into making a characteristic excursion into the Negro question; but he came back quickly to the real issue, and in words which sounded the keynote of his whole speech, all but the discord which has been so magnified by the press, he begged the imperialists to put the "bloody shirt" back again into its grave. Said he:

But do not let us discuss these questions. We want you to vindicate before the people your policy toward the Philippines, to exonerate the American army from the stigma now resting upon it, and we propose to hold you to the issue. We will discuss the South; we will discuss the Negro; we will discuss carpet-bag government; we will discuss anything you want if you will bring in a bill affecting those questions, but we are not going to run off after foxes just now. We are after this Filipino coon, and we want his hide. . . . . I think that if Congress had the authority, sustained by the Supreme Court, to pass an act forbidding any member of either body ever injecting into debate any discussion of the civil war or the revival of any of those bitter feelings of the past, it would be a blessing to our country.

No decision has yet been made by the President on the question of the American breach of neutrality at New Orleans, nor has any authentic report of the investigation appeared. But the general nature of the decision, should the matter ever come out of the pigeon hole in which it seems at present to be resting, may be surmised from an article in the North American Review for May, from the pen of an official of the state department. It is hardly probable that an officer so closely related officially to the question under advisement (or at rest) would have been allowed to publish an argument upon it in a popular magazine unless his argument were in harmony with the views of the head of his department and the probable decision of the President. It is interesting, therefore, to learn that this official concludes that the British mule and horse station at New Orleans, and the operations in connection with it, do not amount to a breach of American neutrality. It is also interesting to observe that he evades the vital point at issue. This point is not whether American citizens may sell munitions of war to a belligerent, "in the ordinary course of commerce," which is the point upon which the state department official places his emphasis. No one disputes their right to do that. Nor does anyone dispute the right of the British to buy munitions of war in this country, "in the ordinary course of commerce." The question is whether they may establish on American soil an army supply station for the reception and shipment of munitions of war, not "in the ordinary course of commerce;" and whether they may enter an American port with naval transports and anchor there while they load those war vessels with munitions of war, "not in the ordinary course of commerce." On that question the state department official is silent. Will the state department, the law department, and the President also be silent on that point? At any rate, the legislature of Louisiana is not. A concurrent resolution passed both houses on the 13th, fully sustaining Gov. Heard in his protest to the President, and urging him "to take any such further steps, conformable to law, as in his judgment may be necessary to establish and maintain in this state obedience to the law of nations and respect for the treaties of the United States." Here is an earnest that, in at least one state of this Union, the merry dollar is not the advance agent of that "Destiny which determines Duty."

The supreme court of the District of Columbia, through Judge Bradley, has made a group of gratifying decisions on the subject of second-class postal matter, a subject to which we have heretofore had occasion to refer at length in terms of criticism (vol. iv., pp. 596, 628, 643) of the postal law, the postal regulations and the post office department. The court has by these decisions restored to second-class privileges some of the publications which the department had excluded, and has issued injunctions restraining the exclusion of others which the department had threatened. Judge Bradley bases the decisions upon the ground that the post office department cannot legislate under the guise of making rules and regulations. It cannot exclude publications by a ruling, which Congress does not exclude by law. This principle is so simple, so sound and so obvious, if government by law and not by bureaus is to prevail, that it is inconceivable that a public officer should ever have questioned it. Yet it was questioned, or else deliberately defied, by the postmaster general when he made rulings—now reversed by the supreme court of the District — for which his department had vainly sought the sanction of Congress. Congress having refused to amend the law as he desired, he proceeded to amend it himself. This has now been stopped by the interpretation of the courts of the District.

—

The Postal Progress league, of which James L. Cowles, of Farmington, Conn., is secretary, proposes to settle all questions regarding second-class mail matter in the only fair way. This league suggests two classes, and only two classes of matter—letters and parcels—to be carried on the basis of cost. The second, or parcel class, would include periodicals; and as the charge would be based upon cost of service, the only just arrangement, there could be no discrimination such as now prevails, nor any danger of the censorship of new or small papers which is now threatened. From the biggest daily to the smallest weekly, every publication would be equal before the postal law. If the established rates would not pay, the necessary increase would be assessed pro rata, as it should be. Deficits would not then be reduced by excluding from equal mailing rights papers that were distasteful to the administration.

