

Torrance, to manage a tax information bureau, to which complaints of unfair taxation will be made and by which they will be investigated. He also employed Prof. E. W. Bemis, the well-known expert, to investigate the subject of taxation on railway rights of way in Ohio cities. Meanwhile Mr. Witt's work had progressed so far that the mayor was able to deliver an illustrated lecture on local taxation to the state and the city equalization boards. It proved to be an eye opener, and the equalizers who had come fully assured that Cleveland valuations were equitable went away convinced that those at least of the Second ward, the subject of the lecture, were surprisingly unjust. At the end of the illustrated lecture the mayor gave to these boards an indication of his fiscal policy. "Take the Lake Shore railroad," said he; "it is paying on less than \$500,000 in Cleveland, and it should pay on at least \$15,000,000. The railroads owning property in this city should pay on \$75,000,000 more than they do pay on; and what I want to know is, if I show you people that this is true will you place this property against them on the duplicate?" One of the equalizers promptly replied in the affirmative, but thought the state auditors would take it off, or if not that the railroads would enjoin the collection. "That's all right," the mayor responded; "that will take us into court, and I want to say that I am positive that if the matter is presented to the supreme court in the right light the city is bound to win."

It is no part of Mayor Johnson's policy, however, to stop with taxing the railroads in fair proportion. There is in Cleveland a local bi-partisan board of equalization, and, according to the Cleveland Plain Dealer, every member will soon be—in consequence of expirations of terms and promotions of present members—"a Johnson democrat or a Johnson republican." As this board, though it cannot raise or lower the aggregate of the tax duplicate, can shift valua-

tions from ward to ward, lowering excessive valuations and increasing undervaluations, it is not difficult to surmise the ultimate uses of the two tax bureaus which the mayor has put under the charge respectively of Witt and Torrance. The council committee mentioned above did surmise.

In the remarks on the need of prudence, in the first of the speeches of the touring president, may be detected a certain nervousness—the uneasy consciousness that the "McKinley prosperity" is mainly a paper prosperity, a marking up of values in hysterical Wall street, a thimble-rigging of watered stocks in trust combinations—just as the "glory" of the acquisition of the Philippines and Cuba by combined force and fraud is in reality a national infamy and degradation. It is true that everything seems to be coming the president's way: the boom in stock gambling (now under suspicion), the capture of Aguinaldo, the apparent acquiescence of the country in the appalling breach of the national word to Cuba with the apparent acceptance of the situation by Cuba itself, and the apparent enthusiasm of the old slaveholding south in the triumph of the old southern filibustering in Cuba. But Mr. McKinley has seen apparent triumphs turn to dead sea apples on his lips before, and his temperamental nervousness was fully justified when the triumph of the McKinley bill was immediately followed by a democratic clean sweep of the house of representatives. Who can say what might not be the outcome in national politics of the bursting of the overblown bubble in Wall street? The collapse of the overblown bubble of colonial commercialism would soon follow, and the reaction of the popular mind would demand retribution from those who have so grossly betrayed the national honor and well being.

At least two grave and specific violations of the law, besides his general violation of the spirit of our institutions, lie at President McKinley's

door, that might be made the basis of an indictment to be answered at the bar of the high court provided for the impeachment and trial of presidential misdemeanants. The first of these high offenses was his declaration of war upon the Philippine islands, in his proclamation of December 21, 1898, usurping therein the right exclusively belonging to congress to make war. Senator Towne, in his great speech of January 28, in the United States senate, described this offense better than it has been presented before:

When the president of the United States, their (Filipinos') ally in the operations against Spain, having negotiated at Paris a treaty, not yet in force, which assumed to dispose of their country, . . . solemnly announces by proclamation to the world . . . that the military government of the United States is to be extended with all possible dispatch to the whole of the ceded territory; and that all persons refusing to submit to this assumption of power are to be brought beneath it "with firmness if need be"—in short, that we propose to take the islands for ourselves and to shoot everybody that refuses to acquiesce in the arrangement—has he not in effect declared war against the supporters of the Filipino republic? If this is so, what becomes of the war power specifically reposed by the constitution of the United States in congress alone? It cannot be said that the president was by this act repelling invasion. . . . Nor can it be claimed that he was suppressing insurrection. . . . There had been no insurrection and his proclamation alleges none, nor could there be among those who owed us no allegiance. The treaty had not been ratified. . . . The high contracting parties had not yet formally struck the bargain. . . . The blood money had not yet been paid. The Filipinos were their own men, at least till the ratification of the treaty. They were not rebels when it was written. They were not rebels when it was published.

