

it opens the door to additional corruption and blackmail.

EDWARD OSGOOD BROWN.  
Chicago, Ill.

**NEWS**

The military situation in South Africa is practically unchanged since our report of last week, when the Boers were attacking Wepener. British reports from Bloemfontein on the 13th described the Boers as in full retreat from this point, but this was contradicted on the 17th by reports from Boer sources; and on the 18th Lord Roberts reported Wepener as still surrounded. He declared, however, that the Boers were now fighting half-heartedly and exhibiting uneasiness about the security of their communications. For their uneasiness there would seem to be reason. Lord Roberts is reported to have "spread his net far and wide" to catch the Boer detachments that are operating before Wepener and throughout the southeastern part of the Orange Free State; and on the 17th his forces were said to be converging. His forward movement to Pretoria is at a standstill. The explanation offered is lack of horses.

Gen. Gatacre has been called home for incompetency, and Gen. Chermenside assigned to his command. This change made a slight sensation in London; but it was followed by one of much greater proportions, caused by the first publication, on the 18th, by war office authority, of a dispatch written by Lord Roberts as far back as February 13, and which had been in the possession of the war office for five weeks. Lord Roberts in this dispatch very freely criticised both Gen. Buller and Gen. Warren for the Natal campaign for the relief of Ladysmith. The publication of the dispatch at this time is regarded as intended either to force the resignation, or prepare the public mind for the recall, of both Warren and Buller.

On the 15th the Boer peace delegation, consisting of Messrs. Fischer, Wolmarans and Wessels, arrived at The Hague. These delegates were first mentioned in these columns at page 7 of No. 104, as being on their way to some of the European capitals and Washington to negotiate for intervention in behalf of the independence of the two republics. They

were received at The Hague enthusiastically with cheers and cries of "Long live the Transvaal and the Orange Free State."

The Boer general, Cronje, with his family and staff were landed on the 14th at St. Helena, as prisoners of war. Other Boer prisoners of war were landed at the same time, and others still were reported as having been sent to St. Helena from Cape Town. The Boers complain of this disposition of prisoners, asserting that the humid atmosphere of St. Helena means death to men accustomed to the dry climate of the African veldts, and they threaten to retaliate.

American casualties in the Philippines since August 6, 1898, inclusive of all official reports given out at Washington to April 18, 1900, are as follows:

Killed .....	473
Died of wounds, disease and accidents .....	1,205
<b>Total deaths .....</b>	<b>1,678</b>
Wounded .....	2,092
<b>Total loss .....</b>	<b>3,770</b>
Total loss reported last week....	3,725
Total deaths reported last week..	1,653

In the Philippines, the petty warfare of which we wrote last week continues. On the 16th 300 Filipino riflemen and bolomen had attacked the American garrison at Batoc, in the province of North Ilocos—which is in the northwest of Luzon—and were repulsed. A few days before this an American detachment had surrounded a Filipino recruiting village in Benguet province—on the western coast, about half way further down toward Manila—and after capturing several prisoners had burned the village. Another American capture was that of Gen. Montenegro, who, with Gen. Macabulos, had been trying to reorganize the Filipino army in the province of Pangasinan, which is on the same coast, still farther south. Montenegro surrendered, but Macabulos escaped. Along with these reports came others of futile attacks by Filipinos upon San Jose, in the province of Batangas, which is on the southern coast, and Santa Cruz on the lake. On the island of Mindanao, the most southerly of the group, at Cagayen, the Americans were attacked on the 7th. A street fight of 20 minutes' duration fol-

lowed, in which the Filipinos were worsted and withdrew to the mountains.

The Philippine question was elaborately and impressively discussed in the senate on the 17th by Senator Hoar. The extracts and descriptions given by the daily press indicate that Mr. Hoar's speech was one of great power and eloquence and the occasion historic. His references to Aguinaldo and his compatriots were brave and discriminating. Aguinaldo he ranked with "that small band who have given life and everything dearer than life to their country in a losing cause," and predicted that "he would live with Kossuth, with Oom Paul, with Joubert, with Emmet, with Egmont and Horn, with Nathan Hale, with Warren, with all the great martyrs of history whose blood has been the seed of the church of liberty." And as one indication of the qualifications of the Filipinos for self government Mr. Hoar declared that—

the state papers of Aguinaldo, the discussion of the law of nations by his attorney-general, the masterly appeal of Mabini, are products of the Asiatic mind. They are not unworthy of the Asiatic mind, the vehicle through which came to us the scriptures of the old and new testament, the poetry of David, the eloquence of Isaiah, the wisdom of Solomon, the profound philosophy of Paul.

The most dramatic feature of Mr. Hoar's speech appears to have been an imaginary roll call of distinguished Americans voting on the question of imperialism. It began with Washington, who briefly gave his reasons and voted "No," and ended with McKinley, who was made to say:

There has been a cloud before my vision for a moment, but I see clearly now; I go back to what I said two years ago: "Forcible annexation is criminal aggression; governments derive their just powers from the consent of the governed, not of some of them, but all of them." I will stand with the fathers of the republic. I will stand with the founders of the republican party. No.

Aaron Burr alone answered "Yes," explaining: "You are repeating my buccaneering expedition down the Mississippi; I am to be vindicated at last."

