

what a Russian paper smiles at grimly as the novel crime of "treason against foreign nations." They require a huge money indemnity. The amount is left to future adjustment, but it will doubtless be big enough to give the powers a long lease of military occupation while China takes the measures necessary for furnishing satisfactory guarantees of payment. Nor is that all. With the legation quarter at Peking perpetually fortified and garrisoned; with all the Chinese forts from Peking to the sea destroyed; with the right of the allied powers to perpetually occupy with military forces any points from Peking to the sea which they may designate; with the right of importing arms and munitions of war denied to China—and these are among the "irrevocable" conditions—with these advantages secured by a treaty to the powers, what possibilities of defense would the Chinese have when the powers had agreed upon a scheme of partitioning the empire and concluded that the time for action was ripe? None. There is no disguising it—indeed, the representatives of the powers do not seem to have tried to disguise it,—the joint note of the powers to the Chinese envoys is a bald proposition for the establishment over the empire of an international suzerainty. When that shall have been firmly established dismemberment will be a simple process, provided only that the powers agree upon their portions. The Chinese government and people will have ceased to be a party in interest. The distribution will concern them only as the distribution of loot by brigands concerns the owner who looks on in silence, being gagged, and without resisting, being bound.

We fail to find in the Hay-Pauncefote treaty, as amended by the senate, any substantial grounds for objection. If Great Britain accepts it, the United States need not complain. The treaty as now framed would abrogate the Clayton-Bulwer treaty, which gives Great Britain a right

to dictate with reference to the Nicaragua canal, and would relinquish to the United States all power over construction, ownership and operation. Very wisely, as it seems to us, provision is made for preserving the neutrality of the canal and for its use by all nations upon equal terms under all circumstances. The United States ought not to have the right to make the canal part of its warlike equipment. This great waterway should be maintained primarily as a channel for commerce. At the same time, since it is to be built and operated by the United States—and all may agree that no European power should be permitted to join in the enterprise—the United States ought to be invested with full power to protect it. This power is acknowledged. There does not appear, then, to be anything objectionable in the treaty. Nor is anything of vital importance omitted.

Yet all is not bright in connection with the matter. So far as international relations are concerned, we of this country may be content with the proposed treaty as the senate has amended it; and Great Britain has no just reason for feeling otherwise. But there are ample reasons for disquieting fears with reference to certain home relations. Instead of itself building the canal and owning and operating it, our government purposes investing a private corporation with that authority; and out of this relationship no end of trouble will probably arise. We shall have in worse form a repetition of our experience with the United States bank in Jackson's time, and with the Pacific railroads at a later day. The government will furnish most of the capital, while the corporation ring will reap all the profits. Worse still, this powerful ring will invest the lobbies of congress and the vestibules of the white house, and the people will fall a prey to a greedy and powerful Nicaragua canal corporation. What will be needed most with reference to the Nicaragua canal should the treaty

be finally ratified, is a vigorous agitation for government construction, government ownership, and government management of the canal.

It would appear that the Baptist ministers' conference of Philadelphia is a patriotic rather than a Christian organization, one which loves colored bunting more than the neighbor. A member, Rev. Dr. Poteat, introduced to the conference at its meeting on the 17th, Sixto Lopez, the Filipino envoy, with a request that he be heard. This request was seconded by Rev. L. Sensholes. We mention these two names for much the same reason that Lot's is mentioned in connection with Sodom and Gomorrah. Mr. Sensholes urged with reference to the Filipino question that "all reports that we have had from the other side have been garbled," and asked if it would not "be better to give a hearing to this man that we may determine the truth." But the truth was not what the conference wanted. One Wayland Hoyt, a doctor of divinity, thought that it would be virtually an acknowledgment of a traitor to listen to Mr. Lopez. It is to be hoped that Mr. Hoyt knows more of divinity than he appears from this remark to know of law. Since one must owe allegiance to a country before he can commit treason against it, Mr. Lopez, who has never, directly or indirectly, actually or constructively, owed allegiance to the United States, can hardly be regarded legally as a traitor. If he were a traitor it would be the duty of the authorities to have him promptly prosecuted. The function of traitor baiting ought not to be relegated to the Philadelphia conference of Baptist ministers. But Mr. Hoyt's objection proved sufficient. The conference summarily refused to hear Lopez. It had a right, of course, to refuse. We make no complaint of its action. But the reason for the action has precious little of the flavor of Christmas season.

