

### THE PROPOSED PHILIPPINE TARIFF LAW.

The bill provides that the tariff law enacted by the United States Philippine commission on September 1, 1901, shall be and remain in full force and effect; that there shall be levied, collected and paid upon all articles imported into the United States from the Philippine archipelago the rates of duty which are required to be levied, collected and paid upon like articles imported from foreign countries; that the duties and taxes collected in the Philippine archipelago in pursuance of this act, less the cost of collecting the same and the gross amount of all collections of duties and taxes in the United States upon articles imported from the Philippine archipelago and upon vessels coming therefrom, shall not be covered into the general fund of the treasury of the United States, but shall be held as a separate fund and paid into the treasury of the Philippine islands to be used and expended for the government and benefit of said islands.

Let every man who reads this bill sit down and think it out for himself. Think for himself and he will see how much profound wisdom it takes to be a congressman; he will see how much it will cost, when we try to subvert natural law. For man is a trading animal, and the Philippines may have a surplus of some things that our citizens may want to exchange for our surplus of other forms of wealth. Now the natural law would let both parties make the exchange without any fines or restrictions whatever.

But see what this "whim" of congress proposes to do. If it was not for the principle of the thing it would make us laugh it off as a joke. Yet it is a serious joke, and will force the citizens of the United States—proper—to pay a tariff tax on all goods they may buy of our Filipino subjects. Now the extra price we must pay on account of the tariff on goods imported from the Philippines does not go into the treasury of the United States at all but is sent over to the Philippines to be used in making good roads, building school houses, erecting bridges, paying high salaries and making other internal improvements. Just as if we had all the good roads, school houses, bridges and internal improvements we needed ourselves.

What would the people of Kansas say if a democratic legislature had the power and would pass a law forcing the citizens of Kansas to pay a 50 per cent. tariff tax on all goods imported into the state, and, instead of putting the money thus obtained from tariff taxes into the state treasury, send it back to the different states from which the goods came

on which the obnoxious tariff tax had been paid. Of course such a foolish act would be a pretty good thing for some of the people of other states, but would it not be a little rough on the citizens of Kansas?

The Philippine tariff bill about to pass congress is of this kind; it will be a pretty good thing for some of the people in the Philippines, and a little hard on us fellows living on this side who must work a little harder to get Philippine tariff-taxed goods. And who will it benefit in the Philippines? The man who has only his labor to sell? Will it enable such as he to get a living any easier? Not at all. If it did we might feel that the extra price we were forced to pay did some good, by making it easier for the "poor" Filipino to get a living. But such will not be the case by any means.

All the money, let it be much or little, paid by citizens of the United States on goods imported from the Philippines, the amount being sent to those islands to be expended on internal improvements, the benefit, all the benefit, will accrue to the friars and other land monopolist owners of franchises to be granted and other special privileged classes. That is the natural law. True everywhere. The more money we are forced to send to the islands the more valuable will be the Philippine monopolies and other special privileges that under a just government should bear the burdens of state. It will be robbing the many in the United States—proper—for the benefit of a few men in the Philippines.—R T. Snediker, in Kansas City World.

### MAYOR JOHNSON'S WAY.

#### AT A SESSION OF THE BOARD OF PARDONS.

Quite a few of the applicants sought to gain favor by announcing to the mayor that they had voted for him. Mr. Johnson was manifestly displeased at this, and showed an inclination to return the men to prison at once.

One of the first applications to be considered was that of Eli Dennis, better known as "Frenchy," the little old man who was the proprietor of the numerous Canal street hovels which have recently been torn down by the building inspector. He was arrested on Thanksgiving day for having purchased ten cents' worth of stolen coal, and received a sentence of \$25, costs, and 30 days. "Frenchy" was very nervous, and his utterance was extremely shaky. After asking him sev-

eral questions Mayor Johnson was about to grant the application, when "Frenchy" volunteered the information:

"I voted for you last spring, mayor," as if he thought that would surely decide matters in his favor.

"I am sorry you told me that," said Mayor Johnson, dropping the pen with which he was about to affix his signature to the pardon paper. "We never pardon men who voted for me.

At this point "Frenchy" became almost tearful in his supplication.

"If we let you out will you promise not to vote for me again?"

"Yes, your honor, indeed I'll promise that," stammered "Frenchy," amidst roars of laughter from the spectators.

"Then I guess we'll have to let you out," replied the mayor, signing the pardon.

One of the 374 John Smiths on the police records was an applicant for pardon. He had received a sentence of \$25, costs, and 30 days on a charge of petit larceny, it being charged that he had stolen some carpenter's tools from an unfinished barn.

"What's your real name?" asked the mayor.

"I'm the real John Smith," was the response.

Detective Rowlands here stated that the tool thief was a common variety of criminal, and a very despicable variety, inasmuch as he deprives workmen of the ability to earn their living. Mayor Johnson was inclined to agree with Rowlands. Seeing the tide was evidently turning against him, the real John Smith declared that he was one of the mayor's most enthusiastic supporters last spring.

"That settles it," said Mr. Johnson, "the pardon is not granted," and the real John Smith was led back behind the bars.—Cleveland Plain Dealer, of Jan. 10.

### SENATOR M'LAURIN'S NEW DOCTRINE.

For The Public.

That eminent Republican, Senator McLaurin, of South Carolina, is credited with saying, at the recent annual dinner of the New York city chamber of commerce, that henceforth all political considerations, both at home and abroad, must be subordinated to the demands of trade.

