

Dr. HJ Woodhouse
Nov 3-00 Box 541

The Public

Third Year.

CHICAGO, SATURDAY, JUNE 2, 1900.

Number 113.

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 column of last page.

President McKinley's new Philippine commission, just arrived at Hongkong, assures the newspaper correspondents that it confidently expects "to pacify the Philippines rapidly." But didn't Gen. Otis pacify them before he left Manila? He said he did.

"Once Lord Roberts gets control of the Johannesburg mines," says a prominent mining stock broker of London, as reported by cable, "the war is over so far as the mine owners are concerned." Doubtless. Its whole object, so far as the mine owners are concerned, will have been accomplished. But so far as the tory ministry of Great Britain is concerned, the war will not be over until the independence of the two Boer republics has been destroyed; for that was the ministry's object in getting it started.

The forty-fourth anniversary of the birth of the republican party was celebrated last week at Bloomington, Ill. The fourth anniversary of its death will be celebrated all over the United States next November. For the republican party did die when the republican principles of Lincoln were crowded out of it to make room for the plutocratic principles of Hanna.

Kansas is badly in need of 20,000 harvest hands. So the word goes around. And many is the homily to unemployed workmen in other parts of the country for which that statement will be made a text by plutocratic papers. But may not the unemployed, before mobilizing in

Kansas, reasonably ask what Kansas would do with them after the harvest is in and their labor is no longer needed?

Col. Parker, president of the Chicago Institute and a famous educator of this city, when addressing the Illinois congress of mothers strengthened a sentiment among the delegates in favor of an auxiliary organization for fathers. The idea is sound. But the new organization ought not to be auxiliary. If the interests of children are the chief object in view the congress should be not one of mothers with a masculine attachment, but one of mothers and fathers. The feminine and the masculine principles are always complementary. Neither is ever complete without the other.

An injunction has been issued by the federal court in Missouri against a postmaster of that state, forbidding his obedience to an order of the postmaster general which directs him to confiscate the mail of a firm charged with using the mails for purposes of fraud. It would be too much to hope that the injunction might be sustained. But it ought to be. It were better to let fraud flourish than to stamp it out by means of a censorship of the mails which, if not checked, will yet be extended so as to hamper freedom of legitimate communication. The matter has gone so far even now that a strong legal case, resting upon precedent, could be made in support of a law prohibiting the carrying through the mails of political documents, such, for instance, as socialist tracts.

It has just come out that the captain of an American warship in the Philippines wantonly shot and killed a Filipino in a Philippine harbor on the 21st of November, 1898. The

Filipino, in a shore boat, came within hailing distance of this naval officer's ship, and was fatally saluted with a bullet from the captain's pistol, an act for which the captain is now to be tried by court-martial. From the specifications presented to the court-martial it appears that he "did wilfully and without justifiable cause, and without the exercise of proper discretion," commit this murderous act. But he is to be tried for it? Yes, indeed! Such a crime must not go unpunished. He is to be tried for—murder? manslaughter? Well, not for either; but "scandalous conduct tending to the destruction of good morals," and "conduct to the prejudice of good order and discipline"! Conviction will doubtless bring down upon him the penalty at least of an "awfully severe reprimand."

"Government by injunction" has been overhauled by a committee of lawyers appointed by the Social Reform club of New York city. Among the members of this committee we recognize the well-known names of John Brooks Leavitt, Ernest H. Crosby and John D. Kernan. Mr. Crosby would not be classed at all as conservative, but Mr. Brooks and Mr. Kernan, the latter a son of the late distinguished Senator Kernan, of New York, are as conservative, both as lawyers and men, as is possible without some degree of collusion with the devil. The report of this committee, being unanimous, may therefore be viewed as a conservative document. So regarded, it is about the severest rebuke that government by injunction has yet encountered.

