

wages have gone down while the cost of living has gone up. His examination of the census reports on manufactures, covering 33 states and territories, shows that the fall in wages from 1890 to 1900 was from an average of \$1.39 to \$1.29 a day, about 6 per cent.; while his examination of Dun's Review's figures shows that the rise in the prices of the necessities of life during the same period was 31 per cent. Yet workmen are gravely assured that these are "piping times" of prosperity.

President Roosevelt is very pointedly advised by the organ of Wall street plutocracy that if he knows when he is safe he will call off his dogs. This is apropos of the proceedings, authorized by the President, against the Northwestern railroad merger as a trust. The plutocratic organ to which we allude is the Commercial and Financial Chronicle. In its issue of the 1st, while defending the merger as an innocent and useful device for promoting American prosperity, it declares its extreme sorrow that—

the government should have put itself in this false position. It is prosecuting men whose acts and works have made them prominent the world over as having accomplished most marvelous results for the commerce and industrial development of the United States at home and abroad. They are men, too, that have given to our railroads the prosperity which they are to-day enjoying—which is the chief source of our present progress—and are enjoying with lower average rates of freight than have ever ruled before. Moreover, the very idea which has given birth to the Northern Securities company is a working basis which conserves the best interests of the farmer, of the distributing merchant, of the railroad and the investor; and anyone who is willing to study its character and application cannot fail to reach that conclusion. Why is it, then, antagonized in the West? Simply because the farmer always feels that lower rates for the carriage of his products are desirable—never mind how low they are now—and he easily believes what his neighbors tell him will contribute to that end. Such being the situation, politicians of both parties vie with one another in trying to make the farmer believe his own party and self are helping him most. It is just

like the old battle about a silver currency. Error will prevail for a time. But the man who seeks permanent reputation cannot dally with error.

It may be needless to explain that President Roosevelt is the man who must not "dally with error." This notice is authoritative and means business.

When Senator Lodge's committee, which is now investigating Philippine affairs, finishes with the official witnesses, and comes to the point of inquiring into the truth of the many charges of American brutality—which are anonymous for obvious reasons but are circumstantial nevertheless—it might use the following quotation as the entering wedge for an inquiry into the savage "water cure" practice of which American army officers are accused. The quotation is from the Manila Times of August 18, 1901, a paper published at Manila under censorship, but prior to the discovery there of the fact that the American people do not approve such barbarities. Writing from Samar, a correspondent of the Times told of some successful spying which the Filipinos had done and then proceeded:

Finally, on June 21, Lieut. Downes and one man were killed and three wounded near Pambahan, in a fight from ambush which evidently had been prepared pursuant to information sent out from Guianan as to Lieut. Downes' movements. Several prominent Filipinos gave some valuable information as to the instigators of this spy system, and as they had before given information which proved true, the commanding officer thought best to act upon this information. Maj. John J. O'Connell, First infantry, of Gussie expedition fame, who arrived on the scene about this time as commanding officer, said that a good shaking up all around would be good. That "he wanted no traitors around him." Therefore all the suspected were given a "dose" of the "water cure," which proved effectual in bringing to light the guilty. These were locked up in prison. The prime mover in the affair was discovered to be the presidente of the Pueblo San Esteban Austria.

There is nothing anonymous about that. The Manila Times prints the item, and it gives the name of the principal participant in the cruelty.

Will Senator Lodge produce him as a witness before his committee, or does he regard "water cure" barbarities with indifference?

#### THE DIGNITY OF THE SENATE.

No American citizen should be indifferent to the disgrace of a fist-fight on the floor of the Senate. All of us wish to see the deliberations of our highest legislative body conducted with dignity, and none of us can view a serious breach of decorum there without some indignation and much regret. But this just feeling need not and ought not to lead us on either to assigning to mere external decorum a higher place than belongs to it, or to making partisan misrepresentations of the facts.

Because Senator Tillman struck the first physical blow, in the encounter in the Senate last month, there is a manifest disposition among Republican partisans and their Democratic allies, to throw the whole responsibility for the affair upon him. The mildest form which this disposition has exhibited was a proposal to suspend his senatorial functions for 25 days while suspending Senator McLaurin's for only ten. Among the more severe discriminations against Tillman is the suggestion that he should have been expelled while McLaurin should have been regarded as having already suffered enough. Even some of the committee on privileges and elections described Tillman as the greater offender, though they shrank from the logic of their position for they consented to equal punishment. But the facts as they appear in the official report of the Senate proceedings warrant no such discrimination.

Senator Tillman was speaking on the Philippine tariff bill, which had come up from the House and was then before the Senate. His speech was in part a reply to Senator Spooner, who had spoken the day before, and at one point it was interrupted by Senator Spooner with a question that produced a colloquy between Tillman and Spooner which led on to the fracas between Tillman and McLaurin.

Spooner having, in his speech of the day before, held Mr. Bryan responsible for the ratification of the Philip-

pine treaty, Mr. Tillman asserted that even with the votes of Democrats who acted upon Bryan's advice, the administration still lacked enough votes to ratify. As reported in this connection in the Congressional Record of February 24th, Tillman said:

But with all Mr. Bryan's influence—and it was very great, because it was recognized then that he would be the nominee of his party—he did not and could not persuade enough men here to give the necessary votes. After every man whom Mr. Bryan could influence had been influenced and counted, you still lacked votes, and you know it. You know how you got them.

It was here that Senator Spooner began the colloquy which terminated in the fist-fight. As reported in the Record it was as follows:

Mr. Spooner—How did we get them?

Mr. Tillman—I say you know how you got them.

