

Roosevelt sent to the House of Representatives, at its request, the papers bearing on an application by Gen. Miles to be assigned to duty in the Philippines. In Gen. Miles's letter making that application, dated February 17, 1902, he referred to the long drawn out Philippine war, and characterized it as having "been conducted with marked severity." The secretary of war answered on the 5th of March, denying the application and closing with the assertion that—it is not the fact that the warfare in the Philippines has been conducted with marked severity; on the contrary, the warfare has been conducted with marked humanity and magnanimity on the part of the United States army. Replying to the secretary, on the 24th of March, Gen. Miles said upon this point:

It is proper to say that I had in mind such information as was conveyed in the letter of Gov. Wm. H. Taft, addressed to the honorable secretary, dated Washington, February 7, 1902, as well as other communications that have been referred to these headquarters or received by me.

The identity of the documents thus alluded to by Gen. Miles was fixed by the secretary of war in his response of March 25, when he wrote that Gen. Miles's allusion was to a report by the civil governor of the Province of Tayabas, received February 7, 1902, and which had been forwarded February 19th to Gen. Chaffee with instructions to investigate, and if the statements were found to be true to adopt disciplinary measures. The secretary rebuked Gen. Miles for assuming the truth of these charges before they had been investigated. On the 7th of April this long withheld Tabayas report was made a subject of inquiry in the Senate committee on the Philippines, the Democratic members calling attention to the fact that although Gov. Taft had been testifying for three weeks, and had been instructed to furnish the committee with copies of reports received by him from civil governors, and had submitted favorable reports, he had held back a damaging one. A resolution was consequently adopted calling directly upon the secretary of war to produce this report; and on the 10th it was produced, and for the first time made public.

The report in question, dated December 16, 1901, and made by Maj. Cornelius Gardner, formerly of the United States regular army but now civil governor of the Province of Tabayas in the Philippines, advises

the early concentration of the troops in one or two garrisons, if the friendliness of the inhabitants is desired. That a friendly sentiment has existed he avers, explaining that he is in touch with the people, "having visited all the pueblos one or more times and having lived with them in their homes." But, he continues—

of late, by reason of the conduct of the troops, such as the extensive burning of the barrios in trying to lay waste the country so that the insurgents cannot occupy it, the torturing of natives by so-called water-cure and other methods in order to obtain information, the harsh treatment of natives generally, and the failure of inexperienced, lately appointed lieutenants commanding posts to distinguish between those who are friendly and those unfriendly and to treat every native as if he were, whether or no, an insurrecto at heart—this favorable sentiment above referred to is being fast destroyed and a deep hatred toward us engendered. If these things need be done they had best be done by native troops, so that the people of the United States will not be credited therewith.

Hardly had the significance of the Gardner report and the Waller verdict reached the public when two witnesses gave shocking testimony before the Senate committee with reference to the "water cure" treatment. One of them was Charles S. Riley, of Northampton, Mass., formerly a sergeant in the 26th volunteer infantry. The other was Wm. L. Smith, of Athol, Mass., formerly a private in Co. M. of the same regiment. Mr. Riley testified that he had witnessed an application of the "water cure" at Igaras, in the province of Iloilo, November 27, 1900. It was administered to the presidente of the town, a man 40 years of age. The object of the torture was to extort information. It was twice applied. The first time the water from a 100-gallon tank was turned into the victim's mouth, he lying prostrate and his mouth being forcibly held open, until he gave the desired information. The second time a syringe was inserted in his mouth and another in his nose, the two syringes taking water from a 5-gallon can. With the man held down upon his back streams of water were in this manner pumped into him, and to make the torture more effective salt was thrown into the water. The confession thus extorted was to the effect that the presidente, while ostensibly friendly to the United States, was in reality a captain in the Filipino

army and that his policemen were soldiers. For that reason the American troops arrested him and burned the town. The other witness, Mr. Smith, corroborated this testimony and gave also a similar account of the application of the "water cure" to two policemen at Igaras. He explained moreover that the management of the torture was in the hands of a squad detailed for the purpose from the 18th regular infantry and known as "the water cure detail." In describing the burning of Igaras (a town of about 10,000) by the American troops, he said that the inhabitants generally escaped only with the clothes they wore. Both witnesses gave the names of the officers under whose direction the torture was inflicted and the burning done. They were Capt. Glenn and Lieut. Conger, of the regular army, and Dr. Lyons, an assistant surgeon.

The President and the secretary of war are credited by the Washington dispatches of the 15th with having in consequence of these revolting revelations, "taken hold of the army scandals in the Philippines with a vigor and directness which cannot fail to punish the offenders of the past and prevent a repetition of similar offenses in the future." Direct orders have been given to Gen. Chaffee to have Gen. Smith court-martialed if such testimony was given at the Waller trial as is reported in the news dispatches, namely, that Gen. Smith ordered indiscriminate slaughter. As to Conger, Glenn and Lyons, a court-martial has been ordered to sit in San Francisco to try them for their cruelty at Igaras. It is to sit in San Francisco because Conger and Lyons are both in this country. Glenn, who is still in the Philippines, and all witnesses still there, are ordered to be sent home at once.

Gen. Chaffee reported officially on the 16th that Gen. Malvar, the last of the important Filipino generals, had surrendered unconditionally the day before, thus terminating armed resistance to the United States in the department of North Philippines. At the same time he advised the President of the necessity of sending a large force to the island of Mindanao and stated that he was fitting out an expedition of 1,200 men, which is to leave for Mindanao about the 27th.

