

by giving them greater guarantees of liberty, the imperial chancellor having introduced in the German reichstag on the 7th a measure abolishing the dictatorial powers of the "stathalter." Referring in his speech to these powers, the Chancellor said that they were necessary in the past because of the—

expressed hope of Alsatians that France would reconquer the provinces; but that the emperor and the government, after mature consideration, were now convinced that the extraordinary powers conferred could be safely dispensed with. Proceeding, he said that their abrogation was a recognition of the fact that the inhabitants of the province had become reconciled to the new order of things, and of a desire to inspire them with full confidence in their connection with the empire. The efforts of the older generation to effect a separation would find no adherents in the mass of the population, he believed, and the imperial government wished to repay confidence with confidence. Germany never of her own free will, he added, would acquiesce in a fresh cession of the province, and he was convinced that Alsace-Lorraine would accept the gift now tendered with the same feeling of German loyalty that animated the rest of Germany.

As predicted last week (p. 138), when the grant of \$250,000 to Lord Kitchener, requested by the king, came before the British House of Commons, as it did on the 6th, the Irish members opposed it vigorously. The grant was made, but only after one of the most riotous scenes ever witnessed in parliament. A. J. Balfour, the ministerial leader in the Commons, moved the resolution making the grant; and Sir Henry Campbell Bannerman, the Liberal party leader, seconded the resolution with a speech in which he joined Balfour in praising Lord Kitchener. Then John Dillon, the Irish Nationalist, opposed the resolution on the ground that the war had been unnecessary. He was supported by Henry Labouchere, Radical. These speeches were received with Nationalist cheers, but called out no other demonstrations. But when William Redmond, Irish Nationalist, after denouncing both Roberts and Kitchener, turned to the ministerial benches and exclaimed: "You allow the women and children of soldiers to starve in order to honor the favorites of your corrupt society," an angry tumult followed. Howls and jeers made it impossible for the rest of Redmond's speech to be heard.

The House was sitting in "committee of supply" at the time, and the chairman, who ruled that Mr. Redmond's words were not out of order, nevertheless advised him to go no further with a speech so irritating to the House. Mr. Redmond did not follow the advice, but attempted, in spite of the uproar, to proceed; whereupon the chairman entertained a motion for closure and the Kitchener grant was allowed by a vote of 382 to 42. Mr. Balfour then moved a vote of thanks to the officers and men of the British army in South Africa and an expression of condolence with the bereaved, which was carried by the same vote. The House of Lords adopted a similar resolution of thanks.

An official statement of British losses in the war, down to May 30, was issued on the 5th. According to this statement, the total of killed, wounded, prisoners, deaths from disease and men invalided home was 97,477. As many of the sick and wounded recovered and rejoined their regiments, the permanent loss was 28,434, distributed as follows:

| | |
|------------------------------------|---------------|
| Killed in action or died of wounds | 7,792 |
| Died from disease..... | 13,250 |
| Other permanent losses..... | 7,392 |
| Total permanent loss..... | 28,434 |

The Canadian contribution of troops to the South African war, as reported on the 7th from Ottawa, was 8,000, and of money \$2,000,000. Of the troops 230 were killed in action or died of wounds or disease.

Somewhat as an anti-climax to the settlement of the war was President Roosevelt's message to Congress transmitting Col. Crowder's report on the question of the British army supply post at Chalmette, near New Orleans (pp. 41, 100), for which the House had called. It is in substance as follows:

1. The British commission directing purchases and shipments of supplies in the United States, is a bureau of the English army administration.
2. As organized by these officers Chalmette station is a governmental shipping agency for but one class of military supplies, and it has not the character of a base of military supplies nor that of a military camp or post.
3. No attempts to recruit for the British army have been made at Chalmette station, nor does the evidence disclose any such attempts at other points in

the United States. A few muleteers were recruited, but this was against the orders of the British government.

4. All shipments have been from the port of New Orleans to South African ports upon vessels chartered by the British admiralty under ordinary commercial charters.

5. The total shipments are given at 98,687 horses and 75,108 mules, 65 different vessels being engaged in the trade, making 166 voyages.

6. All supplies have been for the use of the English army in South Africa, the trade having no existence prior to the war.

7. The port of New Orleans was extensively used in 1896-7 to supply the Spanish army then engaged in prosecuting hostilities in Cuba.

The report is accompanied by a copy of a letter from Secretary Hay to the governor of Louisiana, upon whose complaint the investigation had been made, in which Mr. Hay advises the governor that in international law the facts reported by Col. Crowder do not constitute a case of breach of neutrality.

Another act of the President's, of general interest, has an important bearing upon the question of civil service reform in the Federal government. It is the discharge of a war department clerk without the hearing hitherto required by civil service rules. The clerk in question is Miss Rebecca J. Taylor, who has written several letters to the press in opposition to the Philippine policy of the administration. On the 27th of May, after the appearance of one of these articles (see "Splendid Barbarity," p. 125) the secretary of war, describing her as a "temporary clerk," made an order that she—

be called upon for a statement as to whether or not she is the author of the letter published in the Washington Post of May 12, 1902, under the heading "The Flag Shall Stay Put," as shown in the accompanying clipping [being the article referred to above]. If Miss Taylor acknowledges the authorship of this letter her attention should be invited to section 8 of civil service rule 11, and under the provisions of that rule she should be given three days in which to make any explanation or statement in writing that she may desire to submit in regard to the matter.

