

has been found by experience in voting on constitutional amendments to draw the attention of voters, thereby securing a full expression of opinion. In other respects the bill is excellent. There is probably little hope of its passage this year; yet if it should pass, it would be extraordinarily effective in distinguishing and promoting popular legislation. If the people could officially express their wishes regarding legislation by voting upon important questions free from entangling preferences for candidates, we should at least have opportunities for learning what now it is impossible to learn, the actual will of the people regarding the questions that concern them.

In the Commoner of last week Mr. Bryan called Grover Cleveland to account on the score of his democracy, apropos of Cleveland's characteristic letter to the Crescent Democratic club of Baltimore. Mr. Bryan's offer of a reward of five dollars "for a written statement, not to exceed 500 words, signed by Mr. Cleveland, applying democratic principles, as he understands them, to at least five of the questions now before the country," has been criticized as "infra dig." The contemptuous offer may be; but that is a matter of mere taste—something which is never open to discussion. The essential thing is Mr. Bryan's demand. Forever prating about democratic principles, Cleveland never applies them. If he would respond to Mr. Bryan's demand and make a statement applying democratic principles as he understands them to five of the questions now before the country, he might furnish some test of his democracy. What, for instance, in Mr. Cleveland's opinion, is democratic doctrine on the Spooner amendment? What is it on the Cuban resolutions? What is it on trusts?

Mr. Cleveland's nearest approach to practical democracy was in 1887-88, when he blazed the way for a campaign of free trade. But that ap-

pears now to have been an accident, for in no other important respect does his record tally with it. The free trade issue itself he shunted off the track, as soon as it had put him back into the whitehouse with a strong majority behind him in congress. Instead of calling an extra session of congress at once to give effect to the popular mandate on the only issue of the campaign, he let the spring and the summer and the fall go by, let the opposition catch their breath. Meantime he called an extra session to make an entirely new issue, the money issue, on which he took the republican side. Cleveland could not be better described than in these words of Mr. Bryan: "To desertion of the party organization and betrayal of the principles of the party, he adds ostentatious pretence of interest in the plain people, while he conceals his ideas in ponderous and platitudinous phrases." He yearns in his Baltimore letter for the old days of democracy when "democratic principles, advocated in democratic fashion, gave guarantee of democratic supremacy—or at least strength and influence in our national councils." Which old days does he mean? Those proslavery days that ended with Buchanan's term? or the days that followed the close of the civil war? If the former, what is there in them for a democrat in principle to be proud of? If the latter, what record of democratic accomplishment is there to show for "democratic supremacy" or democratic "strength and influence"?

A London paper, the Daily News, reported on the 28th that Denmark has communicated to the United States the following conditions for the sale of the Danish West Indies:

1. Four million dollars to be paid to Denmark.
2. The population to decide by vote whether to remain Danish or to be transferred to the United States.
3. If the vote is favorable to the United States then the inhabitants to become immediately not only American subjects, but American citizens.
4. Products of the island to be ad-

mitted to the United States free of duty.

It is supposed in London, says the News, that the United States will not readily accept the third and fourth conditions. A shrewd supposition. The United States is less intent, under the present administration, upon establishing citizenship than upon acquiring subjects.

Senator Hoar, who, by the way, is reported by those who have talked with him within the last week or so, to be waiting the proper occasion to declare himself in favor of the repudiation of our national pledge to the Cuban republic, built that masterly speech of his of April 17, 1900, which has been the text-book of anti-imperialists, on the assumption that we would keep our word to Cuba and make her really free. All the way through it occur expressions like this:

Every people is by right entitled to its independence that has got as far as Cuba had in the spring of 1898. You all admit that. Admit! You all avow, affirm, strenuously insist on that. You will always pledge your lives and fortunes and sacred honor for that. You will go to war and send your sons to war to maintain that. If Spain shall deny it, or any other country but Great Britain, woe be to her. It is not necessary, according to you, to have a constitution; it isn't necessary to have courts; it isn't necessary to have a capital; it isn't necessary to have a school. The seat of government may be in the saddle. It isn't necessary to occupy a city, or to have a seaport; it isn't necessary to hold permanently an acre of land; it isn't necessary to have got the invader out of the country; it isn't necessary to have a tenth part of the claim the Filipinos have, or to have done a tenth part of the things the Filipinos have done.

The motto of that speech on its title-page stands in three lines of bold-face type:

No right under the constitution to hold subject states. To every people belongs the right to establish its own government in its own way. The United States cannot with honor buy the title of a dispossessed tyrant, or crush a republic.

