

fully suggest that this, and not the military propriety of Gen. Wheaton's interview, is the really important subject for congressional investigation which the Schurman-Wheaton episode demands.

Gov. Taft's denial of the adoption of Weylerian concentration methods by the Americans in the Philippines, is a striking instance of changing a name without altering the thing. He says that there are no "concentration" camps in the ordinary meaning of the term. Quite the contrary. Nothing has been done but to establish "a dead line into which will gradually be drawn all the remnants of insurrection that exists"! Could verbal gymnastics possibly be more gymnastical? Gov. Taft describes precisely what Weyler called "concentration." If that word had been as odorous in Weyler's day in Cuba as it is now, doubtless he himself would have been perfectly willing to adopt instead Gov. Taft's "dead line into which will gradually be drawn all the remnants of insurrection that exist." Had he shrunk from doing so it would have been because the description is too faithful to the repugnant facts.

Although the Hoar resolution for a special committee to inquire into the situation in the Philippines, something like the committee on the conduct of the war during our civil strife, has been buried in the pigeon holes of the Senate committee on the Philippines, that standing committee has undertaken the investigation itself. A committee so constituted can hardly be expected to make a thorough investigation. Its chairman is a hide-bound partisan who is thoroughly committed to the imperial programme; and of its 13 members all are Republicans but four — Culbertson, Patterson, Carmack and Rawlins. Four members of the committee opposed the Bacon resolution in 1899 — the resolution which disclaimed any intention to exercise permanent sovereignty over the Philippines. These are Lodge, Allison, Proctor and Burrows. One of the Republic-

an members, Hale, and one Democrat, Rawlins, favored the resolution. The other members were not senators at that time. The investigation should have been submitted to a committee selected with more particular reference to the cross-examining and information-gathering reputations of its members, especially those of the minority. Nevertheless, such qualities may be represented among the minority in the standing committee. With a Republican like Hale, and Democrats like Carmack and Rawlins, to probe the imperialist witnesses and bring forward others, the whole scandalous adventure may yet be properly exposed. If Carmack has the disposition and abilities with which he is credited this is his opportunity.

And now comes Senator Spooner with a broad hint that it is the settled policy of the present administration to buy the lands held by religious orders in the Philippines and sell them at cost to actual settlers. What this implies may be learned by anyone who will read up the history of landgrabbing in the United States by "actual settlers." As a rule, the "actual settler" does the grabbing, and land monopolists on a large scale get the land. Sometimes the monopolists hire the "actual settler" to "settle," and sometimes they let him do his own settling, and then freeze him out. "Freeze-out" is not an apt word for what the American monopolists will do to the "actual settler" in the Philippines, under the administration's Philippine land policy, but the process will not differ much and the result will be the same. It is not a matter of temperance; it is a matter of "push," "pull," "boost," "get there," and "grab."

One of the representatives in congress from California might be called a "representative extraordinary." His name is Kahn—Julius Kahn. He is an immigrant, having been born in Germany; which is good enough reason for his activity in trying to exclude immigration from another country, China; though his principal reason, no doubt, is a demagogic impulse

to make local capital in politics. It is none of this, however, that makes Mr. Kahn so very extraordinary. The remarkable thing about him is his proficiency in "statistics as she is taught." Mr. Kahn is quoted by the Chicago Chronicle of the 21st as saying, in effect, with reference to the Chinese question, that not only all the Chinamen in San Francisco, but more than all, are criminals. He finds that there are usually 25,000 Chinamen in that city, and that within the past 25 years 31,000 have been arraigned in the police courts for minor offenses, from which he draws this remarkably intelligent inference:

These astounding figures show that more than 100 per cent. of the Chinese in San Francisco have been arrested for violation of the law in 20 years. It is difficult to believe that such is the case, but the figures are absolutely accurate. They have been compiled with the greatest care.

Should Mr. Kahn remain in public life, Mr. Carroll D. Wright had better have a care for his statistical laurels.

