasers might come forward willing to take and use them as parks, charging a small gate fee; but if not, they would at any rate go off like hot cakes if cut up into building lots. Is it not the part of business sense, then, to sell the parks, which are expensive and yield no in-

come, before parting with the waterworks, which pay for themselves and return a profit? And does not the same reasoning apply to the public schools? Here is an unprofitable asset which a wise man would unload. Why should not the city do the same? If the city is to be governed by business rules, let it apply them unflinchingly.

The absurd notion of selling off the waterworks is another product of the fallacious catch phrase that "municipal government is business not politics." Though municipal administration is properly business and not politics, municipal government is politics and not business. Like all other government, it is politics above everything else—politics in the broad sociological sense, and not in the narrow partisan sense. It is not the part of municipal government to gain a profit in order to make a living. That is a business function, but it is not a municipal function. Municipal government gets its living, as do all other forms of government, not from business enterprise and profit, but from taxation. If it cannot pay its debts and meet current expenses, the reason must be either that its expenses are exceeding its just income from taxation, or that it is neglecting to collect its income. The latter is of course the true reason. In this predicament the first thing for the city of Chicago to do is not to sell off public property; it is to collect its income more sharply. If just taxes were paid in Chicago it could soon rid itself of debt and have an abundant income for current expenditures. Then let it "go for" the tax dodgers. That would be a great note if the tax-dodging plutocrats could first cripple the city's finances, and then use its condition as an excuse for enabling them to buy up the waterworks, and possibly—why not?—the parks, the public schools and the city hall.

No political observer can have failed to see the gradual but strenu-

ous drawing apart in Republican politics of President Roosevelt and Mr. Hanna. The former wishes, naturally enough, to be elected to the office he now holds by accident, and the latter has no notion of abandoning those presidential ambitions of his which were fostered almost to the budding point under the McKinley regime. Both have been discreet, however, and not until within the past few days have the inspired friends of either ventured to disclose with any candor the exasperating situation.

The Republican convention of Ohio was so lavishly unreserved in its devotion to Hanna, that Roosevelt's friends have thought it best to suffer in silence no longer. So Congressman Burton, of Cleveland, has gone into training against Hanna for the senatorship, and has interested President Roosevelt in breaking into Hanna's civil service reserves. These reserves were early set aside for Mr. Hanna by the late President McKinley, and so scandalous were the subsequent appointments to Federal office in Cleveland that the Federal building has acquired the nickname of "Hanna's retreat." Whenever a Hanna politician has lost his job in the city or county Hanna has promptly landed him at a Federal desk, no other qualification being required than fidelity to Hanna. Yet no account was taken of this civil service scandal by the truly good Republicans like Mr. Burton, until Mr. Hanna's disgraceful appointees were detected in "stacking the cards" against the administration.

That was indeed scandalous, and Mr. Burton complained directly to President Roosevelt, who is reported to have decided to investigate, in the very face of Hanna's protests. "The affair may be smoothed over," says the inspired report; but smoothing over is really out of the question. Though this particular squabble over "Hanna's retreat" may be quieted down, and though in itself it is a small affair,

the contest between Hanna and Roosevelt for the presidential nomination of their party, of which this squabble is only a preliminary skirmish, is in its nature irreconcilable. It cannot be smoothed over until the national convention adjourns.

In the meantime it is to be assumed that Mr. Hanna will use civil service officials to the fullest extent of his power to promote his ambitions. As a politician he is essentially a spoilsman, and makes no pretense of being anything better. Mr. Roosevelt is probably not a spoilsman in the same way that Mr. Hanna is; but it is doubtful if anyone in political authority has done more than he to nullify the merit system. Though he posed well enough as a friend of the merit system while he was a civil service reform agitator, he has as President given it a solar plexus blow. On the 29th of May he issued an executive interpretation of the civil service rules which enables spoilsmen in office to discharge subordinates with the same freedom that spoilsmen enjoyed before any merit rules had been adopted. They need only say that the discharge is not for political or religious reasons, and that ends it. The reason may be political or religious, in fact, and even the reason which is acknowledged may have no bearing whatever upon the civil service qualifications of the victim, but at the word he goes.

This executive interpretation seems to have been made to fit the case of Miss Rebecca J. Taylor, a clerk in the merit class of the war department. Miss Taylor has opinions of her own on the great political, not to say religious, questions of the past four years. She does not believe in imperialism, she does not believe in military conquest and cruelty, and she is not in harmony with the idea of the President that when the flag is put anywhere "it must stay put." Miss Taylor has not allowed her views on these questions to interfere with her clerical duties at the war department. No objection what-

ever is made to her qualifications and performances as a war department clerk. But it appears that out of office hours, instead of playing ping pong she wrote articles on the Philippine question which the Washington Post published. One of these articles was reproduced two weeks ago in our Miscellany department (p. 125). It was a well-considered criticism of President Roosevelt's "stay put" speech. Not in the slightest degree indicative of unfitness in the writer as a clerk, the article could have given legitimate official offense only upon some "lese majesty" doctrine. But it appears to have given to the President and the secretary of war such offense, legitimate or illegitimate, that they have chucked—no other word describes it—Miss Taylor out of her clerical chair and into the street. Without a hearing, without a complaint of any kind, without the slightest reference to the Civil Service Commission, without the observance of any of the safeguards of the merit system, without pretense of conduct prejudicial to her official duties, but simply upon the President's order modifying the civil service rules, they handed her a notice of dismissal in the middle of the day, and requested her to vacate her desk immediately. If this is in harmony with the merit system of civil service, one might ask how the merit system differs from the spoils system. It is certainly not distinguishable in method.

When civil service reformers were agitating for the merit system the burden of their argument, as applied to clerkships, was something like this: What the government needs is a clerk. The clerk's views on public policy make no difference. Whether he believes in protection or free trade, or in gold or silver or greenback money, does not concern the public service. What does concern the public service is the clerk's efficiency, industry and fidelity as a clerk. If he is a satisfactory clerk the good of the service demands his retention no matter how heterodox his opin-

ions may be. The same argument might have been properly extended so as to include just such a case as Miss Taylor's. It would have been asked what difference it makes how Miss Taylor views the Philippine question, what difference how she views the water torture in the Philippines, what difference how she regards Mr. Roosevelt's "stay put" speech, what difference how or where she expresses her opinions, provided she expresses them not as a war department clerk but as a citizen, and does not encroach thereby upon the hours, the energies, or the fidelity which as a clerk she owes to—no, not to Mr. Roosevelt or the secretary of war, whom she has offended, or the imperialist policy which she condemns, but to the government that employs her? We are not criticizing Mr. Roosevelt for thus punishing a government clerk who has been bold enough to disagree with him publicly on a political question, nor for knocking the backbone out of the merit system by his executive interpretation. He may possibly be right in both particulars. But he cannot be right in either and be right also in the civil service doctrines he professes. Either in his civil service practice or in his civil service principles, one or the other, he is wrong.

The Republican favorite this week for the Democratic nomination for president is Senator Gorman, of Maryland. Republicans like him because they are confident of his ability to unite the Democratic party, which is what they want, of course.

On Decoration day of this year, Dr. Charles Bayard Mitchell, a militant Methodist, appears to have regaled a Cleveland congregation with a sermon in pious justification of the American invasion of the Philippines, in which he attributed the invasion not to "the Spaniards," not to "the jingoes," not to "Congress or President," but to "God Almighty." It would be in order to ask Dr. Mitchell what has become of the devil, that the responsibility for this great in-

iquity of ours must be shunted off upon God; but that might sound impious to this pious doctor of divinity, though asked never so reverently. Dr. Mitchell is evidently a type of the kind of pietists Lowell satirized in his "John P. Robinson" of the Mexican war period, of whom he wrote:

We were gittin' on nicely up here to
our village,
With good old idees o' wuts right
and wut aint;
We kind o' thought Christ went agin
war and pillage,
An' that epyplets wornt the best
mark of a saint.
But John P.
Robinson he
Sez this kind o' thing's an ex-
ploded idee.
Parson Wilbur sez he never heerd in
his life
Thet th' Apostles rigged out in
their swallow-tail coats,
An marched round in front of a drum
and a fife,
To git some on 'em office an' some
on 'em votes.
But John P.
Robinson he
Sez they didn't know everythin'
down in Judee.

It is gratifying to learn that Recorder Goff, one of the judges of the criminal court of New York city, has administered a severe and much needed rebuke to the police of that city for inflicting the "sweat-box" outrage upon persons arrested upon charges of crime. But a rebuke from the bench is not enough. This lawless torture process of the police, called the "sweat-box," should be brought to the attention of grand juries by the judges, with explicit instructions. They should be told that it is a crime for the police to lay hands upon an untried prisoner beyond what is necessary to secure his presence for trial; and that no prisoner can lawfully be interrogated by the police to any greater extent than may be necessary for identification, nor even by a magistrate in open court without being warned that he need not answer. That is the law, and every police officer who oversteps it is himself a criminal.

When the oleomargarine bill was before Congress, the argument was

made for it that it was intended to interfere with the oleomargarine operations of the meat trust. But now it appears that the meat trust was directly interested in having the bill become a law, and is indebted to the majority in Congress for passing and the President for signing it. It lessens their competition, in fact gives them the monopoly of the oleomargarine business. This appears in an interview with A. L. Allingham, formerly connected with the meat trust. The interview was published in the New York Commercial of May 9, 1902. Mr. Allingham said in that interview that the big packing houses can pay the ten per cent. tax and still compete with butter makers. But not so with the small oleomargarine manufacturers. Said he:

If the oleomargarine business was in the hands of small independent manufacturers the 10 per cent. tax would kill the business, but the big packing houses handle it in connection with their meat business, their plants are established, they use in the oleomargarine by-products of the packing houses and they know they are free from competition.

