

makes a "favorable balance of trade," on May 31 our favorable balance of trade since July 1, 1897, was \$6,416,953,278—all payable "in pure gold," according to William McKinley. The favorable balance since 1834 amounts to \$9,039,930,909, likewise payable "in pure gold." Since the party now in power in this country points with pride to its business ability, why doesn't it take steps to collect some of that "favorable balance"? We need the money.

* *

The Power of "Pork."

It is true, as some observers point out, that the strongest fight for an honest revision of the tariff is being conducted by various Republican Senators "who have thus far received very little help from the Democratic side." It is true, also, as too many of these observers do not point out, that the strongest fight for dishonest revision of the tariff is being conducted by the men, or the political agents of the men, who were in absolute control of the Republican convention at Chicago last year, who made such a platform as they wanted, and who could have prevented the nomination of Taft had they so desired. It is true, again, as these observers do not point out, that assistance for honest revision fails to come from the Democratic side because protection has so debauched the Democratic side that it stands with the dishonest revisionists in order to get some of the "pork" for its own barrel.

* *

A Nervy Senator—No!

The country was startled one day last week by an Associated Press report to the effect that one of the Protection Senators engaged in revising the tariff had "shed his collar." The nerve of the man excited momentary admiration. But it was only his shirt collar.

* *

Another Kind of Police Lawlessness.

Having set themselves a precedent in the case of Emma Goldman, the police of Chicago have now advanced to the point of lawlessly closing a Chinese mission school. The Goldman precedent applied in this case consisted in threatening hall owners who rented halls for Goldman lectures, that they would be closed for violation of the building laws, or for selling beer after hours, or for some such violation or other of municipal regulations of a kind or in a degree which is not usually interfered with. This worked so well in the Goldman case, that when the Chinese mission, which three religious women—Dr. Kline and her two sisters—have carried on for nearly ten years in the basement

of her house, came under the spell of a wretched Caucasian prejudice, the police promptly accommodated the prejudice. On pretense that her basement door moved inward instead of outward (which is a habit with dwelling-house basement doors, and has been with hers all through the life of the mission), and there were no exit lights (something that dwelling houses do not affect, and hers had never affected during the life of the mission), she was violating the building and fire laws. It was a happy even if tardy discovery, this; and the police promptly availed themselves of it. They swooped down upon the little gathering of Chinese who were singing "Nearer My God to Thee" and learning of those three home missionaries what missionaries are sent to China to teach, and stopped the teaching. They did it as lawlessly and despotically as they had stopped Emma Goldman's lecturing. Police lawlessness fattens upon what it feeds on.

* *

Judicial Contempt of Court.

One of Chicago's new judges has signaled his entrance upon judicial duties by placing himself in contempt of court. He has done it by assailing a jury, in open court, for bringing in a verdict of "not guilty" in a criminal case in which he wanted a verdict of "guilty." Doubtless this fresh young judge would not recognize that act as contempt of court. He may be what a candid English observer would be apt to call "a good deal of an ass," who thinks of the court as consisting only of the judge and not of all the functions that go to make a court of justice, including those of the jury.

*

Just as the judge has one function, so the jury has another. The jury's function is to pass upon the facts according to the evidence, and in a criminal case this function is exclusive and absolute. It is therefore quite as truly contempt of the court for a judge to attack a jury and insult them in open court for disagreeing with him on the facts upon which they find their verdict, as it would be for a jury to attack the judge and insult him in open court for disagreeing with them on a question of law involving the admissibility of evidence. The fact that he could punish them and they cannot punish him, makes no difference essentially.

*

We used to think that judges who commit this inexcusable offense overstep their functions and defy the law maliciously; but this latest Chicago case is obviously one of cephalic expansion. As