Passing on from the American war in the Philippines to the similar Brit-

ish war in South Africa, there is little further to report of the peace negotiations mentioned last week, except that they are in progress. The Boer leaders of both republics met at Klerksdorp on the 9th. They had a second consultation there on the 10th. On the 11th it was announced that they had decided to enter into negotiations with the British if granted free use of the cable to consult the Boer representatives in Europe. Whether or not this condition was complied with has not been reported. It is certain, however, that any conditions precedent to negotiations, which may have been exacted, were allowed, for on the 12th the Boer leaders arrived at Pretoria to confer with the British authorities. The two groups—South African Republic and Orange Free State—came on different special trains and were quartered after their arrival in different houses. It is understood that they have since been in negotiation with Lord Kitchener and Sir Alfred Milner, the British commissioner for South Africa. On the day of their arrival at Pretoria a message was received from them, through Lord Kitchener, by the British ministry, and was answered. But neither the purport of the message nor that of the reply has been disclosed. There is no further trustworthy news on the subject.

It was announced in the House of Commons on the 11th by Mr. Broderick, secretary for war, that there would be no armistice during the absence of the Boer commandants from the field; and this announcement was confirmed on the 14th by news of severe fighting in the Transvaal region. Lord Kitchener reports about 200 Boers killed and about 100 British casualties. He also reports the overwhelming of a British patrol in the Orange Free State—one officer and three men being wounded and all the remainder of the British force captured.

On the 15th the statement of the condition of British finances, called the "budget," was laid before the House of Commons by Sir Michael Hicks-Beach, chancellor of the exchequer. From this it appears that the cost of the Boer war for three years has been \$825,170,000. For the years 1902-3 it is put at \$227,000,000. The national debt has been increased \$290,000,000, and there is a deficit to be met of \$226,620,000. To provide for these obligations the chancel-

lor of the exchequer advocated a further (see vol. iv., p. 41) advance in the fiscal retrogression from the British free trade policy back to a bread tax. He proposed a customs tax of 6 cents per 100-weight on all kinds of imported grain; 10 cents per 100-weight on imported flour and meal; a stamp tax of 2 cents on dividend warrants; a stamp tax of 4 cents instead of 2 as now required, on checks; and an increase of 2 cents in the £1 in the income tax, making it 30 cents in the £1 instead of 28. The import duties on sugar, wine, beer, tobacco and tea, and the export duty on coal (vol. iv., p. 63), are not to be disturbed. Besides proposing these taxes, the chancellor asks authority to secure a loan of \$160,000,000.

It was significant of a more pacific policy on the part of the ministry that the chancellor of the exchequer was able to announce upon asking for this loan, that the ministry has acceded to the Boer demands for the restocking and rebuilding of the ruined farms in the South African Republic and Orange Free State; and still more significant of a changed public opinion that the House of Commons resounded with cheers for several minutes after the announcement. In making this announcement the chancellor is reported as having spoken in praise of the valor of the Boers, and expressed his hopes for friendship between Briton and Boer. During the pause in his speech while that sentiment was cheered he is reported to have "turned towards Mr. Chamberlain, the colonial secretary, who sat pale and motionless, palpably none too pleased at this official recantation of his unconditional surrender formula."

For several days the cable news from Belgium has been lurid, and now the country appears from the dispatches to be upon the verge of revolution. This news is evidently colored in the interest of the ruling class, but an outline of the situation and of the condition of the government of Belgium will enable the reader to draw reasonably accurate conclusions from the daily reports.

Belgium is a constitutional monarchy, both representative and hereditary, the legislative power being vested in an hereditary king and in a senate and a chamber of deputies elected by the people under a restricted and plural suffrage. Senators are

elected for eight years, part of them by the direct popular vote of citizens not less than 35 years of age, and part by provincial councils. Princes of the reigning branch of the royal family are senators by hereditary right. Members of the chamber of representatives are all elected by direct popular vote. The qualifications of voters for members of this chamber are defined as follows by the Statesman's Year Book for 1901:

Every citizen over 25 years of age, domiciled for not less than one year in the same commune, and not legally disqualified, has a vote. Every citizen over 35 years of age, married or widower, with legitimate issue, and paying at least 5 francs (\$1) a year in house tax, has a supplementary vote, as has also every citizen over 25 years of age owning immovable property to the value of 2,000 francs (\$400), or having a corresponding income from such property, or who for two years has derived at least 100 francs (\$20) a year from Belgian funds, either directly or through the savings bank. Two supplementary votes are given to citizens over 25 years of age who have received a diploma or certificate of higher instruction, or who fill or have filled office, or engaged in private professional practice, implying at least average higher instruction. No person has more than three votes.

This plural voting system is the cause of the present disorders.

In 1898 an aggregate of 2,175,957 votes were possessed by 1,418,480 voters, a vast proportion of whom had but one vote each. At the election that year (see vol. ii No. 70, p. 10) the Catholic party secured 112 seats, the Socialists 28, the Radicals 6, and the Liberals 6. To still further strengthen the majority, the premier proposed a measure which the Socialists especially, but also the Radicals and the Liberals, opposed. All these parties favor the "one man one vote" principle. Great opposition meetings were held, and from June 20 to July 1, 1898, there was rioting in several cities. Upon being notified by the mayors of four cities that they could not be responsible for public order unless the premier's offensive electoral measure were withdrawn, the king interfered; and those measures being in consequence referred to a parliamentary committee selected from all parties, which recommended their unqualified rejection, the ministry resigned. The new ministry (vol. ii, No. 70, p. 9) promised to present a proportional representation bill on the principle