Tom L. Johnson's efforts, when he was a Congressman and on the District of Columbia Committee of the House, to secure the taxation of vacant land values, is beginning to bear fruit. The Washington public is coming to appreciate the injustice of allowing these values to escape. This is a matter in which the whole country, as well as Washington, is interested, for Congress pays out of the national treasury 50 per cent. of the local expenditures of the District. In consequence the land owners of Washington are enriched at national expense. Yet those of them who stand in the way of improvements, demanding higher and higher prices for sites, are actually encouraged by the assessors. Of this the Washington Times of the 5th sensibly said:

While no exact figures are at hand, it is safe to say that not less than 25 per cent. of the unimproved land in the entire area of the District contributes practically nothing to the support of the local government. Of this unimproved land a large proportion is in large tracts which are held

for the purpose of speculation. They are assessed as agricultural lands, and, as such, pay merely a nominal tax. Even when subdivided and laid off in streets and lots they pay but two-thirds of the tax levied on improved property. In either case the owners can well afford to wait for the opportune moment when a demand arises for such property. If the same tax levied on improved property were exacted from such land the owners would not only contribute their proper share toward the maintenance of the municipality, but they would improve it as rapidly as possible, and these improvements would, in their turn, add to the income of the local treasury. This increase in the revenue would, in a very few years, amount to a far larger sum than will ever be realized from a personal tax.

It is not quite clear why the Times should be anxious to promote improvements in order to tax them, but in other respects its comment is excellent; and many municipalities besides Washington might consider it to advantage.

Some of the "reorganizing" Democratic papers of the East and the middle West are pointing to the election of the Democratic candidate for governor of Oregon as evidence that the Democratic party can win when it is united. Then why did not the whole Democratic ticket win in Oregon? The party was as much united for the other candidates as for governor, but only the governor won. The other candidates were defeated by thousands of votes. The fact is that the Democratic candidate for governor was a popular non-partisan, while the Republican was unpopular and had angered a powerful faction of his own party. The only "getting together," in the "reorganizing" sense, that took place in the Democratic party in Oregon, consisted in "getting together" with the Republicans upon a platform which was publicly characterized by the Democratic candidate for governor as substantially the same as the Republican platform. If this constitutes "getting together," why not take up the Republican platform itself and abandon the Democratic party? As Gov. Altgeld once said, "there is no neces-

sity for two Republican parties." The one we have is bad enough. Another could not make it worse and would not make it better. Let us have a Democratic opposition which is less solicitous about winning and more solicitous about being truly democratic.

FREE TRADE THE ONLY TARIFF ISSUE.

When the tariff question last attracted the attention of the American people, the Democratic party played politics with it.

Though this party then faced toward the free trade policy, it differed in declared principle only a little, and in practical purpose still less, from the Republican party, which boldly advanced the Chinese doctrine of commercial restriction. Both were protection parties, but with a marked tendency on the part of one to become more intensely protection, and a slight tendency on the part of the other to get away from protection. Accordingly, while the Republicans in 1888 and 1892 were demanding extensions of the "American doctrine" of "the home market for the home producer," and denouncing free trade as a device for flooding the country with the "pauper goods" of Europe, the Democrats, clamoring for "tariff reform," were as vigorous in protesting that "tariff reform is not free trade." And when they came into power they proved their fealty to the Republican policy by only slightly cutting down the Republican tariff and protecting special interests about as faithfully as the Republicans had done it.

In consequence of this protection policy, espoused and led by Gorman, coupled with President Cleveland's abandonment of the tariff reform issue, upon which he had been elected, and his precipitation of the money issue, upon which he had not, the tariff question was shelved at the next presidential election and the coinage question took its place. But now that the coinage agitation has subsided, the enormous production of gold having met the economic demands of the silver coinage propagandists, the tariff question is reviving. Even the Republicans are quarreling about it, and Democrats

everywhere are displaying renewed interest in it.

This situation makes it important to warn Democratic leaders who are warming up to the tariff question, that they cannot play politics with it a second time. "Tariff reform" can never be an issue again. The mildest form the tariff question can take in American politics hereafter, is protection versus tariff for revenue only. And tariff for revenue only will be admissible, not as an economic principle, but as an undisguised step in the direction of free trade. The Democratic policy must be unmistakably and unreservedly for the greatest measure of free trade that the revenue clauses of the constitution permit.

How radical a measure of free trade the revenue clauses of the constitution do permit is to some degree an open question. They certainly permit free trade to the extent of tariffs for revenue only. But a tariff for revenue, while vastly better than one for commercial restriction, would be open to all the objections to indirect taxation. It would operate unfairly with reference to individuals and classes; and it would tax the people without their knowing that they were taxed, which would tend to foster corruption in public expenditures. In addition it would offer a constant temptation to special interests corruptly to influence Congress to make the revenue tariffs incidentally protective to them, which sooner or later would be certain to revive protection as the primary purpose of the tariff. A tariff for revenue is the mother of tariffs for protection.

Tariffs for revenue ought, therefore, to be abolished, if the constitution permits. That is to say, if there is any other constitutional method of easily and securely obtaining ample Federal revenues, it ought to be adopted, and the whole unfair, restrictive and corruption-breeding customs tariff be wiped out.

Of the desirability of getting rid of custom houses there can hardly be two opinions. Spoils hunters would, of course, object. So would certain business interests which would be thereby deprived of the indirect subsidies they now enjoy at public expense through protection. But it

would tend to make commercial intercourse as frictionless and profitable between this country and others as it already is between the states of the Union, and that would be universally beneficial. But whether revenue could be raised without custom houses is the real question.

The most direct and fairest source of revenue would be an ad valorem real estate tax exempting improvements. This would fall upon tax payers in proportion to that part of their income which they do not earn, but which is due to the growth and prosperity of the country as a whole; and as the largest unimproved values are in cities and mining regions, and in the franchise values of railroads, the farming and small home-owning classes, whose incomes are almost wholly earned by themselves, would pay but little.

But fiscal experts say that this tax could not be levied fairly for Federal purposes, because it is a direct tax, which must be levied upon the states in proportion, not to their wealth, but to their population. It is doubtful if that objection is sound. The direct tax mentioned in the constitution does not mean direct in the economic sense, but in a legal sense, which is determined by the context and the history of the limitation. This limitation grows out of the slavery question, and the term "direct" is qualified by the term "capitation" in the same clause, thus suggesting that by "direct tax" is meant one that is somewhat of the nature of a poll tax. The Supreme Court has not so decided, and its decisions would not warrant the adoption of the tax above suggested, irrespective of population; but Supreme Court decisions on public questions have always depended and depend now upon the political predilections of the judges. It is no wild prophecy, therefore, to predict that under favorable circumstances an ad valorem real estate tax, with improvements exempt, would be held to be constitutional, though levied without regard to population.

But the Supreme Court has at any rate gone so far as to hold that some taxes which are direct economically, are not direct within the meaning

of the revenue clauses of the constitution; and, as we are advised, one class of taxes which, though economically direct would be regarded as legally indirect, and therefore leviable regardless of population, would be taxes on corporation values.

Assuming this to be so, an ample Federal revenue ought easily to be collected at the expense of the trusts, and the obstructive and corrupt customs system be wholly abandoned.

The total Federal expenditures for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1901, were \$509,983,310.39. Since then they have averaged \$39,862,499.97 a month, or at the rate of \$478,349,999.64 a year. If we estimate Federal expenditures, then, at \$500,000,000, in round numbers, we shall be making a liberal allowance.

Of that sum the customs tariff yielded for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1901, \$238,786,740.89, and since then a monthly average of \$21,102,957.02, being at the rate of \$253,235,484.24 per year. We may, therefore, regard customs duties as supplying an annual revenue in round numbers of \$250,000,000, or one-half the total expenses of the general government.

Now, that this customs revenue could be abolished and the amount it yields be raised by a simple, economically direct, non-corrupting and easily collected tax upon trusts, appears from an estimate by Prof. Edward W. Bemis, of the market value of the principal monopolies and trusts. Prof. Bemis puts it at over \$19,931,000,000 — in round numbers, not less than \$20,000,000,000. Following are the details—

Private water companies.	\$931,000,000
Street railways	2,113,000,000
Gas companies	510,000,000
Electric lighting companies	500,000,000
<hr/>	
Total city monopolies except telephones	\$3,423,000,000
Telegraph and telephone companies	600,000,000
Express companies	100,000,000
Trusts	500,000,000
Railroads	10,808,000,000
<hr/>	
Total	\$19,931,000,000

It will be observed that all these concerns (except the trusts, so named) are special privilege corporations. That is, they own special priv-

ileges conferred by and belonging of right to the people; such as rights of way for the distribution of water, gas and electric lighting, and for the operation of street cars and railway cars. These privileges are, indeed, by far the most important factors in their value. To realize this, one has but to imagine the destruction of the entire plant of any water company, street car company, railway company or the like. The remaining property, consisting of nothing whatever but some such public privilege as a right of way, a mere legal power to levy toll, will still have great value—in most cases far greater value than the cost of restoring the plant. And as to the trusts, those so named in the foregoing table, if they were particularized it would doubtless be found that they, too, derive most of their value from special privileges of some kind, enjoyed either directly from the public, as in the case of railroads and street railways, or indirectly, as in the case of those express companies which depend for their value mainly upon exclusive railway privileges.

A tax upon corporations of this kind, therefore, would be a tax upon business only in minor degree. It would in the main be a tax upon the value of the special privileges. And $1\frac{1}{4}$ per cent. upon these trust values, considering only those discovered by Prof. Bemis, whose estimate does not cover the whole field, would raise enough revenue to replace the customs tariff. Less than $2\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. would supply all the tax revenues required by the Federal government.

We do not suggest this trust tax for immediate action by Congress, nor for immediate adoption by the Democratic party as a proposed substitute for customs revenues in order to secure free trade. It would probably be impossible to induce such action now, and the energy necessary to force it upon a party or upon Congress might secure a better substitute.

But since this method of raising Federal revenues by taxing trusts directly, instead of the people indirectly, by taxing privilege values instead of industry values, is available, let no one venture, hereafter, to oppose the policy of free trade as constitutionally

impracticable. Free trade is practicable, and the privileged classes must be made to understand that it is to be pushed on to complete establishment.

Every Democratic congressional convention this year ought to demand in unmistakable terms "the fullest measure of free trade that the constitution permits." Recognition of that principle secured—and what Democrat dare openly oppose it—and the road to absolutely free trade would be open.

NEWS

In consequence of the resignation of the Waldeck-Rousseau ministry, and the declination of Henri Brisson to undertake the organization of a new one (p. 140), the president of France has placed that honor and responsibility upon M. Combes, a radical republican senator and former vice president of the senate. M. Combes accepted the appointment on the 5th. His official position in the new cabinet is minister of the interior and of public worship. The other portfolios are distributed as follows:

Justice, Senator Valle, radical republican; foreign affairs, M. Delcasse, republican; war, Gen. Andre; marine, M. Pelletan, socialist; public instruction, Senator Chaumie, republican; public works, M. Maruejous, radical republican; colonies, M. Doumergu, socialist; commerce, M. Trouillet, radical republican; agriculture, M. Mougeot, republican left; finance, M. Rouvier, republican.

