

will reflect upon the intelligence of the average Ohio voter if the tax-dodging monopolies and their political friends are not worsted as badly in the state as they have been already in Cuyahoga county.

Why is it that Congressional resolutions expressive of sympathy with the resistance of the Boer republics to the efforts of the Tory party of Great Britain to subjugate their people and annex their territory, never see the light after once getting into the possession of the committee on foreign affairs? Why are they "held up"? Perhaps none of them ought to pass. Possibly the committee ought not recommend all of them or any one of them. It may be that the adoption of any of these resolutions would put our nation in a false light as a neutral power. We might thereby seem to be taking sides with and aiding the cause of the Boer republics, somewhat as in connection with the British army depot at New Orleans we are actually taking sides with and aiding the British empire. This, of course, ought not to be done. No resolution regarding the Boers ought to be adopted by Congress which would really conflict with our obligations of neutrality. But that is not a valid reason for burying the resolutions in committee.

The function of a committee is to inquire into and report upon matters referred to it, not to "pigeon-hole" them. Whether it reports favorably or unfavorably is for the committee itself to decide. But it is its duty to report. When it refuses to do that, the people have a right to complain. And this is what the committee on foreign affairs of the House does refuse to do with the Boer resolutions in its hands. It has "held up" some of them two years, and congressmen and private citizens have tried in vain to get it to make any report, favorable or otherwise, upon any. How is this accomplished? Through the chairman of the committee, as everyone familiar with congressional procedure knows. What the chairman wants

done his associates of the party in power, constituting a majority of the committee, agree to. Unless they do, they get no plums. It is the same with what he doesn't want done. Consequently, if the chairman of a committee wishes to "hold up" any matter referred to his committee, he does so and "no questions asked."

Upon Robert R. Hitt, then, the chairman of the House committee on foreign affairs and a congressman from Illinois, rests the responsibility for the long and comprehensive "hold up" of Boer resolutions in Congress. Of that there can be no question. But what is Mr. Hitt's motive? There can be but one motive for such conduct. If the resolutions ought not to pass, the chairman should report against them with the reasons. But if there are no valid reasons why they should not pass, yet they are objectionable to him, his only recourse is to bury them. And this is what Mr. Hitt has done with the Boer resolutions that have accumulated in his committee during the past two years or more. Opposed to fair play for the Boers, but conscious of the popular sympathy for them which prevails in his state and over the country, he avoids the issue by pigeon-holing the resolutions. Mr. Hitt serves the Tory party of England, by putting the Boers at an unfair disadvantage with reference to American sentiment. He prevents a discussion and vote upon the resolutions in Congress upon their merits, and thereby fosters the notion, of which the British ministry makes much, that in the South African war the sympathy of the United States is with the British. This ought to answer the question of the Chicago Tribune, which wants to know why Mr. Hitt should not be the next senator from Illinois. It is to be hoped that Illinois wants no sympathizer with British toryism to represent her in the United States Senate.

Senator Hanna is widely commended for his fidelity to Rathbone, the Cuban postal defaulter. This is as it should be. Was not Rathbone

the man whose name figured conspicuously in the charges of bribery in connection with Mr. Hanna's election to the Senate—the man who, as the Toledo Bee tersely puts it "handled the legislators who had to be bought"? If Rathbone did push Mr. Hanna into the Senate, it would be only fair for Senator Hanna to pull Rathbone out of the penitentiary.

#### OUR DEMORALIZING CONQUEST.

##### I.

The inhumanity which has characterized the American occupation of the Philippines can no longer be denied. It must now be either defended with bravado or confessed with shame. The trial and verdict in the case of Maj. Waller leave no other alternative.

Maj. Waller was court-martialed for killing natives in the island of Samar, not in battle but in cold blood after capturing them.

His plea in part was that the natives in Samar were treacherous. But he conceded that he had not put his prisoners on trial to ascertain their individual guilt. He had executed them off-hand, without regard to whether they were individually guilty of treachery or not. Defending this as being within the usages of war, he urged that without criticism he had dealt in the same way with "boxers" in China; and that not only did this conduct there go without criticism from his superiors, but it was practiced and approved by officers of the European troops. Indeed, they were inclined to make sport of the Americans for chicken-heartedness, because in other respects the American policy was excessively fair and humane from the prevailing military point of view. Maj. Waller admitted the execution of 11 of his Samar prisoners in this unceremonious fashion, justifying the homicide as a legitimate act of war.

But he did not rest his defense on that plea alone. He made a further plea, the nature of which strongly indicates that his motive after all was not to punish treachery, but to terrorize a stubborn enemy by giving them to understand that they were to receive no quarter. He testified that he had acted pursuant to the orders of Maj.