

should be moved on. On the 13th, however, it was stated that the warships had been recalled from patrolling Mexican waters.

+ +

The Mexican Insurrection.

That the Diaz government would wage a war of extermination against the insurrectos was announced on the 11th from Mexico City, and a bill providing for the resurrection of a provision of the Mexican Constitution not used for fifteen years, by which the government should set aside for six months certain personal guarantees, was sent to the Permanent Commission of the Mexican Congress. Under such a suspension of guarantees, those detected in the act of highway robbery, of raiding a village or farm, or train wrecking, or cutting telegraph or telephone wires, or even removing a spike from a railroad track or throwing a stone at the train, will be summarily shot by those making the arrest. On the 13th the Congressional Committee approved the bill as drafted, and it proceeded to second reading. It is expected to become law this week.

+ +

Of the status of the insurrection itself it is difficult to obtain news. Battles are reported won by both parties. On the 14th the insurrection was reported to have spread from its long-held center in the State of Chihuahua to the States of Coahuila and Morelo. A newspaper man who has been in he field with the insurrectos, writes thus from Maria, Texas:

To secure the facts from the insurgent viewpoints I joined the revolutionists in the field and was an eyewitness of one of the most determined battles of the war.

From my observations in the field I have concluded that the trouble in Mexico is a real uprising of the people against the federal government, that the sympathy of the great majority of the people is with the Liberals, and that men with brains and money are organizing and leading the fight with a determination to win.

Americans and other foreigners have been treated with exaggerated consideration and their property respected by the insurrectos. It seems to be the policy of the revolutionists to fight with bullets and kindness—bullets for the soldiers of Diaz and religious respect for the political and property rights of noncombatants.

Everywhere I went I found the people wildly enthusiastic for the new order and eager to volunteer. Every gun that has been carried into Old Mexico has found a dozen volunteers ready to use it against the army of Diaz.

+ +

Peace Sentiment in the British Parliament.

When the increased naval appropriations of the 1911 budget came before the British House of Commons on the 13th, J. A. Murray Macdonald,

a Liberal member of the House and a leading free trader, made a motion to the effect that the House viewed with alarm the increased expenditure on the army and navy, and that it ought to be diminished. In behalf of the Ministry, Sir Edward Gray, in charge of this feature of the budget as foreign secretary, replied to Mr. Macdonald's motion, formally opposing it but favorably emphasizing its spirit. In his reply he said, as reported, that—

it was not to be inferred by the increase in the present estimates that Great Britain's foreign relations had become strained. He could say the high water mark of naval expansion had been reached, provided the building programs of other powers so far as known to the government were followed out. They were doing their utmost to promote good will on every hand. Sir Edward said it was a paradox that armaments were increasing while the nations were seeking good relations, but it was a greater paradox that the growth of the enormous burdens of armaments coincided with the growth of civilization. "If this tremendous expenditure and rivalry continue," he declared, "it must in the long run break down civilization. You are having this great burden piled up in times of peace and if it goes on increasing by leaps and bounds as it has done in the last generation it will become intolerable. There are those who think it will lead to war. I think it is much more likely to be dissipated by internal revolution—by a revolt of the masses of men against taxation." Sir Edward believed, however, that rivalry would not be stopped merely by one nation dropping out of the race. On the contrary, such a step might give impetus to expenditures by some other nations. He did not believe Great Britain was feeling most the burden of armaments because in this country taxation was so arranged that it was not as heavily felt by those to whom existence must always be a struggle. When they began to create hunger by taxation, as sooner or later every country would if military expenditures went on increasing, they would be within a measurable distance of stopping the evil. "What may be impossible to one generation may be possible to another. The great nations of the earth are in bondage—increasing bondage—to army and navy expenditure and it is not impossible that in some future years they will discover, as individuals have discovered, that law is a better remedy than force and that in all the time they have been in bondage the prison door has been locked on the inside." "Arbitration," Sir Edward went on, "has been increasing, but you must take a long step forward before the increase in arbitration will have an effect upon expenditures for armaments. I should perhaps have thought it unprofitable to mention arbitration had it not been that twice within the last twelve months the President of the United States has sketched out a step in advance more momentous than any one thing any statesman in his position has ventured to say before. His words are pregnant with far reaching consequences. Mr. Taft recently said he did not see any reason why matters of national honor should not be referred to a court of arbitration. He has said that if the United States

could negotiate a positive agreement with some other nation to abide by the adjudication of an international arbitral court on every question that could not be settled by negotiation, no matter what was involved, a long step forward would be taken. These are bold and courageous words. If two of the greatest nations should thus make it clear that under no circumstances were they going to make war again, the effect of their example on the world must have beneficent consequences. In entering an agreement of this kind there would be risks, and you must be prepared for some sacrifice of national pride. I know that to produce such changes public opinion must reach high ideals—higher than some think possible—but men's minds are working in this direction, and history affords instances of reaching such an ideal point."