The ministers were formally commissioned by the President on the 7th.

Alsace-Lorraine, the territory acquired from France by Germany as a result of the war of 1870, is about to be relieved of the dictatorial government imposed by Germany in order to suppress agitations in favor of restoration to France. Although the German constitution was extended to Alsace-Lorraine on the 1st of June, 1874, the country has been treated as imperial territory and its administration placed under a governor general called the "statthalter." He is in fact a military governor with power to suspend the laws in his own discretion. This condition is about to be modified and the loyalty of the people to Germany recognized

by giving them greater guarantees of liberty, the imperial chancellor having introduced in the German reichstag on the 7th a measure abolishing the dictatorial powers of the "stathalter." Referring in his speech to these powers, the Chancellor said that they were necessary in the past because of the—

expressed hope of Alsations that France would reconquer the provinces; but that the emperor and the government, after mature consideration, were now convinced that the extraordinary powers conferred could be safely dispensed with. Proceeding, he said that their abrogation was a recognition of the fact that the inhabitants of the province had become reconciled to the new order of things, and of a desire to inspire them with full confidence in their connection with the empire. The efforts of the older generation to effect a separation would find no adherents in the mass of the population, he believed, and the imperial government wished to repay confidence with confidence. Germany never of her own free will, he added, would acquiesce in a fresh cession of the province, and he was convinced that Alsace-Lorraine would accept the gift now tendered with the same feeling of German loyalty that animated the rest of Germany.

As predicted last week (p. 138), when the grant of \$250,000 to Lord Kitchener, requested by the king, came before the British House of Commons, as it did on the 6th, the Irish members opposed it vigorously. The grant was made, but only after one of the most riotous scenes ever witnessed in parliament. A. J. Balfour, the ministerial leader in the Commons, moved the resolution making the grant; and Sir Henry Campbell Bannerman, the Liberal party leader, seconded the resolution with a speech in which he joined Balfour in praising Lord Kitchener. Then John Dillon, the Irish Nationalist, opposed the resolution on the ground that the war had been unnecessary. He was supported by Henry Labouchere, Radical. These speeches were received with Nationalist cheers, but called out no other demonstrations. But when William Redmond, Irish Nationalist, after denouncing both Roberts and Kitchener, turned to the ministerial benches and exclaimed: "You allow the women and children of soldiers to starve in order to honor the favorites of your corrupt society," an angry tumult followed. Howls and jeers made it impossible for the rest of Redmond's speech to be heard.

The House was sitting in "committee of supply" at the time, and the chairman, who ruled that Mr. Redmond's words were not out of order, nevertheless advised him to go no further with a speech so irritating to the House. Mr. Redmond did not follow the advice, but attempted, in spite of the uproar, to proceed; whereupon the chairman entertained a motion for closure and the Kitchener grant was allowed by a vote of 382 to 42. Mr. Balfour then moved a vote of thanks to the officers and men of the British army in South Africa and an expression of condolence with the bereaved, which was carried by the same vote. The House of Lords adopted a similar resolution of thanks.

An official statement of British losses in the war, down to May 30, was issued on the 5th. According to this statement, the total of killed, wounded, prisoners, deaths from disease and men invalided home was 97,477. As many of the sick and wounded recovered and rejoined their regiments, the permanent loss was 28,434, distributed as follows:

Killed in action or died of wounds	7,792
Died from disease.....	13,250
Other permanent losses.....	7,392
Total permanent loss.....	28,434

The Canadian contribution of troops to the South African war, as reported on the 7th from Ottawa, was 8,000, and of money \$2,000,000. Of the troops 230 were killed in action or died of wounds or disease.

Somewhat as an anti-climax to the settlement of the war was President Roosevelt's message to Congress transmitting Col. Crowder's report on the question of the British army supply post at Chalmette, near New Orleans (pp. 41, 100), for which the House had called. It is in substance as follows:

1. The British commission directing purchases and shipments of supplies in the United States, is a bureau of the English army administration.
2. As organized by these officers Chalmette station is a governmental shipping agency for but one class of military supplies, and it has not the character of a base of military supplies nor that of a military camp or post.
3. No attempts to recruit for the British army have been made at Chalmette station, nor does the evidence disclose any such attempts at other points in

the United States. A few muleteers were recruited, but this was against the orders of the British government.

4. All shipments have been from the port of New Orleans to South African ports upon vessels chartered by the British admiralty under ordinary commercial charters.

5. The total shipments are given at 98,687 horses and 75,108 mules, 65 different vessels being engaged in the trade, making 166 voyages.

6. All supplies have been for the use of the English army in South Africa, the trade having no existence prior to the war.

7. The port of New Orleans was extensively used in 1896-7 to supply the Spanish army then engaged in prosecuting hostilities in Cuba.

The report is accompanied by a copy of a letter from Secretary Hay to the governor of Louisiana, upon whose complaint the investigation had been made, in which Mr. Hay advises the governor that in international law the facts reported by Col. Crowder do not constitute a case of breach of neutrality.

Another act of the President's, of general interest, has an important bearing upon the question of civil service reform in the Federal government. It is the discharge of a war department clerk without the hearing hitherto required by civil service rules. The clerk in question is Miss Rebecca J. Taylor, who has written several letters to the press in opposition to the Philippine policy of the administration. On the 27th of May, after the appearance of one of these articles (see "Splendid Barbarity," p. 125) the secretary of war, describing her as a "temporary clerk," made an order that she—

be called upon for a statement as to whether or not she is the author of the letter published in the Washington Post of May 12, 1902, under the heading "The Flag Shall Stay Put," as shown in the accompanying clipping [being the article referred to above]. If Miss Taylor acknowledges the authorship of this letter her attention should be invited to section 8 of civil service rule 11, and under the provisions of that rule she should be given three days in which to make any explanation or statement in writing that she may desire to submit in regard to the matter.

To that order Miss Taylor replied on the same date, May 27:

I am the author of the letter published in the Washington Post of May 12, 1902, under the heading "The Flag Shall Stay Put." Referring to the explanation or statement called for by the secretary of war, I have the honor to state that not being a temporary

clerk, but having been placed within the classified service by an act of congress, having transgressed no civil service rule and having received no notice to that effect, nor that "removal" is "sought" for "just cause" or otherwise, neither any "reasons" therefor, therefore I have not been furnished the conditions upon which to base an explanation or statement; in fact, I am unable to determine the nature of the "explanation or statement" called for from the communication submitted. If the proper authorities will submit "notice" and "reasons in writing" in compliance with section 8, civil service rule No. 11, I shall be pleased to consider the privilege of "answering the same in writing," as permitted by section 8. I respectfully submit that it is unusual, to say the least, for an individual to plead either innocent or guilty or to offer a defense when no charge has been preferred.

Two days later President Roosevelt, whether apropos of this letter or of something else does not appear, issued an executive order interpreting section 8 of civil service rule 11. That rule prohibits removals for political or religious opinions or affiliations, and the section in question provides that no removal shall be made except for just cause, upon written charges, and after full notice and an opportunity to defend. But by his executive order of May 29, President Roosevelt declared that—

the term "just cause" as used in section 8, civil service rule 11, is intended to mean any cause other than merely political or religious which will promote the efficiency of the service, and nothing contained in said rule shall be construed to require the examination of witnesses or any trial or hearing except in the discretion of the officer making the removal.

This order, the object of which was unknown at the time of its issue, was adopted by the Civil Service Commission, and on the 9th of June the secretary of war ordered that—

Rebecca J. Taylor, clerk at \$840 per annum in the office of the adjutant general (temporary roll), is hereby discharged, to take effect this date.

Miss Taylor made formal protest against removal without a hearing, and the matter has come to the attention of Congress. Friends of civil service reform, though indifferent to Miss Taylor's dismissal, are reported as alarmed at the interpretation of the rules under which it was accomplished without a hearing, because, upon that interpretation any department chief, following the Taylor precedent, may now summarily dis-

miss any subordinate without assigning a cause or giving a hearing.

The bills in Congress for the suppression of anarchy (vol. iv., pp. 553, 810) offered pursuant to the advice of the President in his first annual message, and in consequence of the murder of President McKinley, have now reached a stage where the House and the Senate confront each other with conflicting measures. The Senate measure (see Congressional Record, pp. 2429, 3333, 3336), passed March 21, by 52 to 15—

imposes the penalty of death on any person who, in the United States or any place within its jurisdiction, willfully causes or attempts to cause the death of the president or the vice president or any officer in succession to the presidency, or the sovereign or chief magistrate of any other country; not more than 20 years' imprisonment for aiding, abetting, advising or counseling such killing, or conspiring to accomplish it; ten years' imprisonment for threatening or advising the killing of the president or vice president or other officer in succession to the presidency. Aiding an escape is to constitute the principal offense. A presidential guard is authorized, and some minor details are provided for.

When this bill went over to the House, the judiciary committee of that body reported a substitute (see Congressional Record, p. 6673) which—

imposes the penalty of death for murdering the president, vice president, or other officer in succession to the presidency, or any foreign representative accredited to the United States, while in the performance of his official duties or because of his official character; imprisonment for ten years for an attempt; and imprisonment for five years for a bodily assault upon any of the above-mentioned United States officers while engaged in their official duties or because of their official duties, provided death does not result and for life if it does. One who incites, or aspires, is a principal offender; and whoever assists the perpetrator after the crime, incurs the penalty of imprisonment for not less than one nor more than 25 years. At trials it is to be presumed unless the contrary is proved, that the injured official was engaged in the performance of his official duties at the time of the murder or assault.

The clauses of the House bill which are directed especially at terroristic and anarchistic agitation, regarding which no provision is made in the Senate bill, are to the effect that:

Any person who advocates, advises,

or teaches the duty, necessity, or propriety of the unlawful killing or assaulting of one or more of the officers (either of specific individuals or officers generally) of the government of the United States, or the government of any civilized nation, because of his or her official character, or who openly, willfully and deliberately justifies such killing or assaulting, with intent to cause the commission of any of the offenses specified, shall be fined not less than \$500 nor more than \$5,000, or imprisoned not less than one nor more than 20 years, or both. That any person who conspires or requests, advises, or encourages any other person or persons to unlawfully assault or kill, within or without the United States, the chief executive or chief magistrate of any civilized nation having an organized government, because of his official character, shall be punished as follows: If an attempt to commit such act is made and the death of any person results therefrom, such offender shall suffer death; if such attempt does not result in death, such offender shall be fined not less than \$500 nor more than \$5,000, or be imprisoned not less than five nor more than 25 years, or both; if such attempt is not made, such offender shall be fined not less than \$500 nor more than \$5,000, or be imprisoned not less than one nor more than five years, or both. That no foreigner who is opposed to all organized government, or belongs to an organization teaching such opposition shall be admitted into the United States; and that no such person shall be naturalized.

