

country who live abroad. Its perfect analogy may be found in Irish rent payments to absentee landlords.

A revelation, not at all surprising for what was revealed but very surprising for the sources from which it came, was made on the 7th before the Interstate Commerce Commission, sitting at Chicago. It was nothing less than the fact, now revealed beyond possibility of denial, that trusts are favored by railroads in the matter of transportation rates. The same old trick that originally enabled the Standard Oil trust to ruin competitors is in vogue, despite federal legislation and a federal supervisory commission. Paul Morton, vice president of the Atchison, Topeka & San Francisco railroad, testified bluntly to a cut rate "understanding." He admitted that it was unlawful, but tried to excuse himself. C. D. Whitney, president of the Toledo, St. Louis & Western railroad, gave similar testimony. So did D. C. McCabe, freight traffic manager of the Pennsylvania lines west of Pittsburgh, who naively explained that the memoranda of settlements were destroyed soon after settlements were made, because the railroads feared that the commission might investigate them. Other witnesses to the same general effect were Edward F. Cost, freight manager of the Cleveland, Cincinnati, Chicago & St. Louis; A. C. Bird, freight traffic manager of the Chicago, Milwaukee & St. Paul; J. M. Johnson, second vice president of the Chicago, Rock Island & Pacific; and the general freight agent of the Burlington. These disclosures furnish two or three valuable morals. They show that federal regulation of railroads has not prevented secret preferential contracts. They show also that trusts are traceable in some degree to highway monopoly. They show, furthermore, that indifference to law is not a characteristic of "anarchists" alone. And they suggest that the success of our successful business men may be due in some measure at least to excellence in other things than piety and industry—that excellence in law-

breaking may also cut a figure now and then in making fortunes.

It was a great pro-Boer meeting, that at Cleveland last Sunday, at which ex-Congressman Lentz was the speaker and in which Mr. Bryan and Mayor Johnson personally participated; and it took definite and wise action. Among other things it formally called upon President Roosevelt to prevent the continuous and notorious shipment of mules from New Orleans to the seat of war in South Africa. Commenting upon that feature of the resolutions, the New York Tribune insists that these shipments conflict with no established principles of neutrality. The Tribune's error lies in its assumption that the shipments are commercial. In fact they are not commercial; they are military. That is, the mules are not shipped as commodities in regular course of trade by dealers in this country to dealers in Great Britain or South Africa or elsewhere. If they were, the Tribune would be right. And it would make no difference whether they were mules or guns. But the truth is, as we are reliably informed, that these mules are bought in New Orleans by agents of the British army, and are shipped at New Orleans by those agents of the British army, upon British transports, directly to other agents of the British army at the seat of war in South Africa, where they are used to subjugate the Boer republics. Now, one of the imperative duties of a neutral nation is to forbid the use of its territory as a base of operations by a belligerent nation. But is it not clear, in these circumstances, that we are allowing our territory to be used by the British government as a base for operations against the Boers? Mules so purchased and so shipped for such uses are as truly munitions of war as guns and cartridges would be; and guns and cartridges so bought and so shipped, with our permission, would be evidence of breach of neutrality. It is the imperative duty of Mr. Roosevelt, therefore, as the president of a neutral nation, upon finding the facts to be as

above indicated, to stop these shipments. The courts have refused to do so because the question is not judicial, but executive. This indisputably casts the burden of deciding upon the president. The responsibility is his and his alone.

The political situation in Ohio could not be better than it is now, for the advance in that state, and by force of example in other states also, of the principles of genuine democracy. In the fierce fight between the Hanna and the Foraker factions of the Republican party, Senator Hanna did not win. All he was able to do was to keep Foraker from winning. He made it a draw game by taking his nominees from a small third faction, which held the balance of power in the House caucus. This enabled him to win in the House. But he was defeated in the Senate, where he strenuously sought to name a henchman of his own as clerk for the purpose of balking Mayor Johnson's measures during the session. A draw game so fiercely played cannot be followed by sweet friendship and unquestioning confidence. It is spoils, not principles, that both Hanna and Foraker are seeking, and the struggle will go bitterly on. That makes an excellent opportunity for genuine democracy; and under such skillful and aggressive Democratic leadership as Mayor Johnson's, good things may be looked for in Ohio. Already the monopolistic railroad interests are fortifying themselves. They, at any rate, believe in Johnson's sincerity. They believe in it with all their might. They believe, too, that the solid Democratic delegation which Johnson wrested from the Republican county of Cuyahoga means to keep its pledges. Accordingly they have opened their legislative campaign with petty bribery—railroad passes over every road in the state. The Cuyahoga delegation came down pledged, among other things, to take no passes, and it is making that pledge good. Every member buys thousand-mile mileage. This object lesson, of which the state will doubtless learn before the ses-