Whenever the post office department has given reasons for its crusade against unwelcome publications, it has

fallen back upon the postal deficit, attributing that to the enormous second-class mail. But it is in fact more than probable that the second-class mail, directly and indirectly, pays for itself. What really causes the deficit is the extravagant payments that are made by the department to railroads for mail transportation. This leakage has been exposed again and again, and now it is accounted for. The Chicago Tribune explains how the railroads are protected. They supplied campaign funds galore to Mr. Hanna, and at Mr. Hanna's dictation the late sacrosanct administration did the rest. Note the startling testimony of the Tribune, turned "state's evidence," in an editorial published in its issue of the 13th:

We distinctly charge that after the election of 1896 Mr. Samuel Shallenberger was appointed second assistant postmaster general, in whose office all matters relating to the railway mail service are attended to, in pursuance of a bargain or understanding with the Pennsylvania railroad. Mr. Shallenberger at that time was an attorney for the Pennsylvania railroad. The company had made a subscription—possibly the largest in the United States—to the campaign fund. What could be more natural than that the attorney of the railroad should be appointed to superintend the railway mail service immediately after the election. Still, it was a second-class bargain, and in any other country would have disgraced everybody connected with it. Shallenberger is still in office.

No further explanation of the "economical" crusade against second-class mail matter as a cover for extravagant payments to railroads is necessary. The Chicago Tribune has let the cat out of the bag.

The Bucklin or Australasian tax amendment to the Colorado constitution (p. 11, and vol. iv., p. 810), which has already had many vicissitudes, is now subjected to another attack designed to prevent a formal expression of the popular will in its favor. As our readers know, this amendment, adopted by the legislature over a year ago, and to be voted upon by the people of Colorado next November, would allow any county in which a majority of the voters so decide, to draw its local revenues wholly from land value taxation. It would not put this system of taxation in force; it would merely allow the people of the respective counties to put it in force or not as they choose. It is, therefore, simply a home rule amendment, a county referendum on taxation. But there are diligent efforts on the part of the land grant railroads and the other speculative interests of the state to prevent the submission of the amendment to the people. The latest form these efforts have taken is an application to the supreme court of the state for a writ restraining the secretary of state from printing any constitutional amendments upon the ballots. The contention is that constitutional amendments proposed by the legislature for submission to the people must be in harmony with the rest of the constitution; and that if a proposed amendment would alter the constitution fundamentally, as it is claimed the Bucklin amendment would, it can be made only by a constitutional convention.

Desperate efforts are being made by the Republican machine of Illinois to create an appearance of harmony where there is no harmony. Nor can there be harmony there in view of the boss-ridden character of the Republican state convention. Its nomination of Albert J. Hopkins for United States senator was in no sense a party nomination. As Hopkins and Lorimer had packed the convention, he was nominated by himself and Lorimer. In these circumstances there is an excellent opportunity for the Democrats to name Senator Mason's successor. If it were positively known that a democratic-Democrat like Alschuler, whose popularity throughout the state was demonstrated when he ran for governor two years ago, would be sent to the Senate if the legislature were Democratic, while Hopkins would be sent if it were Republican, there is every reason to believe that the Hopkins machine, which captured the Republican state convention by "boodle" and ballot-box stuffing, would be demolished at the polls.

A wonderful meeting was held at All Souls' church, New York, early in April. Thomas L. James presided, and Walter S. Logan, Recorder Goff, and that redoubtable spiritual knight of the unspiritual sword, the Rev. Dr. MacArthur, all spoke. They discussed a great theme—"the thought of the past, the thought of the present, the thought of the future, with reference to man's relation to his fellow man." Then, inflated with the idea of brotherhood, this meeting solemnly resolved in testimony thereof to erect "a monument to Philanthropy"! After that the meeting adjourned. The inscription on its proposed monument is to be a sentence about brotherhood, from the strenuous Mr. Roosevelt, who believes in making all men brothers even if he has to kill them to do it. A more appropriate inscription would be this: "A mountain labored and brought forth a mouse."

We regret that a misunderstanding of the circumstances led us into the error of saying last week (p. 67) that a constitutional initiative is to be voted on in Rhode Island at the next general election. Such an amendment was before the general assembly of the state, but the Republican members made opposition to it a party measure and defeated its passage in both houses. The question of submitting such an amendment, and not its adoption, is therefore likely to be the leading issue before the people at the November election.

PUT YOURSELF IN HIS PLACE.

To be self-centered is the original condition of mankind. The infant knows of nothing and cares for nothing but self. And this original condition is never wholly eradicated even from the most altruistic characters. Each of us is to his own imagination always the central sun around which everything else revolves.

So essential to our sanity is this inborn habit of looking out from our-