This substitute for the Senate bill was adopted by the House in committee of the whole on the 7th and on the 9th it passed its third reading in the House by a vote of 175 to 38.

A comparison of these two bills indicates that the House aims to suppress what is called anarchistic agitation, as well as to bring crimes against high Federal officials within the jurisdiction of the Federal courts, whereas the Senate aims simply to give the Federal courts jurisdiction over deadly crimes committed upon high Federal officers and foreign representatives actually in the country, leaving questions of free speech and free press and the protection of foreign sovereigns in their own dominions untouched.

Among the important items of the week in American politics is the state convention of the Liberal Democratic party of New York, which met at New York city on the 7th, and that of the Democratic party of Arkansas, which met at Little Rock on

the 10th. The platform of the former convention reaffirms the national platform adopted by the Democratic party at Kansas City in 1900, and denounces David B. Hill's record as treasonable to the party. Melvin G. Palliser was temporary chairman, and Judge Samuel Seabury, of the City Court, permanent chairman. The convention nominated Ex-Assemblyman Edgar L. Ryder for governor, with a full state ticket. What gives special significance to the Arkansas convention is its resolution recognizing "the Kansas City platform as the declaration of the national Democratic party on national questions until supplanted by the action of a succeeding national convention." "As such," the convention declares "a general endorsement of the same."

Somewhat significant action was taken by the state Democratic committee of Ohio on the 10th at its meeting in Columbus. After appointing Sandusky as the place, and September 2 as the time for the state convention, which was in accordance with Mayor Tom L. Johnson's policy of making a short but sharp campaign, the committee chose Mayor Johnson for temporary chairman of the convention. As the choice was contested by Samuel E. Johnson, of Cincinnati, who was nominated by the friends of John R. McLean, Mayor Johnson's selection is regarded as a defeat of McLean in the committee. But the vote was close, Mayor Johnson receiving 10½, Mr. McLean's candidate 8 1-3 and one other candidate 1 1-3.

The Republican convention of Pennsylvania, which met at Harrisburg on the 11th, is reported to have been dominated by Senator Quay. It nominated Samuel W. Pennypacker for governor by a vote of 206 to 152, Pennypacker being the Quay candidate in opposition to Attorney General John P. Elkin, who was the candidate of the present state administration. The platform is notable for its pledge of the party of the state to the renomination of President Roosevelt.

Definite news from the Oregon elections (p. 139) is not yet forthcoming, the returns from all the counties not having been reported. But the majority of the Democratic candidate for governor is about 300, while those of the Republican candi-

dates for the other offices are about 10,000. The amendment to the constitution, providing for the initiative and referendum (pp. 67, 139), is known to have been carried by an almost unanimous vote, probably but little more than 1,000 having been cast against it, but the exact figures have not yet been reported here.

NEWS NOTES.

—The 28th annual session of the imperial council of the Mystic Shrine met at San Francisco on the 10th.

—Whitelaw Reid had conferred upon him on the 10th the degree of doctor of laws by Cambridge University, England.

—Suit was begun on the 6th by the attorney general of Illinois to restrain fire insurance companies doing business in the state from operating in a trust.

—The Rev. Dr. Geo. H. Hepworth, the famous Unitarian clergyman, who was for many years an editor of the New York Herald, died at New York on the 7th at the age of 69.

—Frederick J. Kern, of Belleville, Ill., the single tax Democrat, who is a representative in the present Congress from the twenty-first district of Illinois, was renominated on the 7th without opposition.

—The Rev. Francis L. Patton has resigned as president of Princeton university, and Woodrow Wilson, now professor of jurisprudence and politics, is to take his place. The time fixed for the change is August 1.

—Glass blowing machines invented by John Lubbers and put into practical operation at Alexandria, Ind., on the 10th by the American Window Glass Co., are expected to dispense with the labor of thousands of workmen in the glass making industry.

The supreme court of Kansas decided on the 7th that the state anti-trust law is constitutional, basing its decision upon the ground that as anti-competitive trade agreements are contrary to public policy, it is competent for the legislature to enact penal measures to prevent the making and carrying out of such agreements.

—The monthly statement of the treasury department for May shows on hand May 31:

Gold reserve fund.....	\$150,000,000 00
Available cash balance.....	195,350,229 84
Total	\$345,250,229 84
On hand at close of last fiscal year, June 30, 1901.....	326,833,124 02
Increase	\$18,517,105 82

—A bill has been passed by the Cuban congress granting amnesty to all American prisoners. This action frees the convicted postal embezzlers (vol. iv, p. 810), Neely, Rathbone and Estes. Rathbone, who declares his innocence,

asserts his regret at thus being deprived of a new trial, and says he will demand a congressional investigation.

—A Negro industrial school at Eldorado, Ill., near Carbondale, established about a year ago, and similar in character to that of Booker T. Washington, in Alabama, was mobbed on the eve of the first annual commencement, which was scheduled for the 10th. Its promoters are in consequence about to remove it. Bitter race feeling caused the outrage.

—Gen. Gomez, to whom the Cuban congress proposed voting a pension of \$6,000 (p. 140), published an open letter on the 5th asking his friends to vote against it, saying that it would be unfair for him to accept money so long as the other Cuban soldiers have not been provided for. He adds that he has a bill against the government for war services which some day will have to be paid, but that he is willing to wait until such time as Cuba can pay all her soldiers.

—The May treasury report of receipts and expenditures of the Federal government for the fiscal year beginning July 1, 1901, shows the following:

Receipts:	
Tariff	\$233,169,843 47
Internal revenue....	246,753,784 66
Miscellaneous	31,784,591 09
	\$513,727,719 22
Expense:	
Civil and misc.....	\$104,734,989 63
War	104,441,414 33
Navy	61,952,868 04
Indians	9,270,595 37
Pensions	128,200,010 18
Interest	28,771,920 07
	\$437,371,797 62

Surplus

—At the annual conference of the Ohio Single Tax League, held at Columbus on the 7th, Wm. Radcliffe of Youngstown was reelected as president and J. B. Vining of Cleveland as secretary. The following resolution of general interest was adopted:

Whereas: Under the present system, the state of Ohio lays the burden of taxation upon commerce, industry and the fruits of industry; and whereas, the larger and more powerful interests have, in the past, succeeded in shifting the burden of taxation from themselves to the weaker elements of the state; and whereas, through the devoted efforts of Tom L. Johnson, this wrong has been exposed and so vigorously fought, that the recent session of the present legislature was forced to make pretense of correcting this abuse; and whereas, we believe that a continuance of this fight will result in bringing the people to a realization of the injustice and inequality of the present system; Therefore, be it resolved that we commend and endorse the work of Tom L. Johnson.

PRESS OPINIONS.

OREGON ELECTION.
Pittsburg Post (Dem.), June 7.—Oregon by this result does not lose its standing as a Republican state, but it vindicates the wise discretion and independence of the voters.
Duluth News Tribune (Rep.), June 4.—It is plain that the people of Oregon still stand

by the party of McKinley and Roosevelt, and support the policies of expansion, sound money and protection. Their lead is likely to be followed by the country.

Albany (N. Y.) Argus (Dem.), June 4.—Oregon elects a Democratic governor—a gratifying and unexpected bit of good news. Coming from a section where the Republican boasts have been the loudest, and Democratic hopes the slightest, this result should nerve Democrats everywhere to redoubled efforts. "The morning light is breaking. The darkness disappears." The day of Democracy's reascendency is at hand!

PRESIDENTIAL POSSIBILITIES.

Cleveland Plain Dealer (Dem.) May 30.—As things are going now, there seems to be no necessity for Mr. Hanna's seeking the nomination. It begins to look as if he cannot get away from it.

Sillex (Mo.) Index (Dem.) May 29.—Let the Democratic party give us, as our next nominee, Hon. Tom L. Johnson, and there will be put up such a fight upon corruption, upon monopoly and upon undemocratic institutions as the United States has not yet seen.

Duluth News-Tribune (Rep.) May 29.—Enemies of Mr. Bryan are likely to find "too much Johnson" in the next Democratic national convention. Eccentric Tom, of Cleveland, is likely to be formidable, particularly if he's elected governor of Ohio next year.

Bryan's Commoner (Dem.) May 30.—The Commoner does not expect that its suggestions of presidential candidates on the Democratic ticket will meet with favor at the hands of Republican editors. The Commoner is not suggesting men who call themselves Democrats and support Republican policies. Only Democrats of that class find favor at the hands of Republican editors.

Omaha World-Herald (Dem.), June 10.—How does it happen that Republican organs are foremost in the effort to convey the impression that Mr. Bryan is dead as a political leader? If Mr. Bryan is dead, why discuss Mr. Bryan? If Mr. Bryan has lost his influence with his party and with the people, why waste valuable space in the effort to show that Mr. Bryan is dead and has lost his influence?

Buffalo Enquirer (ind.), June 6.—Why wouldn't Senator Hanna be the ideal candidate of the Republican party? He has always been a consistent and unvarying exponent of what is termed modern Republicanism. He is a thorough believer in the doctrine that government is a convenience which may be used to benefit the few who in turn should take care of the mass of the people. . . . Mayor Tom L. Johnson, also of Cleveland, is being more and more mentioned as the probable Democratic candidate for president. Although both men have had a similar business experience, they are as opposite as it is possible to be in politics and economic belief. Hanna stands for the privilege of a class; Johnson would usher in the Democracy of equal rights to all. Hanna thinks the republic is safe only when it is ruled by the men of large property interests, through the Republican party; Johnson insists that the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution are good enough guides to political conduct and should be given a fair trial, as they mean equal rights before the law and equal opportunity to earn a living. With these two men as candidates in 1904, the issue between modern Republicanism, and Democracy as taught by Jefferson and elaborated by other great teachers, would be fairly joined.

PHILIPPINE QUESTION.

Buffalo Courier (Dem.), June 4.—The bill has had a home value in that it afforded a discussion of the entire Philippine situation, which has done much to enliven public understanding of the wretched, un-American business in which the government of the republic has engaged in the Far East.

