

the Austrian ambassador, L. von Szagenyrich, in behalf of Austria-Hungary, and the Italian ambassador, Count Lanza Di Busca, in behalf of Italy.

Although the "Dreibund" has always been a secret compact and its recent renewal was made in secret, the English correspondent, M. de Blowitz, claimed several years ago to have come into a knowledge of its terms. His disclosures are summarized as follows:

1. Should either of the three countries be attacked by Russia, each is to assist the other with its entire military force and only to conclude terms of peace upon such terms as all agree to accept.

2. Should either be attacked by any other power the others pledge themselves not to support the aggressor, but to maintain an attitude of neutrality. Should Russia assist the aggressor, however, war operations will then be carried on in common and terms of peace be conjointly arranged.

3. The agreement being secret, it shall not be shown to a fourth power without the consent of the three contracting parties, but in the event of Russia's becoming menacing the czar is to be informed that an attack upon any of the powers named will be construed as an attack upon all the parties in the alliance.

No other serious European news is reported, except the bulletins about the British king's condition, which is very greatly improved; his disease not having been, apparently, at all so serious as announced (p. 183) at first.

From the West Indies, however, there are reports of further revolutionary outbreaks in Haiti. The elections under the provisional government (p. 121) began on the 28th. Gen. Firmin was one candidate for the presidency, and Gen. Nord another. Gen. Nord is minister of war under the provisional government. One of Gen. Firmin's partisans, Admiral Killick, whose vessel lay in the harbor of Cape Haytien, disembarked troops on the 28th who participated in the afternoon in street fighting in that city between Firmin and the government, supporting Firmin. The fighting continued through the 29th, when the city was bombarded by the admiral; but in the evening Firmin's partisans withdrew with the admiral's troops to the admiral's vessel. At Port au Prince the election

was proceeding calmly on the 28th, and the citizens were voting freely, but all this had changed on the 30th. At latest advices voting had been abandoned and the rival political parties were lined up for battle.

American politics is not so lurid. The Republican convention of Minnesota met on the 1st and nominated Gov. Van Sant. In its platform it approves the course of President Roosevelt and recommended him for reelection. On the tariff question it affirms its adherence to the policy of protection, but demands such modifications of tariff schedules from time to time as will lighten the burdens of the consumer. In Michigan the Republican convention met on the 26th and renominated Gov. Bliss. Its platform pledges support to President Roosevelt, but does not recommend him for reelection; and in its tariff plank it not only reaffirms its faith in the protective tariff, but opposes "all efforts to destroy it or emasculate it or weaken its beneficent operations." The Republicans of Arkansas are split in two. One faction, which has nominated Henry M. Myers for governor, follows the lead of Gen. Powell Clayton, ambassador to Mexico; the other denounces "the arbitrary dictation of boss rule known as Claytonism" and nominates Charles D. Greaves for governor. Both conventions were held at Little Rock on the 26th. The Prohibition party of Illinois met in state convention at Peoria on the 1st of July and nominated John H. Wilson for state treasurer. John P. Hopkins was elected chairman of the Democratic state committee of Illinois on the 26th against the opposition of Mayor Harrison, of Chicago. His vote was 25 to 7.

An educational question of universal interest has arisen in connection with the University of Chicago, which is distinguished for the democratic character of its students and its policy of coeducation without distinction of sex. Fears are now entertained, especially by the alumnae, most of whom favor coeducation, of what they call a diplomatic movement to segregate the women students. It seems that President Harper has laid before the trustees a proposition to build a woman's quarter for the junior colleges—classes of the first and second year—apart from the regular college buildings, he assuring the board of the necessary funds. The

board having observed, however, that the plans proposed contemplated class rooms in the new buildings, referred the matter for advice to the "Congregation," a comprehensive representative body of the university, which in turn referred it to the "Junior College," composed of the professors and permanent instructors in the junior colleges. In this body the majority of a committee reported recommending "that in the development of Junior College instruction provision be made as rapidly as possible for separate sections for men and women," while the minority recommended "that the system of coinstruction be continued as heretofore." The majority report was lost, 14 to 19; but President Harper afterward reversed this vote by declaring after a scrutiny that 6 of the affirmative votes had been cast by non-permanent instructors. So the majority report went before the "Congregation" as the expression of the views of the "Junior College." But the "Congregation" disapproved by a vote of 24 to 7. This is the status of the controversy at present. A mail vote of the alumnae has brought out an overwhelming majority against segregation.

Neither President Harper nor any of the supporters of the change are communicative as to the purpose of the proposed innovation; but it is believed that the intention is to make a man's college of the institution, with an annex for women, like Harvard. The supposed motive is disclosed by President Benj. Ide Wheeler, of the University of California, who, though not especially concerned about the Chicago institution, is a supporter of the general movement for segregation. In an interview in the San Francisco Examiner of the 2d, President Wheeler said:

I have noticed that in every college or educational institution visited by me on my tour there are two girls for every boy. This is the astonishing ratio. In a measure this disgusts the average young man who has hopes of entering college, and as a consequence we must experience this shortage among the male students. In 1894, in Los Angeles, there were an equal number of boys and girls attending the high schools of that city. Take it now. There are just about half as many boys as girls, and I would attribute this fact directly to coeducation. Let us give the young men a chance. Not directly in reply to this, but bearing upon it by way of reply, is the

remark of Theresa Hirschl, secretary of the "University of Chicago Alumnae association," in the Chicago Tribune of the 29th, where she writes:

It may be an argument in favor of the proposed measure at the University of Chicago that Dr. Harper admires, as he is reported to do, the Ogontz girl more than he does the coeducated girl. It seems not improbable. But there is Ogontz for her. And he may also admire the Yale man, who has greater wealth and social position, more than he does the sturdy representative of middle-class democracy who is typical of Chicago. But there is Yale for him.