The committee took for its starting point the Debs case, as decided by the federal supreme court, regarding which it believes there has been much popular misunderstanding.

ing. Upon its analysis, that decision sustains injunctions by federal courts against such obstructions of highways as tend to impair rights of interstate commerce or interfere with the transmission of the mails; and it justifies punishment for contempt without jury trial in cases of violations of injunctions, even when the act enjoined constitutes a crime with its constitutional guarantees of trial by jury. But the decision does not warrant the punishment of persons not made parties to the action in which the injunction issues, nor the granting of injunctions against the exercise of any lawful act, such as lawful gatherings upon the highways or the exercise of the right of free speech. And the committee is of opinion that the supreme court would countenance no such "gross usurpations of judicial power." In support of this view it quotes from Judge Brewer's opinion in the Debs case, where he says that the complaint or "bill" in that case—

was only to restrain forcible obstructions to the highways along which interstate commerce travels and the mails are carried.

Stress is laid upon the word "only" in this quotation. Yet the committee finds that just such "gross usurpations" have been indulged in by lower courts upon the assumed authority of the Debs case. In the wire trust case in Cleveland a federal court enjoined strikers "from in any manner interfering with" the trust's business. In the Wheeling railway case, another federal court sent two men to jail for contempt of an injunction to which they were not parties nor the agents of parties, for "reviling" and "cursing" employes of the railway company. "If," says the committee, "these men had not actually served out an imprisonment in jail for 30 days as a punishment for contempt of corporation, it might be thought that your committee had taken this example from opera bouffe." Another instance of usurpation cited is that of a New York judge, Freedman, who not only enjoined

striking cigar makers from "picketing," an act which the highest court of the state has shrunk from holding to be unlawful, but prohibited the payment of relief money to strikers, and in describing the act of "picketing" made the injunction so comprehensive as virtually to forbid peaceable and conciliatory communications. All this is condemned by the committee, and made the basis of a charge, couched in the most temperate language, that many of our judges of late years, especially those of the United States courts, have by their usurping injunctions placed themselves in the category of those worst of offenders in a republic—men who so act as to "break down reverence for law and respect for the courts."

To remedy the manifest mischief of allowing these usurping judges to act under cover of contempt proceedings as juries in their own cases, the committee recommends certain restrictions which commend themselves to the serious consideration of a vigilant public. It proposes, in the first place, that the judges of the lower federal courts be elected by the people of their respective districts, as is done with reference to state judges in at least 32 of the most important states of the union; and that appointments of supreme court judges be made exclusively from among judges of the lower federal and of the state courts who have served upon the bench at least ten years immediately prior to appointment. That would certainly end the flagrant evil of presidential appointments from the corps of corporation lawyers. The other recommendations of the committee are that injunctions shall issue against no one but the parties to a suit and their agents; that any prohibition by injunction of a lawful use of highways, of the right of free speech, or of lawful combinations, shall nullify the entire injunction; that any act of disobedience which constitutes an indictable crime shall be tried by jury, if the person charged demands it; that upon application for

preliminary injunctions in labor cases, when there are disputed questions of fact, either party shall be entitled to demand a jury trial; and that general labor organizations be requested to carry all labor questions arising under existing law to the highest courts, to the end that "any usurpation of judicial power in any court of the land, however distant or obscure, may be effectually restrained and brought to naught." The last recommendation is a wise one, and labor organizations may wisely act upon it; but we have less confidence than the committee so conservatively professes, that judicial usurpation would thereby be brought to naught. It is the experience of history that usurpation is one of the characteristics of the judicial establishment. Though it often obstructs usurpations by other departments of the government, it most frequently double rivets its own. Some of the other recommendations are new, and all of them seem to be wise. They at any rate testify to a growing disposition, even in conservative quarters, to resist the tide of usurpation by the federal judiciary.

A very different state of affairs in the Philippines from that inferred by Bishop Potter has been discovered by George Ade, the brilliant and thoughtful journalist who was sent there by the Chicago Record to make a special investigation. While four days in the military atmosphere of Manila enabled the bishop to say that the question of subjugating the Filipinos is now merely academic, Mr. Ade finds, after three weeks' intercourse with all sorts of well-informed people, not only at Manila but in several other places on the island of Luzon, that "our 'peace' in the Philippines is of very unstable quality." The pacification is a sham, and the attempts to conceal the real state of things by characterizing the Filipino troops as "ladrones" or robber bands has become a grim joke. Every reasonably well-informed person in Manila knows that these bands, in