The New Voice (Prohib.) May 29.—There

can be no excuse, no matter were our war the most just war ever waged, no matter what the resistance encountered, no matter what the provocations of the enemy, there can be no excuse for the shooting of ten-year-old boys by the soldiers of a great, proud, powerful "Christian" nation.

Columbus (O.) Press (Dem.), June 4.—The bill also brazenly brands the Filipinos as subjects. They are to be recognized as "citizens of the Philippine islands," but not of the United States, although they are to be "entitled to the protection of the United States." This, then, is to be the full limit of the citizenship of the Filipinos—England has granted more than that to the Boers. . . . The President of the greatest American republic is to be the czar or king or emperor over 10,000,000 of Orientals whom he will rule through the agency of a vice-regal despot bearing the respectable title of governor.

CUBA.

Albany (N. Y.) Argus (Dem.) May 28.—Did the Roosevelt administration omit to send a special ambassador to witness the birth of the new republic, because of a belief that that republic is likely to be short-lived?

Chicago Inter Ocean (Rep.) May 31.—By the act of congress and by her own constitution Cuba is made a dependency of this nation. That is the legal theory of her status. But by sending Cuba a minister plenipotentiary and envoy extraordinary we have recognized her as an independent and equal sovereign state. That is the concrete fact.

INITIATIVE AND REFERENDUM IN OREGON.

Chicago Record-Herald (Rep.), June 10.—Here is a remarkable assertion of popular sovereignty as against legislative and executive power. It is easy to call it an "attack on representative government," but the people have a right to "attack" their agents and servants—that is, to deprive them of some of the power they have long been permitted to exercise—and abuse. The extension of the referendum is inevitable, for the simple and conclusive reason that legislatures are no longer trusted.

INITIATIVE AND REFERENDUM IN AUSTRALIA.

London Daily Chronicle (Lib.), May 22.—The system has the advantage of enabling the will of the people to be ascertained in a more direct way than would be possible at a general election, with its many conflicting issues. It has the disadvantage of encouraging weak ministries and parliaments to transfer their responsibilities to the electors, instead of deciding important questions of policy for themselves. For this reason the introduction of the referendum was opposed in Australia as being the negation of "responsible government." Nevertheless, it is becoming increasingly popular both with the parliaments and the electors.

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.

Senate.

Washington, June 2-7, 1902. Consideration of the Philippine bill was resumed on the 2d, the first formal speech being by Senator Mason (p. 6585) and the next by Mr. Stewart (p. 6594). Mr. Teller (p. 6595) and Mr. Bacon (p. 6597) followed, after which Mr. Culberson offered a substitute (p. 6603), and Mr. Carmack (p. 6605). Mr. Proctor (p. 6605) and Mr. Patterson (p. 6606) spoke, the latter putting into the Record the full text of the address of Felipe Buencamino to the United States Congress, dated August 20, 1899, with documents attached. Mr. McLaurin, of Mississippi, spoke on the question on the 3d (p. 6651), as did Mr. Beveridge (p. 6653), and Mr. Berry

(p. 6655), and at four o'clock in the afternoon, pursuant to agreement, the voting began (p. 6662). Some amendments were unanimously agreed to without formal vote. Others were voted upon. Mr. Quay moved (p. 6663) that duties on Philippine products imported into the United States be 50 per cent. of regular duties. The amendment was rejected, 56 to 19. Mr. Patterson moved (p. 6663) that all crimes in the Philippines except on impeachment be tried by jury in the province where committed. The amendment was rejected, 47 to 23. Mr. Teller moved as follows:

It is not the intention of the government of the United States to harass or oppress the inhabitants of the Philippine islands, or to deprive them of their liberty, but, on the contrary, to assist them to establish a government of their own that shall secure to them all privileges, advantages, and blessings enjoyed by a free people, and ultimate independence under the protection of the United States against foreign powers and domestic violence. And to secure these ends as speedily as possible, the government of the United States invites and urges the people of said islands to aid the United States authorities now exercising power in the islands to secure peace and order.

The amendment was rejected—47 to 30. Mr. Carmack offered amendments as to statehood (p. 6664) which were rejected. Mr. Culberson offered the amendment proposed by the Democratic minority of the Philippines committee as a substitute (p. 6665) for the bill and it was rejected—48 to 23. Mr. McLaurin, of Mississippi, offered the following (p. 6666):

It is the policy of the government to preserve the agricultural public lands in the archipelago for homes for the people of the archipelago, and no part of said agricultural lands shall be sold under this act except for such homes, nor to any except a natural person, a citizen of said archipelago.

The amendment was rejected—47 to 23. The bill as amended was thereupon advanced to third reading and by a vote of 43 to 30 (p. 6666) was passed. The Senate then ordered (p. 6666) that the Isthmian canal bill (H. bill 3110) be taken up; and on the 4th, after this bill had been incorporated textually in the Record (p. 6708) along with the text of a substitute (p. 6704), proposed by Mr. Morgan, Mr. Morgan opened the debate. On the 5th the speakers were Mr. Hanna (p. 6765) and Mr. Mitchell (p. 6766); and on the 6th Mr. Hanna concluded the speech (p. 6802) which he had only partially delivered the day before, while Mr. Mitchell concluded his (p. 6835) on the 7th.

House.

No business of general public interest was transacted on the 2d, but on the 3d the bill (S. bill No. 3668) for the protection of the person of the President was taken up for consideration (p. 6670) and the debate opened by Mr. Ray, whose speech was continued on the 4th. He was followed by Mr. Powers (p. 6722), Mr. Jenkins (p. 6724), and Mr. Parker (p. 6738); and on the 5th Mr. Sibley (p. 6758), Mr. Loud (p. 6760), Mr. Wooten (p. 6764), Mr. De Armond (p. 6764), Mr. Hamilton (p. 6765), Mr. Williams, of Mississippi (p. 6768), Mr. Grow (p. 6771), Mr. Crumpacker (p. 6772), Mr. McDermott (p. 6772), Mr. Graham (p. 6772), Mr. Clark (p. 6772), Mr. Maddox (p. 6772), Mr. Ball (p. 6773), and Mr. Lanham (p. 6774), were the principal speakers. The same debate continued on the 6th, the speakers being Mr. Bartlett (p. 6807), Mr. Patterson, (p. 6807), Mr. Richardson (p. 6807), Mr. Kleberg (p. 6808), Mr. Smith (p. 6810), Mr. Scott (p. 6810), Mr. Littlefield (p. 6810), Mr. Cochran (p. 6811), Mr. Ray (p. 6813), Mr. Alexander (p. 6815), and Mr. Smith (p. 6816). On the 7th the same discussion continued, the principal speeches being made by Mr. Patterson (p. 6835), Mr. Adamson (p. 6836), and Mr. Ray (p. 6844); and after further desultory debate over proposed amendments in committee of the whole, the substitute proposed by the House judiciary committee on the Senate bill was adopted and the Senate bill as so amended reported favorably (p. 6855). A motion to recommit with instructions was defeated, 89 to 61, and the House adjourned to the 9th for want of a quorum and without passing the bill.

Record Notes.—Speeches by Senators Patterson (p. 6541), Carmack (p. 6643) and Stewart (p. 6745) and Representative Ewen

(p. 667) on the Philippine bill; and by Representatives Lewis (p. 6676), Candler (p. 6640), and Sutherland (p. 6648) on subsidiary silver coinage, and Representatives Wooten (p. 6790), Hamilton (p. 6788), and Crumpacker (p. 6822) on the anarchy bill.
 Senator Bacon's proposed amendments to the isthmian canal bill (p. 6802).

MISCELLANY

THE CORONATION.

Let Britain's glories ring!
 Come, let us crown the King!
 The great republic chants his praise
 And weaves for him its martial bays;
 The viol's song and trumpet's blare
 With adulation stir the air;
 We crouch before his mighty throne,
 In his exalted presence prone.
 O glorious Edward, see,
 We humbly kneel to thee!

Yea, sire! Alas, we know
 Our fathers did not so.
 They brought not to thy grandsire's shrine
 The incense of his royal line;
 They did not show the high respect
 And honor due the liege-elect,
 But, laying delicacy by,
 They madly smote him hip and thigh
 And kicked him from the land—
 Him and his Hessian band.

Oh, Edward, Lord and King!
 Thy radiant charms we sing.
 Forgive, forgive our erring sires,
 Their haughty ways and wild desires,
 Their reckless wishes to be free
 That made them rebels unto thee—
 To-day we lift repentant eyes—
 Oh, Edward, we apologize!
 Obedient to command
 We kiss thy royal hand!

Oh, heir of George the Third!
 Lamenting what occurred,
 Agreeing, whereoe'er the land,
 Like thee to lay a blighting hand
 On all republics as they rise
 To soil with hope imperial skies,
 We haste to help thee mount the throne
 And hail thee as our very own!
 We pray, O King, that we
 May thy poor flunkies be.

To thy proud feet, O King!
 Our flatteries we bring.
 We deck ourselves like knights of old
 In purple pomp and plumes of gold,
 In panoply of rich array
 And harness that outshines the day.
 We hail thee, gracious liege, but delgn
 To smile on us and ease our pain!
 Oh, sovereign! Hear our cry!
 Smile on us or we die!

—W. A. Croffut.

THE WAR SPIRIT FOR CHILDREN.

For The Public.

As an instance of the subtle spread of the influence of war the following seems worth noting.

I have before me two editions of a collection of poems, intended to be memorized by school children. The first edition is remarkably free from poems of war and battle. It was published in 1895. The new edition of the

same book, recently published, is enlarged by the addition of several poems. Each one of the added poems has war for its theme. They are what editors speak of as "martial strains."

Now the pity of it is that these additions were made, not by a smart publisher, but in accordance with the prescribed demand of the school authorities in the state in which the little book is to be used.

A primary teacher in a private school recently told me with great satisfaction that each little fellow in her room could tell the names and characteristics of each of our battleships and cruisers. I don't remember whether torpedo boats and torpedo-boat destroyers were included or not. The walls of the schoolroom were decorated with the pictures of these boats.

I am quite sure there are not many teachers who waste their pupils' time in this way, but it is true that there are many teachers of young children who unfortunately associate patriotism almost exclusively with the heroes of battles. In this notion they are supported by most of the prevailing school histories.

J. H. D.

AT THE JUDGMENT SEAT.

