

of such laws as will enable municipalities to acquire, control and operate any or all of the public utilities therein in case they decide so to do.

Then comes a demand in the platform for jury trial in cases of "contempt of court committed out of its presence," which is its way of opposing "government by injunction." This is followed by demands for merit laws in the civil service, for the abolition of convict labor, and for liberal pensions. After congratulating the Republic of Cuba, expressing admiration for "all our brave soldiers and sailors," referring with "horror and deep regret" to "the monstrous crime which removed from the nation its much-loved and mourned president, William McKinley," the platform closes with the following tribute to the late Gov. Altgeld:

We deplore the untimely death of the late John P. Altgeld. An exemplary citizen, a sterling Democrat, a great governor, a firm friend of the oppressed, an uncompromising foe of shams and pretenses, an unyielding opponent of special privileges, he died as he lived, fighting for human freedom and liberty and the uplifting of earth's races.

The candidates named by the convention were George W. Duddleston, of Chicago, for state treasurer; John L. Pickering, of Springfield, for clerk of the supreme court; Anson L. Bliss, of Mount Vernon, for state superintendent of public instruction, and Dr. Julia Holmes Smith, of Chicago, Dr. J. E. White, of Champaign, and S. S. Maxwell, of Monmouth, for trustees of the state university.

Republican politics now oscillates about the question of reducing the tariff on Cuban sugar (vol. iv, pp. 673, 792, 822), the party in Congress being divided on that question and the President having now become involved in the controversy. It seems that when the Cuban delegates came to this country (vol. iv, p. 56) to consult President McKinley with reference to the Cuban constitution, Mr. McKinley promised that if Cuba would accept the Platt amendment, "he would use his influence"—we are quoting from Walter Wellman, in the Chicago Record-Herald—"to secure commercial concessions from Congress." To that promise, says Mr. Wellman, "there are plenty of living witnesses," and "the Cubans accepted it at par value." President Roosevelt has undertaken to redeem it. Accordingly, on the 13th, he sent

a message to Congress, in which he called attention to the recommendations in his annual message for a reduction of duties on imports from Cuba, and embodied a cable dispatch sent through the American minister to Cuba by President Palma asking for legislative relief before Cuba is financially ruined. President Roosevelt then discusses in his special message the object of the tariff law, and objecting to the proposition to relieve Cuba by collecting full duties and paying a bounty in the nature of a rebate over to Cuban exporters, asks for "that open-handed help, of a kind which a self-respecting people can accept." Although not specific, his message is evidently intended to further the plan of making a 20 per cent. reduction of the tariff on imports from Cuba.

The conflict in the Republican party which has called out this message, is one between the beet sugar interests, which do not want their protection interfered with, and the refined sugar trust, which wishes to weaken the beet sugar interests by lowering the duty on raw sugar from Cuba. The trust is accidentally supported by tariff adversaries and by Cuban sympathizers, because what they believe in the trust happens to want. When the House bill came before the Republican caucus on the 13th of March the beet sugar interests were defeated by a vote of 85 to 31 (vol. iv, p. 793), the caucus agreeing to introduce a bill, such as the President now indicates his desire for, reducing tariff rates on Cuban sugar 20 per cent. That bill was introduced March 19. The committee on ways and means of the House agreed (vol. iv, p. 822) to report it favorably, the vote being 9 Republicans and 3 Democrats in the affirmative, and 2 Republicans and 3 Democrats in the negative. On the 18th of April this bill came to a vote in the House, but by a union of Republican protectionists who oppose reduction on Cuban sugar, with Democrats who oppose protective tariffs, an amendment prejudicial to the sugar trust, reducing the tariff on refined sugars no matter whence imported, was first adopted, against the Republican majority (p. 44), by a vote of 199 to 105. The bill as so amended was then passed by 247 to 52. But the Senate committee refuses to recommend this House bill, the Republican majority having agreed upon the Spooner compromise bill which proposes a 20 per cent. re-

duction for five years. That was the situation when the President sent in his special message noted above.

It was hoped that the message would secure favorable action on the Spooner compromise, but that hope appears now to have been abandoned. Senator James K. Jones states the Democratic position when he says:

In my judgment there will be a solid Democratic vote against the Spooner bill as agreed to by the Republican members of the committee. If the Senate were given the chance to vote on the measure as it passed the House, including the striking off of the differential duty on refined sugar, then, I am sure, every Democrat would have been glad to vote for the bill. But that proposition has been eliminated by the action of the Republican managers.

As to the possibility of getting a majority from the Republican vote alone, the administration senators are reported as admitting that agreement is impossible. Mr. Wellman, the correspondent already quoted, who is friendly to the administration, writes in the same issue of the Chicago Record-Herald, June 18:

President Roosevelt has met with his first serious defeat. Cuban reciprocity is beaten. . . . Defeat for the President. That is what it is. An unmistakable defeat. He has failed to carry his party with him on the most important issue of his administration up to date. He has been slaughtered in the house of his friends. But it is a defeat for the party, too. It is a confession that the Republican party is so wedded to high protectionism that it can do nothing in the way of a revision or a reformation, however slight. Confronted by the conflicting demands of two greedy trusts—a sugar refining trust on one side and a sugar growing trust on the other—it could not choose between them. So it does nothing and "lets well enough alone." With a large majority in the House, and nearly two-thirds of the whole membership of the Senate, it is forced to admit its impotency.

This prediction was partly verified on the 18th, when at a Republican Senatorial caucus, 18 senators, under the lead of Senator Elkins, declared that they would not support the President's policy. Decisive action, however, was not taken, and the caucus adjourned until the 20th.

Nothing very definite in connection with the anthracite coal strike has transpired since our last report (p. 138), though the condition is evidently becoming more tense. As a