

bitration, and it would thereby prevent wars. But Mr. Roosevelt in his message said nothing of Bryan's suggestion. It is not to be presumed that he was silent because the suggestion came from Bryan. That would be too small for a mind like Roosevelt's. It must have been because the militant mind of the President likes better to make peace than to keep peace.

Senator Rayner's splendid speech.

A new voice, a strong voice, and a welcome voice was heard in the Senate of the United States on the 8th. It was the voice of Rayner—reputed to be one of the greatest lawyers in this country—the new Senator from Maryland, a State to which we had long since ceased to look for high ideals.

Senator Rayner's subject was the foreign receivership which President Roosevelt has established over the custom houses of Santo Domingo. Mr. Rayner said he found no clause in the Constitution empowering our government to act as a receiver for any nation. But that part of his speech which probed the depths of this new iniquity, was his criticism of President Roosevelt's primary doctrine that the great nations are within their rights when they forcibly collect money claims against other nations by blockade, bombardment and seizure of custom houses. "I respectfully deny," he said, "that foreign nations are within their rights when they actively intervene in favor of the contractual claims of their subjects." Elaborating his criticism he continued:

With great deference to the President, this proposition is at war with the elementary principles of international law. There are some exceptions that sustain his statements in countries where anarchy and a failure to administer justice prevails, but with an exception in cases that are sui generis, the rule is an inflexible and unbending one, precisely to the contrary tenor of what the President states it to be. In this country nearly every secretary of state, including Madison, Adams, Clay, Webster, Cal-

houn, Marcy, Seward and Blaine, have given the broad denial to suggestions of this character, so that until the new doctrine was promulgated it was considered a postulate and a fundamental law that governments would not interfere in behalf of the contractual claims of their citizens, except through the channels of diplomacy and the proper presentation of the claims by their ministers.

As President Roosevelt bases his unprecedented and unwarranted occupation of the Dominican custom houses (vol. vii, p. 731; vol. viii, p. 630), upon a curious interpretation of the duty of this government under the Monroe doctrine, Senator Rayner, with as much polite deference to Mr. Roosevelt's exalted station and as little respect for his imperial policy, considered that phase of the subject. This is the Roosevelt doctrine, he said, but not the Monroe doctrine. Referring to Jefferson's comments on the famous message of Monroe, he asked:

Was he contemplating the probable bombardment of a Caribbean fort to enforce the payment of a usurer's bond? Was his mind perplexed by a vision of a war conducted by bailiffs and constables and collectors in the interest of foreign pawnbrokers, whose weapons are pledges and debentures, and who, struggling with each other for preferences and priorities in their insatiate chase for plunder, sweep down upon the pitiful revenues of those bankrupt and impoverished republics, until they become prostrate supplicants at the exchequer of the world, and are willing to yield their resources and concessions at any price or sacrifice that may be dictated in the gambling dens of the European stock market? . . . The new Monroe doctrine is strictly a financial doctrine. The income is money, the legend is cash, and the foreign hordes who are advancing into the state department are a syndicate of relentless mercenaries and money lenders, who traffic in calamity, look upon national misfortunes as so much merchandise, and who for a venal profit would call a vendue and auction to the highest bidder the liberties of mankind.

Senator Rayner's is one of the few inspiring speeches that have been heard in the Senate chamber since McKinley and Hanna ushered in the now expiring era of imperial plutocracy at home and im-

perial conquest abroad. Nor was it a mere lawyer's tour de force. The man who uttered those sentiments must have been inspired by sincere conviction or he would not have closed with this confession of a type of patriotism which is as rare as it is profound and exalted:

I am with the slave in every darkened corner of the globe where he is struggling to be free, and I hope the day may come when every government that is built upon the bowed bodies of its subjects may disintegrate, and that upon its ruins republican institutions may arise. However deeply, Mr. President, as I may love my country, with all the devotion I would lay upon her altars, with a fervid reverence for her flag wherever its colors greet the eye, I would rather see that flag lowered and trampled upon than used as a pirate's ensign, and raised, not as an emblem of honor, but as an instrument of terror and oppression to the helpless and enfeebled races of mankind.

Corporation Antomatons in the Chicago council.

The traction-corporation ring in the Chicago Council has now confirmed what few Chicago citizens had failed to guess, that this ring, despite all its virtuous pretenses, is a ring in fact. Whether its members or any of them are paid, either directly or indirectly, by the traction companies, is another question. If future disclosures should reveal corruption, we should have another case of good men gone wrong or bad men found out, according to the point of view; if, however, there is no corruption, the irreverent and cynical may repeat their sneer, that "reformers come cheap." Wholly apart from these considerations, the fact is now plain, that the majority of the local transportation committee, from one motive or another, and supported in their course by a majority of the Council, have ignored the instructions of their constituents and taken orders from the traction companies. It matters little whether such men are tainted or not; they are unfaithful public servants.

The facts speak for themselves. These men were elected by their respective constituencies because they were, for a variety of reasons