One day three men stood before the judgment throne. One was a Filipino patriot, one was a soldier, and the other was a bishop. A voice from behind the throne addressed the Filipino, inquiring what were the deeds done in the body, on which he based his hope of heaven? Whereupon the Filipino uncovered the wounds which he had suffered in the name of liberty, and at sight of them the gates opened and the martyr entered, while the voice said: "Blessed are they which are persecuted for righteousness' sake, for theirs is the kingdom of heaven."

The voice then commanded the soldier to recite his deeds done in the body. In reply the soldier unsheathed his sword and held it aloft, dripping with his brother's blood. The voice was stern and said: "They that take the sword, shall perish with the sword."

Then the voice demanded of the bishop what he had done to merit heaven. He replied: "When my brethren were drunk with dreams of empire and lusted for their neighbors' lands, I said nothing to save the lives of the weak or to stay the scourge of war. I told them that Thy hand had set their feet upon the neck of the oppressed. I blessed the things that cursed mankind and cursed men

with my blessings." Then the voice made answer: "Not every one that saith, Lord, Lord, shall enter into the kingdom."—Rev. Herbert S. Bigelow, in Willis J. Abbot's "Pilgrim" for June, 1902.

THE STRENUOUS LIFE.

For The Public.

"Uncle Phil, what's dis yere stringuous life dey's makin' so much fuss about?"

"G'long, chile; dat's politics. Dat's when dey's stringin' you, an' dat's politics. Dere ain't no nigger what's got no sense dat has nuffin to do wid politics. Don' talk to me of de stringuous life. I gits all de stringuosity I needs gitten nuff to eat."

Uncle Phil weeded the radishes more savagely than ever. The disciple tackled the radish bed with a humble—

"Well, Unc' Phil, I des ax you cose I hear you talkin' 'bout dat to Mistah Robert; an when I'm driving Miss Sally she makes me nervous wid dot stringuous life she always talkin' about."

"Well, chile, I'm gwine tell you. De stringuous life is a keepin' a rippin' and a rarin' and a kickin' and a roarin' de whole time like a politician on a platform wid a pitcher in front of him, de big horn drunk behine him and de Merriken flag round de table legs. Ain't you never seen a little yaller fyste run after de cars like he's gwine ter swaller de ingin'? Dat's stringuosity. De yaller dog is leadin' a stringuous life an' de train is leadin' him.

"When Miss Sally's tarrier's throwin' dirt like he gwine to git to the center of de earth, an' chawin' roots biggern he is himself, dat tarrier leadin' a mighty stringuous life. But old man Woodchuck, settin' deep down in his back parlor, he ain't stringuous a bit. Den when de time come, ef de tarrier ain't plumb tuckered out and quit before dat—when de time come, old man Woodchuck say: 'Hello, who you spot-eye come in my home which I make fo myself and my chilluns?' and, Bim! He nab dat tarrier and de stringuosity of de occasion is mix in de promiscuousness of de mix up; and all de dirt dat tarrier dig up is just natchally de monument of his stringuousness.

"Dere is de fish worm, de plain natchal fish worm. Dese yere fellows. See? Dey ain't stringuous (cept when you's puttin' dem on de hook), but Marse Robert says dey digs de whole round yearth over and over, and if it wasn't fer dese same dopey little worms dere wouldn't be no garden soil

and no ventilation. Needer is de rain stringuous. Nor de fellow what 'tends strickly to his own business. But for stringuosity, you keep your eye on de politician and de yaller dog.
C. E. S. WOOD.

FREDERICK THE GREAT AND AMERICAN INDEPENDENCE.

Both Emperor William and President Roosevelt seem to have gone off at half cock in the matter of the proposed erection of a statue to Frederick the Great at Washington. There is no ground for the tender or the acceptance of such a gift. As the published correspondence shows, Kaiser William assumes that there is some foundation for the vague allusions made during the reception of Prince Henry to an alleged exhibition of friendliness on the part of Frederick the Great toward the American colonists in general during their war for independence and toward Washington in particular. The story that the Prussian sovereign sent to the commander of the continental army a sword bearing the inscription: "From the oldest to the greatest general," or any sword whatever, has been shown by Mr. Moncure D. Conway to be entirely apocryphal. Neither is there an atom of evidence for the assertion that Frederick rendered any service to the American colonies during their struggle for liberation from the British yoke. He was repeatedly requested to recognize the independence of the United States, as France, Spain and Holland did, but he never complied with the request until Great Britain herself had acknowledged the independence of her colonies. It is true that Frederick ultimately refused to allow German troops, destined for service under the British flag in America, to traverse Prussian territory; but that was because he detested the practice of selling German blood for foreign gold. The veto was ineffectual, moreover, because the mercenaries could pass from the interior of Germany to the seacoast without traversing the Prussian dominions. It ought by this time to be evident to every American and German of common-sense that, if any European sovereign deserves the honor of a statue at Washington, it is not Frederick the Great, who did nothing, but Louis XVI., who did everything in his power to assure the independence of the United States. In his reply to the emperor's offer, President Roosevelt rashly promised to submit the proposal to congress. If he does, we are likely to hear an interesting debate upon the subject.—Collier's Weekly.

THE JUVENILE COURT IN CLEVELAND.

Judge Callaghan's juvenile court promises to produce results far beyond the most sanguine hopes of the people who have been active in its creation. With only three days' work much has been accomplished, and the revelations of this small insight into the great work of helping Cleveland's friendless boys to become honest and valuable citizens, have been very encouraging.

Of the three dozen boys who have already been brought into court, not one was there who was not susceptible to friendship and who was not anxious to take advantage of the opportunity offered by the court to become better boys. Some of them were boys with very bad police records and bright chances for soon being removed from society and confined at hard labor in the Lancaster reformatory.

In every case the boy's waywardness could be directly traced to his surroundings. They were from the very poorest and most congested portions of the city. They had no real home life. Some were orphans, many lived with stepparents, and nearly all were the children of people who are obliged to work so unceasingly that they have no time to look after their children.

Through neglect and evil associations the boys went wrong. In some instances the parents were worse than children, in others the parents were honest and affectionate, but forced by their poverty to be with their children but a very small portion of the time. The boys were anxious to reform and the parents seemed glad of the court's assistance.

Of the 36 boys who were taken to Judge Callaghan 20 were placed on probation in charge of one of the probation officers. A week ago these 20 boys were running the streets with no one to care for them, watched by the police and in constant peril of arrest. To-day every one of those boys possesses a new friend who is anxious to help him and who is in a position to do it. Most of them have been given positions and are earning money. They have been made to feel that there is good in them and that there is a place in the world for them. They have been assured every assistance in their struggle to become good men. If they had any preference for some particular line of work, they were found positions where they could learn that work. They were given a turn about in life and in every instance the change was accepted with enthusiasm.

The work with the boys has extend-

ed to the parents and families. In investigating the home lives of their charges the probation officers have in several instances found an opportunity of assisting the family. One family was found in a neighborhood where it seemed impossible for the boy to reform. The probation officer in this case has persuaded the family to move to a respectable locality, and thereby every member of the family, as well as the boy, has been benefited.

The police who at first were skeptical of the new system are becoming enthusiastic. One officer, who has done much duty in a section of the city frequented by the worst gang of boys, told Judge Callaghan yesterday that a marked change in the boys was already noticeable. Several of the gang had been taken to court and put on the reform road. They had returned to their companions and told them of the strange experience. They had been cleaned up, given new clothes, and were working. The unexpected treatment of these boys had its effect on the whole gang and there seemed to be less of a desire among the members to be troublesome.

Nor are the hopeful signs of the court confined to the boys. The interest of the probation officers has been most gratifying. Business men, who reluctantly consented to become probation officers are already enthusiastic over the work. They walk into the courtroom, take some hopeless looking urchin under their wing and depart. Soon after they call on Judge Callaghan, and sing the praises of their adopted boy. The utter friendlessness of these boys, and their desire to be somebody strikes a responsive chord in the big hearts of these busy men and they turn aside from pressing duties to devise means for the boys' assistance.—Cleveland Plain Dealer.

AN OHIO NOVELTY—A HUMANE AND INTELLIGENT POLICE JUDGE.

If one were inclined to sentimentalism, "The Last Appeal" might be a fitting term to apply to the session in police court this morning. Mayor Jones, in all probability for the last time in his career, sat upon a police judge's bench and every prisoner who was brought in was dismissed. The mayor pleaded with all to become better men. Remarkable because of this, a still further interest was added to the session by the remarks and directions of the mayor.

The first case that was brought before the mayor was in connection with five men who were arrested last

night by Officer Mundin, charged with begging on the streets. The five men were ranged in a row and stood with downcast eyes before the mayor, who was leaning out from the bench, watching them intently. All of them pleaded not guilty to the charge of begging. They asserted unanimously that the officer was mistaken in thinking that they were beggars. Mundin claimed that they had stopped a woman and two men. The woman had been frightened. People in the vicinity of Beach street had been greatly annoyed by these men, or others of their ilk. At intervals the five prisoners would break into the conversation, and were only silenced by the stern rebuke of the mayor. One of them had a trade, he said.

"Have you been working?" asked his honor.

The fellow replied that he had been.

"And are you broke now?" was the next question.

The man had 75 cents which had escaped the turnkey.

Then the mayor, after listening to all the evidence, started a heart to heart talk with the prisoners, that stood out in strong relief when compared with the procedure of Judge Wachenheimer. He asked the men what they would have done if they were in the officer's place. The officer was not to blame for arresting them. The men admitted it argumentatively. The mayor accused them of "rushing the can," as he concisely termed it. "I sympathize with the officer," said his honor, and everyone wondered why. "Don't you men know that it's a fearful crime to get drunk—if you're poor. If you're rich, it's all right, but you can't do it as long as you're poor."

The mayor then expressed his ardent desire to treat the beggars as he would his own brother or son. He wanted to help them to become better men. As there appeared to him no better way of disposing of their cases, he would dismiss them. One of the men announced he had quit drinking. The mayor said he had done so several years ago. The men fumbled their hats and swore they would be better men. It was like a parent threatening to chastise wayward children, but withholding the rod, in view of their promises to "be good." "Call the next case," and the five penitents filed out.

Quotations from Capt. McLaughlin, of the Pennsylvania Railway police

force: "If Mayor Jones takes the bench this morning, my case will be continued." It wasn't continued, however; and because it wasn't continued, one of the strangest proceedings ever seen in police court came to pass this morning, when Mayor Jones was acting as police judge.