Senator Towne refrained at the time from pushing this indictment of President McKinley any further, but he did ask what use it was to inquire who fired the first shot after that proclamation, and did remark that nothing like proper attention had been given to this breaking of the faith of the nation plighted in the protocol by the issuance of the proclamation of Decem-

ber 21, 1898. There may be an efficient attention paid to it in the house of representatives of the next congress. Then there is the other count in the indictment. A treaty ratified is the law of the land as much as any statute. As Mr. Bryan has pointed out in the Commoner, the Paris treaty recognizes the independence of Cuba and we have no more right to deprive her of that independence than we have to march to Mexico and assert our sovereignty there. What duty would lie at the doors of a new house of representatives, elected to reverse the high-handed course of the McKinley administration, clearer than to press charges based on these two main violations of law.

Impeachment is a harsh and repellant business, and public opinion instinctively recoils from any assault upon the head of the state or impairment of its dignity and powers. There have been only seven impeachments altogether in the history of our government, and in only two of these cases, both of minor officials, was a verdict of guilty given; but our system provides no other means of changing rulers except at the end of a presidential term. In the English system, where the chief magistrate reigns but does not govern, a change of policy can be effected by a vote of the lower house of parliament, followed by the resignation of the ministry in power. Our way is to suffer until the full end of the presidential term, under a president, it may be, who does not represent the whole people as a king does, nor more than half, and yet is driving them on to what they consider destruction and dishonor. Moreover, this irremovable ruler is the head of a party and may strengthen himself by rewarding its friends and punishing its enemies while pursuing an odious policy. As Mr. Towne pointed out:

The vast patronage of the presidency, to be almost immeasurably increased, should this policy be persevered in, by army and navy appointments and by places in the colonial

administrations, taken in connection with the fact, whose significance in many ways has not, I think, been fully appreciated, that in our political system the president is the head of a great party organization, which when in power is bent on increasing its means of self-perpetuation, and whose congressional and senatorial members are by their very relation toward the executive converted into abettors rather than critics of executive usurpation, makes the danger I am pointing out a very real one and a constantly increasing one. . . . A president cannot be at one and the same time a constitutional chief magistrate and an autocrat, and president in America with imperial powers in the orient.

This situation Mr. Towne set forth to exhibit the central vice of the whole theory of colonies and dependencies, namely, that in the secrecy, swiftness and independence in which the central control must act, it inevitably aggrandizes the executive. The pendulum seems still to be on the swing towards the aggrandizement of the executive. Is there anything more important before the country than to give it the most violent resistance, even if we should drive it to the other extreme of impeaching this self-aggrandizing executive? Is it not worth even the turmoil that the attempt would produce if out of these nettles the country should pluck the flower of safety?

Much is made in some quarters of the increase in the value of stocks as indicating prosperity. In this connection a comparative table has been published, showing an enormous increase in certain railroad shares since 1897. We reproduce the table:

	1897.	1901.
Atchison .....	10½	82¾
Atchison pfd.....	19½	104½
Baltimore & Ohio.....	12	109
Chicago, Burlington & Quincy .....	74¼	198
Chicago & Northwestern.....	104½	207¼
Chicago, Milwaukee & St. Paul .....	73½	185
Chicago, Milwaukee & St. Paul pfd.....	131¼	198½
Chicago, Rock Island & Pacific .....	63	164
Missouri Pacific.....	14	114½
New York Central.....	99½	162
Northern Pacific .....	12¼	110
Union Pacific.....	5¼	122¼

From this table it is argued that the

country is more prosperous in 1901 than it was in 1897. But how does the table show that? The enormous increase in values there exhibited does not in any important degree represent augmented wealth. It implies, not that locomotives, cars, station buildings, rails and other equipment have so enormously increased, but that the power of levying tolls has done so. The increase in the value of railroad shares is largely speculative, and is based almost entirely upon franchises.

The Commoner of May 3 furnishes additional proof that Mr. Bryan has dropped his gloves and gone into the political battle with naked fists. His story of the party treachery of 1893, whereby President Cleveland threw tariff reform to the wolves and forced the money issue, is a simple recital, but full of forcible suggestion. This article is an assurance, if any were needed, that the struggle of the "re-organizers" to place the democratic party once more under the control of its plutocratic manipulators, will not succeed without a fight to the finish. The issue of the 10th gives further and still stronger assurances to the same effect.

A successful burlesque of a burlesque is commonly regarded as a literary impossibility; but a contributor to the Chicago Tribune has accomplished it in his series of "Bilious-tine" skits on the "Philistine."

Lyman Abbott's equipment, or lack of it, for writing on "The Rights of Man," as he is now doing serially in the Outlook, is sufficiently indicated by his attack upon the theory of self-government, or "government by consent of the governed." This is his epitome of that theory: "In a state of nature every man was free; by a covenant with one another men agreed to surrender this freedom for the greater advantages of government; and this covenant and surrender constitute the foundation of government." Mr. Abbott mistakes