It was not expansion that Mr. Hoar argued against but imperialism. He found authority enough in the declaration of independence for expansion, but, he said, this is—  
the expansion of freedom and not of

despotism; of life, not of death. Never was such growth in all human history as that from the seed Thomas Jefferson planted. It has covered the continent; it is on both the seas; it has saved South America; it is revolutionizing Europe; it is the expansion of freedom; it differs from your tinsel, pinchbeck, pewter expansion as the growth of a healthy youth into a strong man differs from the expansion of an anaconda when he swallows his victim.

But Mr. Hoar spoke as a republican and a party man. "I do not expect," he said, "to accomplish anything for liberty in the Philippine Islands but through the republican party. Upon it the fate of these islands for years to come is to depend. I cannot look with any favor upon Mr. Bryan as an alternative." Yet he fully recognized that perseverance in the administration's present policy will not only—be the abandonment of the principles upon which our government is founded, that it will change our republic into an empire, that our methods of legislation, of diplomacy, of administration must hereafter be those which belong to empires, and not those which belong to republics; but I believe persistence in this attempt will result in the defeat and overthrow of the republican party.

On the constitutional question Mr. Hoar maintained that the "acquisition and governing of territory can be only a means to a constitutional end," and reminded the country that in every previous accession of territory we have "recognized fully the doctrine of consent of the governed and the doctrine that territory so acquired must be held to be made into states."

The policy which Mr. Hoar announced his willingness to support was this:

I would declare now that we will not take these islands to govern them against their will. I would reject a cession of sovereignty which implies that sovereignty may be bought and sold and delivered without the consent of the people. I would require all foreign governments to keep out of these islands. I would offer to the people of the Philippines our help in maintaining order until they have a reasonable opportunity to establish a government of their own. I would aid them by advice, if they desire it, to set up a free and independent government. I would invite all the great powers of Europe to unite in an agreement that that independence shall not be interfered with. I would declare that the United States will enforce the same doctrine as applicable to the Philippines that we

declared as to Mexico and Hayti and the South American republics. I would then, in a not distant future, leave them to work out their own salvation, as every nation on earth, from the beginning of time, has wrought out its own salvation.

Another congressional event of historical importance, though in a minor way, was the adoption by the lower house of congress on the 13th of a resolution for the amendment of the constitution so as to require federal senators to be elected by the direct vote of the people of their several states instead of being elected by the legislatures in accordance with the present system. This resolution was adopted by a vote of 242 to 15. When it came up in the senate on the 16th, Senator Butler moved to place it upon the calendar at once, without referring it to a committee, arguing that the subject had been so thoroughly and generally discussed that no committee investigation was necessary. In the course of his remarks he intimated that the resolution would be smothered in committee. This intimation was resented by Senator Chandler, the chairman of the committee on privileges and elections, to which the resolution was referable, and to which, upon Senator Butler's withdrawal of his motion the resolution was referred.

Congress has been also shaping anti-trust legislation. The subcommittee of the house judiciary committee has formulated an amendment to the Sherman anti-trust law, besides an amendment to the federal constitution of a most revolutionary character. The amendment to the Sherman law would require the branding of trust-made goods, so they could be easily identified; the prohibition of interstate commerce traffic in goods made by trusts which are not branded; and prohibition of the use of the mails to concerns and their officials proven to be trusts. It would also authorize injunctions against combinations sending trust-made goods from one state to another or a foreign country, and require corporations having a capital of \$1,000,000 and doing a business of \$1,000,000 a year to make a report to the secretary of state. These provisions are commonplace, however, in comparison with the proposed constitutional amendment, which provides that—

all private corporations, copartnerships and joint stock companies in the

United States shall be under the control of congress; that congress shall have power to define, regulate, control, prohibit, repress and dissolve all trusts and monopolies and combination or conspiracy to monopolize any part of trade or commerce, and all contracts and combinations in form of trusts or otherwise, or conspiracy in restraint of trade or commerce; that congress shall have power to enforce this article by appropriate legislation; that in the absence of legislation on the part of congress all powers conferred upon congress by this article may be exercised by the several states.

The chairman of the judiciary committee explains that this amendment is made necessary by the decision of the supreme court, which holds that manufacture is no part of inter-state commerce, even though the manufacture be a monopoly affecting inter-state commerce. Consequently manufacturing trusts cannot now be reached by congress under the inter-state commerce clause of the constitution.

While congress was preparing anti-trust legislation the managers of the American Steel and Wire Company, one of the great beneficiary trusts of the protective tariff which congress maintains, gave the public a shock by shutting down 12 out of its 44 plants, and throwing 6,200 workmen out of a job. The mills shut down were three at Pittsburg, two at Cleveland, three at Joliet, and one each at De Kalb, Ill., Waukegan, Ill., Anderson, Ind., and New Castle, Ind. The effect of this action was apparent at once in the price of stocks. Common shares of the trust fell from \$51 to \$43, and preferred shares from \$85 to \$80.50 in a few hours, the loss in these speculative values aggregating nearly \$6,000,000. When pressed for explanations, the managers of the trust who were willing to talk attributed the shut down to over production, the high prices of their products having so checked demand that supply had run ahead of it. Over against this explanation are the assurances of others in the iron and steel industry that they cannot keep up with the demand. It is suspected, therefore, that the shut down was ordered arbitrarily for the purpose of affecting the value of the stock on the market, to the end that the managers who unloaded several months ago at high prices caused by persistent rumors of dividends might buy in again at depressed prices. This suspicion derives slight confirmation from the