Following the debate Mr. Macdonald's motion was lost, and the army and navy appropriation proposed by the Ministry, was adopted by 276 to 56.

+ +

Russian Ultimatum to China.

The reported peaceable understanding between Russia and China (p. 205) seems to be melting away. Dispatches of the 13th are to the effect that Russia has sent an ultimatum to China demanding a closer adherence to the provisions of the treaty of 1881, which is the subject matter of the present dispute (p. 181). The ultimatum embodies two points, the reopening of Russian consulates at the points specified in the treaty of 1881, and the establishment of free trade in certain products, including tea, in fulfillment of article 12 of the same treaty. To these has been added the demand that the Russians may place doctors and police in Chinese border towns for the purpose of quarantining the frontier against the plague. Russian troops were reported as within 100 miles of the Chinese frontier, toward which they were pressing as a reinforcement of the ultimatum.

+ +

The "Friar Lands" of the Philippines.

In our account last week (p. 226) of the Congressional committee reports on the "friar lands" in the Philippines, based upon newspaper dispatches, the really important minority report did not appear. Seven Republicans and one Democrat signed the majority report, and three Republicans signed a minority report condemning the large disposition of public lands in the islands. The substance of those reports we gave. But there was a third report which the dispatches had overlooked. It was signed by five Democrats—W. A. Jones, Robert N. Page, Finis J. Garrett, M. R. Denver and Harvey Helm. This report, emphasizing the points developed by Jackson H. Balston in his brief, concludes as follows:

In our opinion it is most unfortunate that the bureau of public lands should have inaugurated a new policy in respect to the sale of the friar lands, and

that this new policy should have first been carried into effect in an agreement entered into with a prominent American, who holds the high and most important position of executive secretary. . . . It is difficult to believe that he would have been willing to lease "temporarily for a period not exceeding three years" so large a body of unimproved lands unless he had been given assurances of a very satisfactory nature that the law would be amended so as to permit him to purchase them. As a matter of fact it was so amended in a few weeks after his lease was executed. In conclusion, we wish to emphasize what has hereinbefore been said in respect to the policy which has of late obtained in the Philippine Islands in regard to the sale and other disposition of the vast public domain of those islands, whether these lands be known as public lands or friar lands. They are the property of the people of the Philippines, and should be administered and disposed of solely in their interest and for their benefit. They are thoroughly united in their opposition to the policy of exploitation to which the bureau of public lands seems to be so resolutely committed and which is being pursued with utter disregard of the opinions and wishes of those most interested. That the officials whose duty and responsibility it is to administer the public-land laws have, at least until recently, entertained doubts as to the legality of the policy pursued by them is evident from the fact that they have so frequently sought and obtained legal opinions with which to fortify their position. In our opinion these doubts should have been resolved in the interest of the citizens of the islands rather than in that of the aliens, whose purpose it was to exploit the islands.

+ +

Seattle Municipal Election.

Closely following the recall election in Seattle (p. 201) has come the regular election for City Council (p. 207). For the three-year term Oliver T. Erickson (pp. 207, 242) was elected by 36,654, the largest vote ever cast in Seattle for any candidate. Joe Smith, whose name is familiar to our readers, and who was nominated at the primaries, polled 20,048, the highest vote for any defeated candidate, but only 862 less than the lowest candidate elected.

+

A charter amendment providing for removal of chiefs of police by the council was carried by 23,337 to 5,394; and one providing for the initiative and referendum was carried by 17,514 to 5,747. A referendum authorizing municipal railway bonds to the amount of \$800,000, which, together with the election of 8 municipal ownership councilmen out of the 9, is regarded as an assurance of municipal ownership of the traction service in Seattle.

+ +

Commission Government in Spokane.

The first election under commission government in Spokane (pp. 11, 62), a city of 125,000 popula-