The amazing and painful depravation, intellectual and spiritual, which permits the author of this once great speech (it cannot be esteemed any-

thing but word mongering now, alas!) is one of the saddest and most wonderful phenomenon of the general spiritual decline of our day.

In the same speech, Mr. Hoar girded at the administration for its silence on the Boer struggle and contrasted the eagerness of the republican senators to express their sympathy for Venezuela in its contention with Great Britain, with their silence on the murder of the South African republics. "Where are they now?" asked the old Massachusetts senator. "They are bound over to keep the peace; they are bound over to hold their peace, the open door and the shut mouth." And the joke of it is, as we now see it, that the door was soon after shut as well as their mouth, and the British as well as Yankees outside of it, while direct overland connection with China is made for England's inveterate enemy whom she has always been preparing to fight for the last three generations. It is the work of the wills of the gods, most assuredly, that just at the appointed hour, when Asia is dropping into Russia's grasp, as England has always dreaded its doing, Great Britain finds herself so limited with Chamberlain and Rhodes's shameful and disastrous commercialism in South Africa, plain sandbagging highway robbery in the eye of international law, that she cannot move hand or foot to resist!

It is proposed by L. A. Russell, the Cleveland lawyer, that—

American citizens get together everywhere in their home localities in mass meetings and send word direct to the citizens of Cuba and the citizens of the Philippines that we perfectly understand that our hired men at the present moment operating our governmental functions are betraying our faith toward them, and ask them to administer their own affairs as patiently as they can till we can get our affairs into such hands as will execute our intentions by respecting the independence of Cuba and the Philippines and letting them alone except in friendly intercourse and mutual helpfulness. It seems to me straight talk from us to those peoples is now necessary to save our nation from doing them more wrong

and to save ourselves and our posterity from being slaves to tyrants.

Word comes up from South America that the people of those countries are mentally disturbed by a growing conviction that the United States contemplates appropriating their countries as additional "new possessions." This is what it means to get a bad name. After our national crime with reference to the Philippines, and our unblushing national perfidy with reference to Cuba, no foreigner would believe our most solemn protestations that we are not ambitious of empire, and none would trust us again in the presence of a national temptation. This is humiliating to an American, and it is inexpressibly disappointing and saddening to those European lovers of liberty who have been accustomed to look to the United States as the exemplar of the nations. We are told that Russian exiles in Siberia, victims of an absolutism from which at the risk of fortune and life they have struggled to free their own country, were dumb with amazement and sorrow when they learned that the United States had taken the title and the place of Spain in subjugating the Filipinos. At first they refused to believe it, suspecting the story as another St. Petersburg lie invented and published for their discouragement. But time brought confirmation of the story, and they were forced to acknowledge, what the loyal officers of the tsar had long insisted upon, that the aspirations of the United States were the same as those of the oppressive land-grabbing nations of Europe. The pity of it! The shame of it!

The system of putting prisoners accused of crime into what the police significantly and aptly call the "sweat box," has been vigorously condemned by Judge Tuley, of Chicago. In the particular case, it was charged that the prisoner had been brought to the prosecuting attorney's office and questioned. Judge Tuley said of this: "I cannot countenance the

practice of the state attorney's office in sending for defendants charged with crime and interviewing them in the state's attorneys office in the absence of their attorneys." This practice is denied by the state's attorney, but it is a common practice with the police. One of the favorite methods of extorting confessions is the police "sweat box," which is a sort of European court of "first instance." The prisoner is subjected to a torturing cross examination without the advice or protection of counsel, but none of the safeguards of "courts of first instance" are thrown about him. The "sweat box" is an irresponsible and pernicious institution. Its object is not so much to expose crime and punish criminals, as to confuse prisoners and make them, innocent or guilty, convict themselves.

We have no disposition to say anything about Andrew Carnegie's munificent benefactions. On the one hand there is nothing in this philanthropic spree of a modern Dives to call for commendation; and on the other, the expenditure by any man of what society concedes to be his own fortune, is a private matter outside the pale of criticism. It is only when the question of how a millionaire ought to use his wealth is brought forward in connection with these charitable performances that the subject becomes one of public concern. Then it is of public concern only to the extent of justifying the retort that it is nobody's business but his own how any millionaire uses his wealth, provided he does not use it prejudicially to the rights of others. The vital question is not how millionaires use their wealth, but how they get it. Not how they did get it, for what has happened has happened, and by-gones should be by-gones; but how they are getting it now. Have they a hoard of goods formerly accumulated, from which they draw? Then their getting it hurts nobody. Do they earn it as they go along? Then their getting it benefits everybody. Or do they merely possess legal authority