If legal news from Ohio was abundant last week (p. 186) it is overflowing this week. The supreme court of the state has made decisions which will revolutionize the municipal system of Ohio. They destroy the validity of every important municipal charter.

The constitution of Ohio prohibits the passing of any "special act conferring corporate powers." But it has long been customary for the legislature to evade this prohibition, when legislating for the government of cities, by classifying and grading them so that only one city in the state would come within any given grade, and then legislating for cities of that class. In this way the federal system, under which city employes are responsible to the mayor and he to the people, was adopted in 1891 for Cleveland. The plan has worked satisfactorily. But when Mayor Johnson's crusade against tax dodging corporations began, a suit was instituted, evidently to weaken his influence in local government, to uproot the federal system as special legislation. The attorney general, Mr. Sheets, authorized this suit, but refused to authorize one with reference to Cincinnati, whose charter is open to the same general objection. While the suit against Cleveland was pending, Mayor Jones, of Toledo, attacked the Toledo "ripper" bill (p. 72), which specially legislated the local police board of Toledo out of office and put a state board in its place, by describing that city according to its special grade and class. Both the Cleveland and the Toledo cases were decided by the supreme court on the 26th. In the Cleveland charter there were defects peculiar

to that charter alone; but the Toledo case brought up the whole question and made the revolutionary character of the decisions unquestionable.

In its opinion the court says: The eleven principal cities of the state are isolated, so that an act conferring corporate power upon one of them by classified description, confers it upon no other. They have been isolated under the guise of classification. . . . We have been required, from time to time, to examine many of the acts to confer corporate powers upon the isolated cities composing the eleven classes referred to, and others containing special classifications, and still others have been examined in the present inquiry. In view of the trivial differences in population, and of the nature of the powers conferred, it appears from such examination that the present classification cannot be regarded as based upon differences in population, or upon any other real or supposed differences in local requirements. Its real basis is found in the differing views or interests of those who promote legislation for the different municipalities of the state. An intention to do that which would be violative of the organic law should not be imputed upon mere suspicion. But the body of legislation relating to this subject shows the legislative intent to substitute isolation for classification, so that all the municipalities of the state which are large enough to attract attention shall be denied the protection intended to be afforded by this section of the constitution. The provisions of the section could not be more clear or imperative, and relief from the present confusion of municipal acts and the burdens which they impose would not be afforded by its amendment. Since we cannot admit that legislative power is in its nature illimitable, we must conclude that this provision of the paramount law annuls the acts relating to Cleveland and Toledo, if they confer corporate power.

In consequence of these decisions, the effect of which upon Cleveland is delayed until October 2 by a stay granted by the court in the ouster suit in which the Cleveland decision is rendered, it is believed that Gov. Nash will be obliged to call a special session of the legislature before the 2d of October.

In anticipation of that contingency, Mayor Johnson has called the Cuyahoga county senators and representatives together to draft a municipal code, upon the home rule principle, for all the cities of Ohio.

Mayor Johnson's signed declaration of his views regarding the confusion resulting from the decision, written for the Cleveland Press, is as follows:

Editor of the Press: In answer to your request for a statement on the federal plan decision:

I regret the publication in morning papers yesterday, of what were claimed to be interviews with me in New York. I talked to a correspondent who claimed to represent a press association, but he so garbled what I said that it was beyond recognition.

The ouster proceeding had its origin with two cheap Republican politicians, backed by interests opposed to the things the city administration stood for. It would have ended there, but for the action of Attorney General Sheets, with the advice and consent, as I am informed, of the state administration. Without the approval of Attorney General Sheets, no case could have been brought in the supreme court, and after this suit was begun he refused to comply with the request of Cincinnati attorneys to test the Cincinnati law. It was an attempt to play politics, but the result will show that it was poor politics. The entire responsibility rests with Attorney General Sheets and his advisers.

The important question is, however: What shall be done? I believe that the supreme court should be praised rather than blamed for its courageous decision. It was the timidity of their predecessors that made possible so much special legislation.

The federal plan of government in Cleveland is confessedly the best of any city in the United States, and we should not lose its advantages by reason of the mere form of its enactment. It can be and ought to be made the law. The legislature should be convened at once and the advantages of our form of government should be extended to the other municipalities of the state, rather than foist on Cleveland an antiquated board system or a government largely directed from the state capitol.

In an effort to enact a municipal code that will give us home rule and a federal plan of government all good citizens should cooperate. As to when this shall be done, it depends upon the will of the same state administration that has brought on the difficulty, and I hope they will display as much courage in building up as they have in tearing down.

Timid politicians may fear a meeting of the legislature before the fall elections, but the people have a right to know, before they vote, how a Republican administration and a Republican legislature will meet this emergency.

Along with its decisions in the Cleveland and Toledo cases the Ohio