Bert Walker, a resident of Sherrardsville, O., claiming to be a fisherman, was arrested yesterday at one o'clock by the Pennsylvania Railroad detective. He was found in the yards of the company on some freight cars, and was in a drunken state when arrested, so it was asserted. Detective McLaughlin made a grab for the visitor, and succeeded in catching him. A big revolver was found upon him, also a box of cartridges. The gun had two bullets in it. Walker gave the detective a smart fight for a time, but was subdued.

In court this morning, before the sympathetic judge, Walker related his troubles. He had been in jail since yesterday at one o'clock, and was considerably worn out. All day yesterday he screamed at the top of his voice, and his frenzy at times became so frantic that the other prisoners in the bastille climbed up the walls to get away from him. He told the mayor he had bought the gun to give to his wife.

Regarding his presence in the yard of the company, the mayor thought it a trivial thing, but the gun question was more serious. The man admitted it with great good nature. Holding the weapon aloft in his hand, where every one could see it, the mayor declared it was a devilish weapon, intended only and solely to kill human beings. It was an instrument worse than useless. It was hellish. Worse than whisky a thousand times, for a man under the influence of whisky would recover from its effects, but a man perforated would never get over it.

The prisoner sat quietly, agreeing with every word the judge said.

Then came the punishment, like a thunderbolt out of a clear sky. Not a workhouse sentence for carrying concealed weapons; not a fine; merely a little smashing party in the engineer's department. Walker was sentenced to take his little revolver—it was worth probably six dollars—and place it in a convenient position, and then smash it to pieces with a sledge hammer. The smash was postponed until court adjourned. Then everybody—judge, Chief Raltz, clerks, deputies, policemen, sergeants, re-

porters and bailiff, repaired to the engineer's office. Down the hall they paraded.

The mayor laid his arm affectionately over the shoulder of the prisoner, who grasped his hand with a sudden pressure, that indicated how little he expected the unusual sentence. Words of good counsel passed from the mayor to the decrepit looking prisoner. Officer Freeman placed the revolver in a vise. The prisoner, Walker, was handed a sledge. In an instant he had smashed the revolver to fragments. Then he was again a free man.

"You stand up there where I can see you!" Mayor Jones frowned threateningly.

Peter Emline, Charles De Vaux and Eugene Emline ranged themselves in front of the police desk. The older Emline had been accused by DeVaux of "soaking him in the eye" on Sunday at a ball game on the East side. Emline stood up tragically and announced that he was guilty, but that he had blackened DeVaux's optic because his son stood in dire danger. Therefore he was guilty. His tragedy failed to impress the judge. It seems that Eugene Emline had "swiped" a ball glove at the game referred to on Sunday afternoon. DeVaux discovered it under his coat. He removed it, and then placed his arm about the neck of the lad, so that he could conveniently reach that portion of the boy's anatomy where there were no bones to be broken by a slap. Instantly the father landed on DeVaux, and a mob chased the man off the field.

The three people stood in a line, and their heads looked like a set of three steps. 'Gene Emline was 54 inches high; DeVaux was 64 inches, and Emline, Sr., was about 70 inches. The mayor looked at the trio and then exclaimed:

"There you have it, without saying a word. Brute force. It is the explanation. Emline is larger than DeVaux. So he struck him. DeVaux is larger than the boy. So he struck him. The only way for the boy now is to get two and lick DeVaux. There weren't two to be had, so the court is called into the row."

To Emline, Sr.: "You see what a citizen you are. If DeVaux had been Jim Corbett, you would never have touched him, and you know it. If Eugene had been Bob Fitzsimmons, DeVaux would not have struck him.

It is the theory of force, and that's all there is to it. If there was any punishment to be distributed, both DeVaux and Emline should be imprisoned. The case is dismissed."

Mayor S. M. Jones appeared in police court for the last time this morning. When the session was concluded his honor took occasion to make some remarks that are more than usually interesting, especially because of the fact that they came from the bench. He said in part:

"The legislature is greater than the people, and it has seen fit to take the power of appointing temporary police judges from the hands of the mayor, and place it in the hands of a subordinate officer of the court. I have no fault to find with the arrangement. I have no unkind feeling toward anyone connected with this police court, and I have made friends down here who will last as long as life.

"It is a comfort to reflect that in all my experience as acting police judge I have done nothing either as a judge or a mayor that I would not do as a man. I have done by the unfortunate men and women who have come before me in this court everything in my power to help them to better lives, and nothing to hinder them. I have sent no one to prison, nor imposed fines upon people for their being poor. In short, I have done by them just as I would have another judge do by my son, if he were a drunkard or a thief, or by my sister or daughter, if she were a prostitute, and for thus being true to the highest and holiest impulses of my soul, the power of appointing a police judge is taken away from the mayor and conferred on a subordinate officer of this court—the clerk—and for the offense of being human I am removed from the police board, where the people elected me to serve, and this, by a power that is evidently superior to the people—the revised statutes of Ohio. But we can keep sweet God's rules, and the statutes are to be again revised.

"I am aware of the fact that many people believe in the virtue of brute force. But I do not. For my part I would be happy to see every revolver and every club in the world go over the Niagara Falls, or, better still, over the brink of hell."—Toledo Bee, April 30, 1902.

"Say, pa, what's a crank?"

"A crank, my son, is a specialist in any line in which you are not interested."—Chicago Daily News.

FROM A REPUBLICAN CITIZEN TO A REPUBLICAN STATESMAN.

For The Public.

Hon. U. G. Denman, Toledo, O.—My Dear Sir: Republics (and Republicans) are proverbially ungrateful. Hence, your recent action as a member of the Ohio legislature has not been fittingly celebrated in song or in monumental brass. Would that I could sing, that I might rehearse the excellence of your service to the new genius of our Grand Old Party. Nor am I in position to furnish the monumental brass, which, I admit, were a more appropriate tribute than a Homeric epic.

Few, indeed, have been the great statesmen of the world, who, confronted with an opportunity to give voice to the prevailing sentiment of the people that exalted them to illustrious position, have been as prompt to avail themselves of the occasion as you have been. Elected to represent the people of Toledo in the legislature of your great state, you perceived a divided allegiance. On the one hand loyalty to your party made demands on you. On the other, you perceived a duty to your constituents. A conflict confronted your conscience.

There came before the legislature of which you were a member a measure to take from the people of Toledo the right to manage a part of their domestic affairs, and to place the management of those affairs in the hands of extraneous powers. One may imagine with what indignation you regarded this proposition. Knowing your neighbors to be capable to exercise the province of self-government, you did not relish the thought that their liberties were threatened. On the other hand, party exigency also had claims upon you. Had you yielded to your primal impulse to cast your vote for the untrammelled liberties of your constituents, you might have won some evanescent praise from a limited circle of your neighbors. But no pent-up Utica (or Toledo) can contract great powers. You recognized a duty greater than the fugitive interests of the passing hour. Posterity, too, had claims upon you. Alas! how few of our great men are gifted with the sense of prevision! Happy republic that numbers a Denman as its savior from perils that the shortsighted may not discern. Well and truly did you argue with your conscience that while the people of Toledo to-day may be capable of self-government, there is no guarantee that they will remain so; that the mutations in the characters of peoples as of individuals, may

not be foreseen. Toledo, for generations, had been respectably Dr. Jeckyl, but on recent occasions had been known to go Hyde. Who could foretell the ultimate outcome of such a tendency? Commonplace people would contend that Toledo had a right to go Jekyl or go Hyde, at its own transitory will. Great saviors of society have a mission to check insalutary tendencies of a people to go wrong. And so you registered your vote in behalf of posterity, and at the same time gave the benefit of your moral support to the new position of our Grand Old Party, that no people are to be deemed capable of self-government until they have demonstrated their fitness to exercise it; and that the way to ascertain whether or not they are so capable, is to deprive them of the power to exercise those rights during the period of probation.

Such has been the attitude of our party toward inferior peoples at the other end of the world, and now, in order that those denizens of our possessions may see that we are ready to practise at home what we preach abroad, you have enabled us to point with pride to Toledo, which enjoys far better local government from our party leaders at Columbus than could possibly be secured by home rule.

Emerson tells us that "Consistency is the hobgoblin of little minds." It must ever be a source of satisfaction to you to remember the occasion on which you lifted your voice for the oppressed people of Ireland, demanding, in their name, the right of home rule. Having seen a new light you are brave enough to trample the hobgoblin under foot, and to sacrifice the liberties of your neighbors of Toledo on the altar of Posterity, and thus show how great and far-seeing a statesman you have grown to be since your enthusiastic and magnetic appeals for home rule in Ireland thundered terrors to the Tory government of perfidious Albion.

Neither the people of Ireland, nor of the Philippines, nor of Toledo deserve home rule until they give evidence of their capacity to use their own powers safely. These seem local questions to the groundling, but the judicious understand how vast in import are the issues involved. Ireland may be trusted with home rule when her people show a more submissive spirit of loyalty to the British throne; the Filipinos "are and of right ought to be" free to manage their own affairs as soon as they admit that they are not as competent to do so as we can do it for them; and as for Toledo,

whenever that community will promise to be good, and give some hostage of repentance, by appointing no more non-partisan policemen, and to confine appointments to "the force" to picked men, loyal to our party, then, and not until then, will home rule be accorded. And I, for one, am convinced that when the right time comes the name of Denman will be found in the list of statesmen who will be willing to restore the liberties which he was, in the interests of posterity, instrumental in stifling. Admiringly yours,
HERMAN KUEHN.
 St. Louis, Mo., June 2, 1902.

TROUBLOUS TIMES.

We've had a social squabble down to Pohlck on the crick.
 It's goin' to smash the town, unless it's settled purty quick.
 It were an ice cream festival as started all the strife,
 'Twas Mrs. Jabez Jopples who exclaimed,
 "To save my life
 I can't see how it was that Salme Swoggins come to be
 Picked out to have the ice cream helped to her ahead o' me,
 When everybody livin' in the county shorely knows
 That we could buy and sell the Swoggins family, if we chose!"

Now, Jabez and Sam Swoggins has been friends for many a year;
 An' they're cut up 'bout this quarrel; but they're skeered to interfere.
 An' all the other women folks are started—that's the wust!
 Whenever there's a party each one wants her victuals fust.
 An' the men folks, they are gettin' so uneasy 'bout the fray
 They dasn't stop a minute, jes' to pass the time o' day.
 This "social precedence" has got us worried till we're sick,
 An' there ain't no joy in livin' up to Pohlck on the crick.

