

hostility of Samuel Gompers, Ernest H. Crosby, Daniel Harris, A. J. Boulton, Charles B. Spahr and Henry White, all representative men, who have issued a public letter denouncing Prof. Jenks's recommendations. They quote the recommendations, which propose empowering the Philippine Commission to legislate regarding the admission of Chinese labor under contract. The details have evidently been nicely adjusted with a view to creating and maintaining a system of coolie slavery in our Asiatic "possessions." Employers of "not less than, say, twenty-five laborers," would be allowed, under Prof. Jenks's system, to import "Chinese under contract for a period of not over three years," and the employers would be required to give bonds to secure proper treatment of their imported Chinese coolies, as well as for their security and employment at the work specified in the contract, and their return to China at its expiration, unless "the contract is renewed under the special permission of the government granted separately in each case." Over this system of coolie slavery an inspector or "protector of the Chinese," appointed by the governor of the Philippines, would preside, to rigidly enforce the law by, among others things, preventing the imported coolie from "absconding and going elsewhere in the islands as a regular inhabitant." In other words, what the delectable Prof. Jenks calmly proposes is that large employers in the Philippines shall be allowed to establish a system of term serfdom, the serfs to be bought for importation and reexported at the end of their terms, being meanwhile closely confined to their masters' domicile. Commenting upon this iniquitous proposal, the gentlemen named above justly define it as meaning "the establishment of the contract system of coolie labor in its most objectionable form, in many respects resembling slavery." Little by little the real purpose of the policy of imperialism discloses itself to those workingmen who voted for a "full dinner pail" in 1900, with no

thought or care for the "obsolete" rights of man they were thereby trampling upon in the Philippines. Prof. Jenks's proposals are abhorrent, but they are in the regular order of evolution under the duty and destiny policy.

A valuable contribution to the subject of figure cooking in the statistical kitchen at Washington has been made by the Baltimore News. One of the reports of the bureau of statistics of the treasury department had shown for 1901 a great increase in American exports to China—an increase of 350 per cent. in six years. This compared favorably, from the "favorable balance of trade" point of view, with British and Russian exports to China, the latter having increased only 60 per cent. and the former only 25. But the Baltimore News was skeptical and investigated—with impressive results. It learned that the period from 1895 to 1901 had been selected because our exports to China were exceptionally low in 1895. They could consequently be compared with those of 1901 with an effect almost spectacular. If the figure-cooks had gone back four years and begun with 1891 instead of 1895, the increase would have been much smaller, for the exports to China in 1891 were two and a half times as great as in 1895. Or, if they had begun in 1897, they would have been obliged to record, instead of an increase of 350 per cent., an actual decrease of 12½ per cent. This exposure shows much delicate skill on the part of the figure cooks, but of what public use are figures so cooked?

Down in Delaware there is a Republican of the name of Addicks, who has all over the country a bad name as a political corruptionist. The bad name is doubtless well deserved. But in condemning Addicks and his offenses one should be careful to avoid creating the impression that the conditions Addicks is fighting are altogether pure. In a recent interview Addicks is reported as saying:

In 1893 there were five or six thou-

sand disfranchised Republicans in the State. The law required each voter to pay a poll tax of \$1.20, and if on election day he was eighteen months in arrears he found himself on the delinquent list and unable to vote. Those five or six thousand Republicans were kept from exercising the franchise by every conceivable device. The State was wholly Democratic. The courts and the boards of tax levy and the sheriffs were Democratic. Even the privilege of serving on juries was used as a Democratic prerogative. There never was a more absolute despotism in this country. Not only were the Republican Negroes and poor whites strictly held to their poll-tax responsibilities, not only were they falsely charged with dog taxes, but when they wanted to pay and qualify themselves for voting the tax receivers would evade them, sometimes even leaving the State to prevent payment in time for voting. On the other hand, it was not uncommon to find Democratic officials giving Democrats receipts for taxes they had not paid, in order that they might vote, and afterward declaring the receipts to be errors.

Whatever may be said about Addicks, his indictment of the Delaware oligarchy is true. The difference between him on the one side and the highly respectable gangs with which he has come in collision in Delaware politics, is only that their rascalities are garbed in traditional respectability. Low type of public character as Addicks is, it is questionable if he is not doing good work in breaking up the gangs of respectable rascals. As for democracy, the Delaware Democrats don't know what it means. Look at Judge Gray, for instance, and consider the game which that Delaware Democrat played for a judicial appointment at the hands of a Republican President. If the press were to make as much of those circumstances as they do of Addicks's political performances, Addicks would begin to look white by contrast.