Our reply (p. 644) to the San Francisco Star relative to Chinese exclusion elicits a somewhat remarkable rejoinder. Referring to our figure of speech in which we likened the claim of our Pacific Coast friends to be allowed to decide the matter for the rest of the nation, because they know the facts, to a plaintiff claiming the right to render a verdict in his own case, it accepts the figure and offers the Pacific Coast objectors as witnesses to the facts, saying: "Only those who know something about the facts can testify." Truly, those who know the facts are proper witnesses, but they are not the only witnesses unless they alone know all the facts; and under all circumstances their testimony is to be taken with caution if they are interested parties, and quite rejected if on cross-examination they break down. Moreover, it is a very long time since witnesses were allowed to decide cases. They may testify but not decide. Our contemporary's next point—it's charge that we resorted to epithets by calling the

Pacific Coast "hysterical"—is fully met by the article to which the charge applies. We did not call the Coast hysterical in this matter; we called it an "interested locality," and that is what it certainly is. But the most remarkable part of this remarkable rejoinder of our valued contemporary is its indictment of Chinese immigrants for not assimilating and passing "into the body of our national life." Inasmuch as by our own laws the Chinese are denied all the rights of American citizenship, it hardly lies in our mouth to complain of them for not passing "into the body of our national life." This would be much like the complaints of the Egyptian taskmasters who expected the Jews to make bricks without straw. The Star only confirms our previous impressions that some of the best arguments against Chinese exclusion are made by the "witnesses on the spot," who testify in its favor. Nevertheless we like the San Francisco Star. We like it because it is a courageous Democrat of the democratic variety, even if slightly limited in that respect. We like it, among other things, for the same reason that we like Senator Tillman, of South Carolina. A better democratic-Democrat than Senator Tillman one could hardly wish to meet, until he runs up against the "nigger question." So with the Star. A better democratic paper would be hard to find until it runs up against the Chinese question. These "local questions," as a distinguished and extinguished Democratic candidate for the presidency once described another question of the same general character, are great disturbers of democratic principle.

The advance sheets of the fifteenth annual report of the Interstate Commerce Commission make interesting reading. One important fact appears quite clearly. It is that the existence of certain kinds of trusts not generally supposed to have any legislative monopoly, is traced to secret contracts with railroads, which do have legislative monopolies. We quote:

The recent investigation of packing-house products showed that rates below published tariff charges had been applied both east and west of Chicago. . . . While the general public probably receives some profit from these lower rates, in the main these sums swell the profits of the packers. These great concerns number only about five or six, and little distinction in the rates appears to have been made between them. The effect is to give them an enormous advantage over smaller competitors located at other points. Already these competitors have mostly ceased to exist. These disclosures afford a pregnant illustration of the manner in which secret rate concessions are tending to build up great trusts and monopolies at the expense of the small independent operator.

This is another illustration of the demonstrable truth that trusts are neither possible under nor an evolution from free competition; but that they depend for existence upon some private monopoly. In this instance the supporting monopoly is private ownership of a public highway.

Daniel D. Healy, warden of the Cook county (Ill.) hospital, deserves special commendation for a thankless interference with medical students in behalf of the impoverished patients at this public hospital. Students had offered indignities to women patients at clinics, and upon learning the fact the warden forbade public surgical operations in cases requiring exposure. He properly declared that the hospital is for the patients, not for the students. A moment's reflection will justify Warden Healy's act. Granted that it is for the general good to have medical students present at surgical operations. What then? Shall county hospital patients be forced to submit to operations in public? Why such patients only? Why not require all persons, of whatever degree of wealth or social standing, who must be operated upon, to submit to the ordeal before medical students? From even the thought of such a law one recoils instinctively. Then why make a law of that kind for patients in the county hospital? Because they are poor.

There is no other answer. It all comes down to this in the end—that the poor who require surgical treatment must submit to an exposure which well-to-do patients escape. This very distinction tends to diminish to medical students the opportunities which of course they ought to have. When public operations are regarded as not only disagreeable in themselves, but also as one of the degrading badges of poverty, no one is disposed to volunteer for the benefit of surgical science. But if they were altogether voluntary, a general disposition, arising from a sense of duty, something in the nature of public spirit, would furnish all the opportunities to students that could be desired. Voluntarily, for the good of their kind, real or supposed, both men and women will submit to much which they seek to evade when it is compulsory. If all clinics were of this voluntary character, students would indulge in no indignities, for they would be invited guests on their good behavior; and poverty would be relieved of at least one of its degrading incidents. Warden Healy has taken a step which will, it is to be hoped, be persisted in by him and followed by his successors and others in like authority.

Advance sheets of consular reports on taxation in New South Wales and New Zealand have been issued by the state department. The most notable feature of the report from New South Wales is a ridiculous argument by the consul, intended to show that the land value tax in vogue there is an indirect tax on improvements, because "in taxing the increased value of the land, the improvements producing the increment are taxed indirectly." As any cross-roads politician could make that absurd argument without prompting, and any intelligent boy could refute it, it was hardly necessary to devote to it the "general observations" of a consular report. The astute consul who is primarily responsible for this report is Orlando H. Baker. He is well supported by Consul