

telling the people you will not place any burden upon tea?" By way of challenge he added, referring to Senator Hale's argument: "I want to know whether the Senator from Maine will join me to protect the infant tea industry which we have down in South Carolina." An amendment, proposed by Senator Bacon (Democrat), which would have reduced duties on steel and earthenware, was supported only by Senator La Follette among the Republicans. It failed by 25 to 54. On the 12th the debate continued along the same general lines. Also on the 13th, when the principal subject of discussion was the reduction, proposed by the Senate finance committee, of present duties on iron ore, from 40 cents a ton to 25. The lower house had proposed putting it on the free list. Senator Burrows explained in this connection that 56,500 men are employed in producing iron ore, receiving \$31,500,000 in wages, and that their wages would be subjected by the proposed reduction to the competition of the world. The iron ore duty came to a vote on the 13th, when the free list proposal was supported by fourteen Republicans in the Senate: Beveridge, Borah, Bristow, Brown, Burkett, Clapp, Crawford, Cummins, Curtis, Dolliver, Du Pont, Gamble, La Follette, Nelson. But eighteen Democrats, some influenced by their respective local interests and others by revenue-tariff principles, voted with the finance committee for a duty of 25 per cent. These were: Bacon, Bailey, Bankhead, Chamberlain, Clay, Daniel, Fletcher, Foster, Frazier, Johnston, McEnery, Martin, Paynter, Simmons, Stone, Taliaferro, Taylor, Tillman. The 25 per cent duty carried by 61 to 24. The tobacco trust was the subject of attack on the 14th. Senator Beveridge (Republican) taking the lead. An amendment offered by Senator McLaurin, exempting from duty a series of farming implements and carpenters' and blacksmiths' tools made of iron and steel, was defeated on the 15th by 52 to 22. The discussions of the 16th bore upon particular items, and, as reported, were of no essential importance. But on the 17th the effort of the finance committee to increase the tariff on common razors from 55 per cent to 100 per cent, on the ground that the German "invasion" of the American razor market has destroyed the razor industry here, brought from Senator Bailey the comment that American protectionists used to complain of free trade England, but now they complain of protection Germany.

+ +

Anti-Imperialist Resolution in Regard to the Philippine Tariff.

The following resolution was adopted by the executive committee of the American Anti-Imperialist League (vol. xi, p. 851) at a special meeting in Boston, on the 11th, and has been communicated to Congress (p. 467):

Whereas: It is proposed that Congress shall by enactment lay a tariff on goods entering the Philippine Islands from other countries, without consultation with the Philippine Assembly, a body organized by our own government to represent the Filipino people, such enactment meaning taxation without representation; and

Whereas: It is proposed that the tariff on goods passing between the Philippine Islands and the United States shall be either lowered or abolished; and

Whereas: Every commercial favor between the Philippine Islands and the United States not granted to other countries constitutes a tie which prejudices the independence of the Islands; therefore

Resolved: That the Anti-Imperialist League, through its Executive Committee, recommends respectfully that all reference to the Philippine Islands be stricken out from the tariff bill now under consideration. If, however, any action be taken to modify the Philippine tariff the League urges that as a proper notification to investors in the Philippine Islands under the law, either a promise of independence at a definite period be incorporated as an amendment to any such enactment, or that an amendment may be added thereto directing the Executive to make arrangements looking to the neutralization of the Philippine Islands when their independence shall be declared.

MOORFIELD STOREY,
President.

ERVING WINSLOW,
Secretary.

+ +

A Mexican Manifesto.

An organizing junta of the Mexican Liberal party, evidently a socialistic organization, issues from San Antonio, Texas, a manifesto, signed by Enrique Flores Magon and Praxedes G. Guerrero, which describes the aims and objects of the Mexican working class movement, and incidentally the political and industrial conditions in Mexico under President Diaz. The more important parts of this manifesto are as follows:

The conditions of the working class in Mexico are different from those in other countries, different because Porfirio Diaz has for years been conspiring with foreign capitalists to build up a system which will create dissension between the Mexican workers and the workers of other lands. He has given vast grants of lands, mineral claims and railroad franchises to foreign capitalists, who on their part have hired foreign managers and foremen for their works, in which the foreign workmen were paid often double the wages allowed the Mexicans for the same class of labor. This crafty system of breeding discord among the workers has made it impossible for the Mexicans in the shops, factories and railroads to organize powerful unions as is done in other lands. The result of this great capitalist conspiracy has been to keep the standard of living in Mexico down to a point of starvation and to make great riches for the foreign friends of Diaz at the expense of the entire Mexican working class. . . . To show with what a lavish hand the Diaz government has enriched the American capitalists, it is only necessary to point out that E. H. Harriman owns 2,500,000 acres of oil

land west of Tampico, that the Hearst interests control in the neighborhood of 3,000,000 acres near the city of Chihuahua, and that the total area of territory now cornered, on the Gulf coast alone, by the joint interests of the Standard Oil and Harriman is over 1,000 miles long by an average of 70 miles in width, running through the richest lands of Mexico. These are but a fragment of the concessions granted by Diaz to American capitalists.