We have so long listened to administration hypocrisy that we thank the senator for so much honesty. But the doctrine he announces is one whose principles, if applied to his private conduct, would be apt to land him in the penitentiary. For even the utilitarian idea that honesty is

the best policy will have to be rejected, as the senator knows that many a private fortune is gained by means that would not endure the test of day, much less of morality. But the senator also knows that transactions do not lose their moral character when we leave the domain of private life and enter that of national politics. He knows that, if there is any difference, the ethical obligation is more binding in public than in private life, on account of the greater numbers and interests involved.

But, if the senator's doctrine be new, its practice had been thoroughly initiated by the United States before he spoke.

The sincere and hearty welcome given by Porto Rico was rewarded by the subordination of the political consideration of "plain duty" to the demand for a tariff on the part of the commercial oligarchy which ran the McKinley administration.

The political consideration of Cuban independence, reaffirmed "to the letter" by the last Republican national convention, was subordinated to the demand of that oligarchy for the control of Cuba's foreign policy, and for interference in her domestic concerns.

The political consideration of our virtual pledge of independence to the Filipinos was subordinated to the demand of that oligarchy that the Philippines be seized under the form of a treaty and that the war be provoked by us for the purpose of subjugation or extermination.

And, if the Danish West Indies are ceded to us, against the well-known wishes of their inhabitants, the senator will doubtless be the first to proclaim that, if they have the impudence to object to being sold to a new master, all political considerations must be subordinated to "benevolent assimilation" at the cannon's mouth.

Of course the mere fact that we have already expended more money on the Philippine war than we are likely to gain in trade profit with the islands, or through them, for 200 years, is too trifling a consideration for a sound business man like Senator McLaurin, or for the present "sound business administration."

The policy advocated by the senator involves, too, a not unlikely abandonment of the Monroe doctrine, for if, in return for our permission of European encroachment in Central and South America, we may obtain any commercial advantage (which is

not at all impossible), it will of course be our duty to throw that doctrine overboard.

The senator distinctly advocates a policy which is utterly at variance with constitutional liberty, and which robs the United States of that peculiar honor which she enjoyed until recently as the bulwark of republicanism. He advocates a policy which measures the national honor by the extent to which we can exploit weaker peoples. He advocates the very policy against which his own forefathers rebelled in 1776—a policy through which Great Britain lost her national honor so long ago that the memory of man runneth not to the contrary,

Soften the senator's doctrine by whatever euphemism he may, it nevertheless remains a fact that his doctrine means nothing more or less than robbery and murder on a national scale.

It is suggested that the United States senate appoint a commission, of which the republican senator from South Carolina shall be chairman, to make a tour of the world and report as to those peoples (weaker than ourselves) with whom our trade may be increased; so that, upon one miserable pretext after another, we may seize their lands and subjugate or exterminate their inhabitants for the enhancement of the balance of trade and to the glory of the "national honor."

JOHN SAMPSON.

Washington, D. C., 2420, 14th St., December 27, 1901.

To the children of the tenement a park means play. They are slow to appreciate the esthetic values of trees, grass or landscape gardening, and make the lives of the policemen who do miserable. I met two little girls one day, each holding a baby in her arms, gazing through the fence around one of the small triangle parks downtown, beautiful examples I thought of what nature studies in the schools can do; but when I asked one of them whether they were ever allowed to go inside, she hitched up the baby and said: "No, it ain't a park, it's grass."—Robert Alston Stevenson, in Scribner's for September.

The story is told of an anonymous correspondent who forwarded £50 in bank notes to a predecessor of Sir M. Hicks-Beach with the note: "Dear Sir—Some time ago I defrauded the revenue of £500; my conscience gnaws

and I send you £50. When it gnaws again I'll send you more."—English Paper.

"Molly," said some one to the little daughter of a clergyman, "does your father preach the same sermon twice?" "I think, perhaps, he does," returned Molly, cautiously, "but I think he talks loud and soft in different places the second time, so it doesn't sound the same at all."—London Tit-Bits.

The remedy for the evils of liberty is more liberty.—Macaulay.

Wantno—Ah! so he saw service in South Africa. Did he take part in many victories?

Showup—He fought on the English side.

BOOK NOTICES.

"Common People," by Frank Oliver Hall (Boston: James H. West company. Price \$1.00) comprises eight sermons. They deal respectively with common people at home, at work, at play, at study, in politics, at church, as neighbors, and climbing. Though sermons in general character, these essays lack both the text and the dullness of your conventional sermon. There is not a dry paragraph in one of them. And altogether they are wholesome as well as interesting. From many of the ideas presented we should dissent, and from some of them strenuously. But any book which strives with intelligence and vigor to awaken young men from a lethargy of satisfaction with their own comfort and enjoyments to their responsibilities, as this book does, may be forgiven many more and much worse things than we find in it to condemn. Its description of patriotism, a typical example of the style, is alone an inspiration: "What is a patriot? A man who lies behind a breastwork and undertakes to shoot some other man to death? A man who charges up a hill and perhaps lies down and dies on a slope? No, that is not patriotism. That may be one of the manifestations of patriotism, or it may be only a manifestation of bull dog ferocity, of brutal and degrading lust for a fight. \* \* \* To love one's country, to be ready in emergency to die for one's country, to be ready above all to live for one's country—that is patriotism."

"Smaller Profits, Reduced Salaries and Lower Wages; the Condition, the Cause, the Cure, by a Business Man," is the

**CHINESE**  
**EXCLUSION**

The editorial article of THE PUBLIC entitled,  
**"The Chinese Exclusion Act,"**

has been put in pamphlet form. For price, etc., see list of PUBLIC LEAFLETS on next page.