—Washington Star.

"Before I deliver sentence on you," said the judge to the culprit who had been found guilty, beyond all dispute, of breaking every commandment in the decalogue, besides committing some newly invented sins, "I should like to ask you if you have anything to say in your own behalf?"

"Only this, your honor," replied the prisoner; "I pray that the twentieth century receiver of inspiration be called to testify if the deeds I committed were not 'acts of God.'"

SOME BROWNIE TALK.

Said the Brownie above to the Brownie below: "Do not disturb our present peaceful relationships. Our interests are mutual. We cannot get along without each other. My prosperity is your prosperity. I

will be as easy on your back as I can—and ride."

Said the Brownie beneath to the Brownie above: "You come off! You make me tired! Go way back and sit down! I need no parasites on me."

Now the latter was very rude in his speech. And public sentiment turned against him. Senator Hanna and the Civic Federation came to arbitrate the difference. Since the Brownie above had spoken in such a genteel and conciliatory way, the case was decided in his favor. And he is still riding—Yellow Springs (Ohio) Social Justice.

"I understand there is a county in California that would like to be annexed to Chicago."

"But could we annex anything in California?"

"Why not? Must we expand entirely by annexing contiguous territory?"—Puck.

When it was urged that the coronation be omitted and the money it would cost used to buy rice for subjects who were starving, the Nation protested clamorously.

"What! and feed our vanity nothing?" they cried, aghast.

Man does not live by bread alone.—Life.

BOOK NOTICES.

FIRST READERS.

Could the prophetic soul of Solomon have had in mind first readers, when he wrote, "Of making many books there is no end"? There is a sharp competition among them in the matter of artistic make-up, and in this respect Funk & Wagnalls' product (Funk & Wagnalls' Standard Reader Series. First Reader. Edited by Isaac K. Funk, LL. D., editor-in-chief of the Standard Dictionary) and Montrose J. Moses, B. S. Also Teachers' Manual for First Reader. Same editors. New York: Funk & Wagnalls, publishers) can hold its own. The newest feature of the series is that it adopts for purposes of pronunciation the scientific alphabet, used in the Standard dictionary and by other recent authorities. The scientific alphabet furnishes a symbol for each separate sound in the language, introducing three new vowel symbols and two new diacritic marks, and combining letters when necessary to give sounds not otherwise adequately rendered. There is no doubt that the new alphabet is of value; the question remains, whether a school text book is the place to introduce it while it is not yet generally adopted; whether confusion to the children may not result when they enlarge their reading later among books of reference. The other feature of the book open to objection is the printing of lessons in the scientific alphabet. These lessons are on opposite pages to the regular form, and are printed in red ink. It may be anticipating trouble, and it may also be an argument for the scientific alphabet, to wonder whether the children will not remember the phonetic spelling longer than the unscientific but orthodox form. But so long as our spelling is a sensitive point with us, perhaps it would be as well to remove even the most scientific forms of temptation. For older

folk the phonetic equivalent in a dictionary is helpful and necessary; but the primary teacher will probably fight shy of it for the period of life when all symbols are new and difficult. An ingenious method of teaching sounds in connection with music will commend itself to teachers, however, and the pictures are quite beyond criticism. The reader, which is accompanied by a Teachers' Manual, is an intelligent effort along the line pointed out by modern educators, of presenting the form of words as a sequence to thought. The reading matter is well worth reading, which is the main thing after all, and here and there are bits of verse and stray lines of prose which are hints such as children take hungrily, of the larger world of literature to which their little primers are the portal. There is a commendable lack of the puerile devices supposed to appeal to children which are so different from the cheerful nonsense they invent themselves, helping to keep the world young.
 A. M. M.

In "Economic Tangles" (Wynkoop Hallenbeck Crawford Co., Lansing, Mich.) Judson Grenell, the well known Detroit Journalist, has undertaken to explain industrial problems through lessons drawn from passing events, and has done it with wonderful skill and in charming style. There are 30 essays and a story, all related so intimately as to preserve the unity of the book without a break. Among the particular subjects treated are strikes, guilds, arbitration, trades unions, wages, socialism, the single tax, newspapers, industrial depression, free speech, etc. These seem like dry subjects, but here Mr. Grenell's newspaper skill serves him well. They read more like stories than essays, but without any sacrifice of good sense. Indeed, the simple common sense which pervades the essays is part of their fascination. Each is an argument; yet none of them read like arguments. They give facts, and suggest rather than assert reasons, so that the reader almost unconsciously carries the argument along himself as if it were his own. Mr. Grenell's sympathies are clearly with working men, and while he has no quarrel with socialism and leans toward individualism, he is evidently a very intelligent disciple of Henry George.

PERIODICALS.

—The Church Standard (Philadelphia) prints in its issue of May 31 a letter from a mechanic which makes a temperate and yet stanch reply, in behalf of the striking miners, to an editorial note in a previous issue of that paper. The letter, after speaking of the great need of improvement in the condition of the mines, makes a clear statement of their willingness to accept the slightest concessions rather than resort to the present strike.
 J. H. D.

—In the North American Review for June, Mr. Henry Michelsen, vice president of the

THE POLITICAL CAMPAIGN.

With the political campaign now opening, in which important questions of government, both political and economic, are at stake, we follow our usual custom of offering The Public at a reduced rate for the campaign, with the view of extending its influence and promoting its circulation. We will therefore receive

CAMPAIGN SUBSCRIPTIONS

from bona fide NEW SUBSCRIBERS from now on, to and including the issue of November 8, next, for

FIFTY CENTS.

This price is considerably below the regular terms, but we have found that a large proportion of campaign subscribers, becoming acquainted with and friends of the paper in that way, become regular subscribers, which makes it worth our while to encourage campaign subscriptions.

Address THE PUBLIC, Box 687,
 CHICAGO, ILL.



DR. JEKYLL — and — **MR. HYDE**
The Liberator and Champion
of Freedom in Cuba.

MR. HYDE
The Despot and Foe of Liberty
in the Philippines.

American Forestry association, answers the question, How to Curb Trusts, by advocating the nationalization of the railways. Mr. Michelsen was for 30 years in the railway service, and is able to speak with authority on certain details of railway management. The same number of the North American contains an article by Carroll D. Wright, giving statistics on strikes in the United States. Many will doubtless be surprised at the number of strikes which have succeeded wholly or in part—about 65 per cent., according to Mr. Wright's tables.—J. H. D.

—Under the title, "More Land for the Irish Peasant," a recent article in the Manchester (Eng.) Guardian calls attention once more to the inevitable Irish land question. The statistics quoted speak "louder than words." In 1851 there were 315 persons per 1,000 acres against 219 in 1901. In the same period the cattle per 1,000 acres have risen from 143 to 214, the sheep from 102 to 227. "Government returns," says the writer, "tell a tale of woe and lamentation in relation to uncultivated and uncultivated land." The article bears out the statement long ago made by Henry George that very much of the best land in Ireland is not cultivated. J. H. D.

—The Independent (New York) has recently been publishing articles of more than passing interest to students of social problems. The striking article by Mr. W. J. Ghent was followed by a discussion of the Concentration of Wealth, in which, among others, W. J. Bryan, John R. Commons, Ernest H. Crosby, John DeWitt Warner and Henry D. Lloyd took part. The number for May 29 contains a further discussion of Mr. Ghent's article by Prof. John B. Clark, of Columbia university. Prof. Clark asserts that "the new century is ushering in a benevolent feudalism;" but he thinks democracy will be strong enough to maintain the commonwealth. At the close of his too brief paper he recognizes monopoly as the real foe of both labor and capital. "If we were to make a picture," he says, "that should symbolize the coming state it would not be that of a portly figure representing capital holding labor under its feet and glancing apprehensively at fierce shapes lurking in the shadows and representing communism and anarchism. Rather would it be a picture of two strong men standing side by side and representing the honest capitalist and the honest laborer in their natural alliance, looking with displeasure but with no fear at the ugly shape of monopoly which menaces them both."—J. H. D.

The Colorado Campaign for Home Rule in Taxation.

A great opportunity is presented for advancing the cause of true tax reform in Colorado. Senator Bucklin has secured the passage of a bill to amend the constitution of Colorado by granting to each county of the state the power to exempt from taxation any property other than land values and franchises in public ways. The people are to vote on this amendment at the next election in November, and if approved by the people it becomes a part of the constitution of the state.

If this great reform is effected in Colorado its influence will be felt throughout the United States. The prospect of a favorable vote is excellent, as the amendment must receive only a majority of the votes cast for or against it and not, as in some states, a majority of all the votes polled at the election. The bill passed the Senate and Assembly with very little opposition, and Senators Teller and Patterson have both declared themselves in favor of the amendment. Senator Patterson is the owner of the "Rocky Mountain News," the most important paper in Colorado, and the support of this paper can be relied upon. The State Federation of Labor has endorsed the amendment, and many local Unions have pledged themselves to vote for it.

Some opposition has already developed, but the chief danger is that the amendment will not be sufficiently well understood to avert the danger of misrepresentation toward the end of the campaign.

It is the duty of everyone who understands the great social and economic change that can be brought about through scientific taxation to help to the full extent of his power. A national committee has been formed and makes an appeal for contributions. Money is needed for the spreading of literature on the subject and for the expenses of speakers. Let us give what we can, and promptly.

Contributions from any of the southern states may be sent to Mr. R. H. Cage, P. O. Box 533, New Orleans, La.

J. H. DILLARD,
National Committeeman for Louisiana.

"THE PUBLIC" WANTED. We want
of Volume I
of "THE
PUBLIC" bound, in good order. State price.
CROWN PUBLISHING CO.,
42 Second St., San Francisco, Cal.

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
1641 UNITY 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,
613 Roanoke Building, Chicago.

Houston.

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

New York.

FRED. CYRUS LEUBUSCHER,
COUNSELLOR AT LAW,
BENNETT BLDG.
80 Nassau St., Borough of Manhattan,
Tel. Call, 1858 Cortlandt. Rooms 1011-1012
NEW YORK.

TELEPHONE WEST 1073. NOTARY PUBLIC
CHARLES A. JOSLYN, JR.
AUDITOR AND ACCOUNTANT

A specialty made of Opening, Closing and Examining Books of Small Concerns.
Satisfaction guaranteed and charges reasonable.
Call or address 351 SOUTH TROY STREET.