A bloody saturnalia has followed the career of Porfirio Diaz, whose record of killings among his own people is popularly estimated to be over thirty thousand lives. . . . Mexico's revolution is not purely a political revolution—it is a social problem which relates to us directly. We are compelled to meet force with force, for so the tyrant Diaz has decided. We did not seek strife, we were driven to it. We have learned the lesson so ably expressed by a great thinker—"Better a handful of force than a bag of rights." Our program is simple: we do not attempt to realize everything in a day, and so we will begin with the untying of the rope which binds, in order that we may go on to progress. Freedom of the press, speech and education, the right of public assemblage and the turning back to the people of all the great holdings of uncultivated lands; the abolition of capital punishment and the present brutal system of prisons; the abolition of debts which the peons have carried upon their shoulders for many generations, binding them to their masters in practical slavery from birth to death. These reforms are all in the program of the Liberal party. The eight-hour day, a minimum scale of wages, and the right of the people of the Republic to participate in all public questions, is also part of our program. In this fashion the Mexican revolution will open a trench in which will be built a social organism more just, more harmonious with the sentiments of solidarity and love such as will some day rule the world. It is axiomatic that those who work for the individual work for the mass, and that the emancipation of one people shortens the days of the whole world's slavery. Those nations which have attained comparative freedom should not close their eyes to the miseries of the less fortunate; nor should they turn their backs upon a struggle which is for the benefit of all. The armed mercenaries of the Mexican despot drive our countrymen into prisons of torture where life is prolonged merely to make the agony more cruel, and it must be remembered by you that the power to commit these atrocities has been obtained by Diaz, in large part, from his friends, the foreign investors, of whom many come from the United States. But not only in Mexico are we tracked by the police agents; in the United States we are also hunted like wild animals. Mexican homes in this country are entered without warrant, the patriots manacled and hurried to United States jails, while others are secretly taken to the border and delivered into the hands of the waiting rurales. . . . Comrades of the world, read carefully our manifesto and then take such action as will best help the cause of freedom.

+ +

Chicago Harbor Rights.

The fact has just become public that on the

26th of February last, the War Department of the United States granted a permit, supplementary to an old and unused franchise from the State of Illinois to the Chicago Dock and Canal Company, for the erection of piers into Lake Michigan along the lake shore within a distance of 1,000 feet north of the mouth of the Chicago river. This permit, however, is explained by the Department as giving no property rights to the company, but only as certifying that its proposed structures would not obstruct navigation or interfere with fishing. But as the submerged lands along these shores are held by the State of Illinois in trust for the City of Chicago, and as the State once chartered the Chicago Dock and Canal Company to build piers, it is feared that the company now possesses property rights with reference to pier construction, unless the non-user of its rights since the State granted them in 1857 may furnish sufficient grounds for revocation. This uncertainty is urged in behalf of legislation empowering the city to construct its own piers and other harbor improvements. What the private company definitely proposes is the construction of three piers, each 2,500 feet long, two of them solely for freight business and one for the accommodation of passengers; the passenger pier to be a three-deck affair, the lower for handling baggage, the middle for passengers, and the third for an amusement pier and an immense convention hall. It also contemplates doing a big lighterage business to and from the piers to wharves, railroad terminals and warehouses, and the operation of a warehouse business near the piers.

+ +

Another Commission-Government Charter.

By an overwhelming majority the Colorado Springs charter (p. 315) was adopted by referendum vote on the 11th. This charter was framed and is now adopted pursuant to the recent Colorado law which follows the general lines of the Des Moines law of Iowa (pp. 322, 331). It was framed by a local elective convention, and it confers upon the city absolute and final authority in all municipal matters—legislative, executive and judicial. It is subject to modification in any or all of its provisions by popular vote. It provides for a commission form of government, the elective officers to consist of a mayor and four councilmen, chosen from the city at large; and for division of the administrative powers of the city into five departments—waterworks, finance, public safety, public works and property, and public health and sanitation, presided over respectively by the mayor and four councilmen. All city employes are to be appointed by the mayor on recommendation of the heads of departments. It provides also for an absolute elimination of party politics; for adequate civil service rules; for the recall of any elective officer by special election on petition of 30