Secretary Shaw is reported as advocating the abolition of customs houses at points where business is greatly disproportionate to the expense of keeping up the establishment. One custom house, for instance, costs the government about \$250 for every dollar of duties it collects; and there are others which resemble it, though the ratio of receipts

to expenditures is not so disproportionate. These are the kind of custom houses Mr. Shaw would abolish. Evidently he is not as good a protectionist as he is supposed to be. The principal object of customs houses is not to get revenue. That is only incidental. The principal object is to keep foreign goods out of the country, so that our exports may exceed our imports and a "favorable balance" of trade be thereby maintained. It is in this manner that protectionists save American markets for American producers. Now, a custom house that costs \$350 for every dollar it collects on imports may be serving that purpose as well as any of the others. In fact, if no custom house was able to collect more than one dollar in duties for every \$350 necessarily expended to maintain it, the principal purpose of the protective tariff would be served better than it is now served. Mr. Shaw's reasons for abolishing the kind of custom houses he indicates are utterly invalid—from the protection point of view.

The committee on education and labor, of the Federal Senate, is doubtless in receipt of a large mail just now, burdened with a varied assortment of objections to the eight-hour bill (House bill No. 3076) which has passed the House and is about to be considered by the Senate. It may be useful, therefore, for the committee to know that the objections are inspired by the National Association of Manufacturers, a trade union of employers who are opposed to trade unions among workmen. This organization recently sent out a confidential circular, enumerating 32 objections to the bill; and with the circular it enclosed a letter requesting the recipient to write the Senate committee urging an unfavorable report upon the bill, giving at least two objections—not copying them verbatim from the circular, however, but elaborating them. In this way it is evidently hoped to secure the appearance of "spontaneous" expressions of disapproval which in fact are

perfunctory and made in response to the call of the employers' union. Such expressions have their value, but it is important that the facts about them be known, so that they may not pass in the Senate for more than their value.

Under the title of "The Menace to Economic Independence," the Independent of December 4 has a striking editorial contribution to this subject, which the ruthless march of events is forcing upon public attention more and more. "It seems certain," says the writer, "that before long it will be impossible for any man on his own account to engage in even so simple a business as selling smoking tobacco and cigars, retailing cut flowers, selling newspapers, or even peanuts and bananas on the street corner. Every man who is not a multi-millionaire will be a millionaire's man, dependent upon the good will of a superior for his daily bread. Could there be a more melancholy outcome of our great American attempt to build up a civilization in which every man might be independent and self-respecting?" The editor sees the danger at either end: There will be a great extension of trade union methods. "We shall see," he predicts, "innumerable unions within the salaried class, each striving to bar out competition . . . to maintain a rigorous monopoly of the job." There are many indications that this prediction will come true; for the fact at present is that the so-called salaried classes, including mainly clerks and teachers, are the most dependent and servile portion of any community. We use the latter epithet in no spirit of offense, but rather of pity. Tied to their job, and without the feeling of strength that comes to some extent from organization, they are absolutely helpless, and have only one door of freedom, that is, to quit and sink into one of Ghent's lower strata. In many communities you will find that the wage-earners, to use a distinction that is easily understood, are clearly more

independent personally than the salaried-earners. Among the latter one can see far more cringing and a far more manifest bearing of subservience. If you want to see tremulous homage, be present when the superintendent, or the president of a school board comes into a group of teachers. Then see them "process" to the platform, and hear them lead the young voices in singing "Sweet land of liberty," or "The land of the free and the home of the brave!" If any, even a temporary, spirit of independence could come to them and others of the salaried classes from any kind of union, it might be welcomed as a temporary release, even if it should lead to the charge of trying to monopolize the job. But the important work at present is to get the American people to come to a consciousness of the situation of dependence into which all but a very few are being rapidly corralled.

Wall street is in bad plight. Its affairs are on the brink of collapse, and the United States treasury refuses it further help. This refusal is encouraging, but the reason calls for special wonder. Further help is withheld not for the good reason that the government has no business to dabble in Wall street speculations, but for the bad one that the previous aid extended has not lessened the demand for more aid, and that there seems to be no end. "The best posted men in the treasury," writes "Raymond" to the Chicago Tribune (Republican), for which he is the Washington special correspondent—

say the government has simply been pouring money into a rat hole, and there is not the slightest prospect of being able to supply funds enough to meet the extraordinary demands of Wall street any longer. Every dollar which could be spared from the United States treasury has been loaned to the banks without interest, and in a few cases without any too good security. In addition to this the ordinary interest payments have been anticipated for a long time to come. The secretary of the treasury has gone to the danger line in the matter of purchasing bonds, and has submitted to rank extortion and paid extraordinary premiums merely that the government should do