To that order Miss Taylor replied on the same date, May 27:

I am the author of the letter published in the Washington Post of May 12, 1902, under the heading "The Flag Shall Stay Put." Referring to the explanation or statement called for by the secretary of war, I have the honor to state that not being a temporary

clerk, but having been placed within the classified service by an act of congress, having transgressed no civil service rule and having received no notice to that effect, nor that "removal" is "sought" for "just cause" or otherwise, neither any "reasons" therefor, therefore I have not been furnished the conditions upon which to base an explanation or statement; in fact, I am unable to determine the nature of the "explanation or statement" called for from the communication submitted. If the proper authorities will submit "notice" and "reasons in writing" in compliance with section 8, civil service rule No. 11, I shall be pleased to consider the privilege of "answering the same in writing," as permitted by section 8. I respectfully submit that it is unusual, to say the least, for an individual to plead either innocent or guilty or to offer a defense when no charge has been preferred.

Two days later President Roosevelt, whether apropos of this letter or of something else does not appear, issued an executive order interpreting section 8 of civil service rule 11. That rule prohibits removals for political or religious opinions or affiliations, and the section in question provides that no removal shall be made except for just cause, upon written charges, and after full notice and an opportunity to defend. But by his executive order of May 29, President Roosevelt declared that—

the term "just cause" as used in section 8, civil service rule 11, is intended to mean any cause other than merely political or religious which will promote the efficiency of the service, and nothing contained in said rule shall be construed to require the examination of witnesses or any trial or hearing except in the discretion of the officer making the removal.

This order, the object of which was unknown at the time of its issue, was adopted by the Civil Service Commission, and on the 9th of June the secretary of war ordered that—

Rebecca J. Taylor, clerk at \$840 per annum in the office of the adjutant general (temporary roll), is hereby discharged, to take effect this date.

Miss Taylor made formal protest against removal without a hearing, and the matter has come to the attention of Congress. Friends of civil service reform, though indifferent to Miss Taylor's dismissal, are reported as alarmed at the interpretation of the rules under which it was accomplished without a hearing, because, upon that interpretation any department chief, following the Taylor precedent, may now summarily dis-

miss any subordinate without assigning a cause or giving a hearing.

The bills in Congress for the suppression of anarchy (vol. iv., pp. 553, 810) offered pursuant to the advice of the President in his first annual message, and in consequence of the murder of President McKinley, have now reached a stage where the House and the Senate confront each other with conflicting measures. The Senate measure (see Congressional Record, pp. 2429, 3333, 3336), passed March 21, by 52 to 15—

imposes the penalty of death on any person who, in the United States or any place within its jurisdiction, willfully causes or attempts to cause the death of the president or the vice president or any officer in succession to the presidency, or the sovereign or chief magistrate of any other country; not more than 20 years' imprisonment for aiding, abetting, advising or counseling such killing, or conspiring to accomplish it; ten years' imprisonment for threatening or advising the killing of the president or vice president or other officer in succession to the presidency. Aiding an escape is to constitute the principal offense. A presidential guard is authorized, and some minor details are provided for.

When this bill went over to the House, the judiciary committee of that body reported a substitute (see Congressional Record, p. 6673) which—

imposes the penalty of death for murdering the president, vice president, or other officer in succession to the presidency, or any foreign representative accredited to the United States, while in the performance of his official duties or because of his official character; imprisonment for ten years for an attempt; and imprisonment for five years for a bodily assault upon any of the above-mentioned United States officers while engaged in their official duties or because of their official duties, provided death does not result and for life if it does. One who incites, or aspires, is a principal offender; and whoever assists the perpetrator after the crime, incurs the penalty of imprisonment for not less than one nor more than 25 years. At trials it is to be presumed unless the contrary is proved, that the injured official was engaged in the performance of his official duties at the time of the murder or assault.

The clauses of the House bill which are directed especially at terroristic and anarchistic agitation, regarding which no provision is made in the Senate bill, are to the effect that:

Any person who advocates, advises,

or teaches the duty, necessity, or propriety of the unlawful killing or assaulting of one or more of the officers (either of specific individuals or officers generally) of the government of the United States, or the government of any civilized nation, because of his or her official character, or who openly, willfully and deliberately justifies such killing or assaulting, with intent to cause the commission of any of the offenses specified, shall be fined not less than \$500 nor more than \$5,000, or imprisoned not less than one nor more than 20 years, or both. That any person who conspires or requests, advises, or encourages any other person or persons to unlawfully assault or kill, within or without the United States, the chief executive or chief magistrate of any civilized nation having an organized government, because of his official character, shall be punished as follows: If an attempt to commit such act is made and the death of any person results therefrom, such offender shall suffer death; if such attempt does not result in death, such offender shall be fined not less than \$500 nor more than \$5,000, or be imprisoned not less than five nor more than 25 years, or both; if such attempt is not made, such offender shall be fined not less than \$500 nor more than \$5,000, or be imprisoned not less than one nor more than five years, or both. That no foreigner who is opposed to all organized government, or belongs to an organization teaching such opposition shall be admitted into the United States; and that no such person shall be naturalized.

This substitute for the Senate bill was adopted by the House in committee of the whole on the 7th and on the 9th it passed its third reading in the House by a vote of 175 to 38.

A comparison of these two bills indicates that the House aims to suppress what is called anarchistic agitation, as well as to bring crimes against high Federal officials within the jurisdiction of the Federal courts, whereas the Senate aims simply to give the Federal courts jurisdiction over deadly crimes committed upon high Federal officers and foreign representatives actually in the country, leaving questions of free speech and free press and the protection of foreign sovereigns in their own dominions untouched.

Among the important items of the week in American politics is the state convention of the Liberal Democratic party of New York, which met at New York city on the 7th, and that of the Democratic party of Arkansas, which met at Little Rock on