

tendency toward centralizing all power at Washington. Such laws are part of the imperial programme.

A British transport fleet of eight ships was reported this month in the harbor of New Orleans, as openly loading munitions of war—mules and horses for use against the Boers in South Africa—at this neutral American port. Well may it be asked how long these flagrant violations of neutrality are to be permitted by our government. Let it be observed that the shipments are not commercial. The mules and horses are sold in New Orleans, not to dealers but to agents of the British army; they are embarked at New Orleans, not on commercial vessels, but on transports of the British government; and they are carried not to foreign markets but directly to the seat of war. If that does not constitute a violation of American neutrality nothing can. When urged to take action in the matter, President Roosevelt is understood to have replied that the courts had been appealed to and decided that there was no cause. That is true. The courts were appealed to, and they did decide that there was no cause. But the reason they gave was that the question is not one for the judicial department of the government, but that it belongs to the executive department, with which the courts have no right to interfere. President Roosevelt is the head of the executive department. He cannot escape responsibility by referring to this judicial decision. On the contrary, that decision fixes his responsibility. What does he propose doing about it? Will he fall back upon the doctrine of his message, that these munitions of war are not for the prosecution of war, but are for the control, by a civilized power, as matter of "international police" regulation, of a "barbarous or semibarbarous" people?

A copy of the civilian salary lists at Manila under the American government there has come to light. As reported by the Chicago Daily News,

it is an exposure fit to make any sensitive American blush for shame. These salary lists carry 4,606 names. Of that number of office holders 2,044, or nearly 45 per cent., are Americans, and 2,562, or slightly more than 55 per cent., are Filipinos. The annual salaries of these 4,606 office holders amount to \$3,086,989, a mild average of only \$670. But of this amount the Filipinos get but \$806,945, or about 26 per cent., while the Americans get \$2,280,044, or about 74 per cent. It appears, therefore, that only 26 per cent. of the salaries go to 55 per cent. of the officials, who are Filipinos, and that 74 per cent. of the salaries go to 45 per cent. of the officials, who are Americans. Gov. Taft receives \$20,000, which is double the highest salary paid to the governor of any state. Four American commissioners receive \$15,000 each, or three times the salary of members of congress. Other salaries, drawn almost exclusively by Americans, vary from \$5,000 to \$7,500. As these salaries are paid by the people of the Philippines, the circumstances are not altogether unlike those of which the Americans complained so bitterly in 1776, when, in the declaration of independence, they charged George III. with having "erected a multitude of new offices, and sent hither swarms of officers to harass our people and eat out their substance."

Instructions have been given throughout the island of Luzon to celebrate annually in the public schools "the birthday of Jose Rizal, the Filipino patriot who was executed by the Spaniards." Such is the order of the American superintendent of public schools in the Philippines, according to Manila dispatches published on the 9th. The dispatches add that "the life and history of Rizal will be recited on this day." What is the meaning of it all? Rizal a "patriot!" Did he not "rebel" against the authority of Spain? We recognized Spain's right to govern the Filipinos when we paid her \$20,-

000,000 for her title. We recognize it now when we are spending \$119,000,000 a year to maintain that title against the inhabitants. If the Filipino who resists our authority is a "rebel," a "guerrilla," a "bandit," surely the Filipino who resisted Spain's authority was also a "rebel," a "guerrilla" and a "bandit." Not even President Roosevelt's adeptness in twisting logic and language can make our title one whit better than the title of the country from which we got it. If Rizal were still alive, resisting our invasion as he resisted Spain's occupation, he would be, in the language of President Roosevelt's recent message, deserving of no more respect or sympathy than an Apache Indian. Why, then, this order styling Rizal a "patriot" and directing the annual celebration of his birthday? It is a dangerous experiment. If we are to keep the Filipinos in subjection our officials in Manila should see to it rather that the word "patriot" is blotted from the dictionary. They should also prohibit the importation or printing of copies of the declaration of independence. References to patriotism and just government resting upon the consent of the governed can do no good in a country that acknowledges our sovereignty only at the muzzles of a hundred cannon and 50,000 rifles.

THE CHINESE EXCLUSION LAW.

One of the important subjects to come before congress this winter is the question of reenacting the statute for the exclusion of Chinese immigrants. The existing statute with its amendments expires next May; and not only is there a vociferous demand for its reenactment, but President Roosevelt has in his message advised that policy.

Doubtless the president will be severely criticised for this recommendation, and for signing the new exclusion bill when it shall have passed congress. So also will congressmen who vote for the bill. But all such criticism should be especially considerate, for the Chinese question is difficult and embarrassing to public men. On the Pacific slope gen-