Against the narrow patriotism of

that Baptist conference let us refer our readers to the Christmas greeting of the man it scorned. It will be found in the Miscellany department of this issue. After comparing the exalted letter of Lopez with the refusal of the Baptist conference of Philadelphia to hear him because he is a traitor, the reader may fairly wonder which is pagan and which is Christian?

A much-needed society has been organized in Boston, having for its object the collection and publication of authoritative information regarding the Philippine question. This society is known as "the Philippine Information society." Its president is Dr. James J. Putnam, and among its vice presidents are Charles Francis Adams, Arthur Astor Carey, Edward W. Emerson and Dr. Edward G. Gardner. L. K. Fuller, of 12 Otis place, Boston, is the secretary, to whom applications for membership or for the publications of the society may be sent. Contributions from one dollar upwards are solicited. They may be sent to the treasurer, William H. McElwain, 84 Essex building, Boston. Members of the society are expected "to inform themselves, as fully and accurately as possible, as to the true state of affairs in the Philippine islands," and "to circulate accurate information, by informal conversation, by inducing others to study the facts collected, and by sending to the secretary the names of people who may be thought to be interested."

Congressman Lentz will render a public service, whether he succeeds in establishing his right to a seat in congress for the third term or not, if he makes good his promise to expose the corrupt methods by which last fall he was nominally defeated for reelection. He makes this promise after a conference with the democratic leaders at Washington, who advise him to contest the seat, which has been awarded to his republican adversary; and in

an open letter to his constituents of the Columbus district of Ohio, he says:

Bribery ran riot in this district on election day, and the country at large should be given an opportunity to know the methods employed, for which numbers of men should spend their remaining days in the penitentiary. I have evidence to justify a deliberate statement that men in the United States service, and others equally under the control and influence of President McKinley, spent their entire time in corrupting the miserable and needy voters in this district. The capital city of Ohio has been the scene of the corrupt use of money and presidential favors during the contests of three successive years. First, when Hanna secured his seat in the United States senate in 1898; second, when trusts removed Attorney General Monett in 1899, and third, when \$100,000 was spent in the corruption of voters to defeat me in 1900.

Such a sink of political corruption needs renovation, and there could be no better man to superintend the job than Congressman Lentz.

Mr. Lentz's reference to the removal of Attorney General Monnett by the trusts coincides significantly with the abandonment of the suits against trusts which Mr. Monnett began. This gentleman was the republican attorney general of Ohio. As such he prosecuted trusts, under the Ohio law, with such unusual vigor, for a republican office holder, as to attract the attention and win the confidence of the whole country. Not unnaturally, the trusts suspected him of trying to make a "strike." That is what vigorous official opposition has so frequently meant to them. So they offered a bribe. It was big enough—\$400,000—to satisfy the most greedy "striker." But Mr. Monnett refused it and pushed his prosecutions. Finally the trusts realized that he was not a "striker," but an honest official; and as there is only one way of dealing with that kind of rare bird, they promptly adopted it. They requested the managers of the republican state convention not to renominate Mr. Monnett. The convention readily complied. Another candidate was

named and elected along with the rest of the ticket. And now we have the sequel. On motion of the new attorney general, all the anti-trust suits before the supreme court of Ohio are dismissed.

It seems that New Jersey has a law, enacted last winter, which authorizes towns to meet the expenses of advertising their advantages for residences and factories by levying a local tax for that specific purpose. One of the New Jersey towns to avail itself of this privilege is Plainfield, which has decided to raise a tax of one and one-half per cent for advertising. Commenting upon that action, the Washington (N. J.) Star advises the people of its own town to follow Plainfield's example. It says:

Such a tax here would yield about \$750 per year, and this amount, judiciously spent by an active board of trade under the direction of the borough council, would certainly bring results. The whole idea, when properly handled, amounts to the exchanging of one dollar for two and is worthy of serious consideration, not only by this borough, but by all the towns of the state that have any ambition to push ahead and share in the great industrial expansion which has struck New Jersey.

We must take the liberty of admonishing our New Jersey friends that the Star is mistaken in supposing that "the exchanging of one dollar for two" is "the whole idea." That is only a part of the idea. The whole idea is this, that all the people of a town shall give one dollar in order to bring two to local landowners.

It is to be observed that this New Jersey tax falls upon all the taxable property of a town. People who rent real estate as well as people who own real estate must pay it; for people who rent real estate own taxable property. Moreover, they buy taxed store goods and pay the storekeeper's tax in the price. Besides that, they pay in their rent so much of the landlord's real estate tax as falls upon the value of the building and other improvements. This is a well understood principle of taxation. Taxes upon tenant