Mr. Spooner—I do not know how we got them. I do not know that any man voted for that treaty except in obedience to his convictions. Does the senator know any different?

Mr. Tillman—I only know that in a court the senator would convict on circumstantial evidence some men.

Mr. Spooner—Does the senator impeach any senator? Let him name him. I do not impeach any senator, nor do I know any ground for impeaching any.

Mr. Tillman—I have reason to believe from the circumstantial evidence and from things that have been told to me in confidence by men on the other side that improper influences were used.

Mr. Spooner—Name the man. That is due to the country, and due to the man whom you suspect, and by inuendo charge. Who was it? Let him answer for himself if he is still a member of this body.

Mr. Tillman—Whom do you mean? I cannot name the man who gave me the information.

Mr. Spooner—Whoever you mean.

Mr. Tillman—I cannot give the name of the man who gave me the information, because he gave it to me in confidence.

Mr. Spooner—Oh, in confidence. A man who would impeach another in confidence is a coward.

Mr. Tillman—Cowardice in that case does not rest on my shoulders.

Mr. Spooner—The senator turned to me. If the senator knows of any member of this body who voted under corrupt influences for that treaty, name him.

Mr. Tillman—I cannot prove it.

Mr. Spooner—Well, I would not say it.

Mr. Tillman—But I can prove this—

Mr. Spooner—I would not say it.

Mr. Tillman—I can prove this: That the patronage of a state has been given to a Democrat who voted for the treaty.

Mr. Spooner—What state?

Mr. Tillman—South Carolina.

Mr. Spooner—Fight it out with your colleague.

Mr. Tillman—I am ready.

Mr. Spooner—Yes, I am ready and he is ready.

Mr. Tillman—Let him—

Mr. Spooner—He is not here—

Mr. Tillman—He has not shown his readiness.

Mr. Spooner—But he will be.

That Tillman had no intention originally of making his speech the occasion of a personal charge against McLaurin is evident. He himself said, immediately after the above quoted colloquy and before Mr. McLaurin had come into the Senate chamber, that he had not expected to bring the subject into his speech in that way; and his well-known veracity—which is unpleasantly distinguished by no means for untrustworthiness but for bluntness—would be enough to confirm that statement even if the rest of the speech itself did not furnish inherent proof of it. The charge against McLaurin was drawn out by Spooner, apparently with a design—shrewdly parliamentary and nominally dignified—to take some advantage of Tillman's characteristic bluntness of speech and quickness of temper to put him in an awkward position. That Spooner expected McLaurin to resent the charge on the floor is evident from his last words quoted above, though he may have imagined that McLaurin would keep within parliamentary bounds, as he himself had done.

But McLaurin did not keep within parliamentary bounds. Appearing in the chamber at the close of Tillman's speech, having been sent for as he himself stated and as may be fairly inferred from Senator Spooner's last words, he rose to a question of privilege, and said (See Congressional Record of February 22d, page 2171):

The senator who has just taken his seat, said that improper influences had been used in changing the vote of somebody on the treaty, and then went on later and said that it applied to the senator from South

Carolina, who had been given the patronage in that state. I think I get the sense of the controversy. I desire to state, Mr. President—I would not use as strong language as I intend to had I not, soon after the Senate met, replied to these insinuations and said that they were untrue—I now say that that statement is a willful, malicious and deliberate lie.

Instantly Senator Tillman sprang at Senator McLaurin, and the fight occurred.

If disorder in the Senate consisted only in physical assaults, Senator Tillman would have been the aggressor. It is not disputed that he struck the first physical blow. But to regard only physical assaults as constituting disorder would be to place the dignity of the Senate on a very low plane. He must have a poor conception of dignity, and withal but little knowledge of human nature, who regards giving the "lie direct" as mild misbehavior in comparison with the instant blow which resents it. Yet, if giving the "lie direct" is misbehavior equal in grade to the prompt blow in reply—something that cannot well be disputed—then McLaurin and not Tillman was the aggressor, and consequently the greater offender against the dignity of the Senate.

In behalf of McLaurin, however, it is urged that Tillman's charge of corruption sorely tempted him to call Tillman a liar. Those who thus defend McLaurin for his insulting words seem oblivious to the fact that such a defense would excuse Tillman for his responsive blow. Did not McLaurin's insult sorely tempt Tillman to strike?

And in behalf of Tillman it may be added that he was within striking distance of McLaurin when the latter called him a liar; there was therefore, no time for his suddenly heated blood to cool and his respect for senatorial dignity to reassert its sway. McLaurin, on the other hand, did not hear Tillman's charge, was out of the room when it was made, and waited until Tillman had concluded his speech before making the verbal assault. For him there was ample opportunity to gain control of sudden passion. This consideration alone shifts the principal responsibility for

the breach of decorum to McLaurin. He offended with intention and deliberation; Tillman offended in the heat of momentary passion.

Even if responsibility for provoking the disorder were to be determined not by the first breach of decorum, which was Mr. McLaurin's verbal assault upon Tillman, but by referring the matter back to Tillman's original accusation, still McLaurin and not Tillman would have to be pilloried as the chief offender. For, if it be said that Tillman was provoked to uncontrollable passion of momentary duration by McLaurin's directly calling him a liar in open Senate, and to that it be answered that McLaurin had been provoked to uncontrollable passion of long duration by Tillman's accusation regarding the Philippine treaty ratification, we must consider Tillman's accusation to see whether it did not demand a defense in the nature of what the lawyers call "confession and avoidance," rather than one in the nature of an insulting and passion-provoking form of the plea of "not guilty."

Tillman had said in his speech that the administration lacked enough votes to ratify the treaty, and that while he could not prove that any senator had been corruptly induced to vote for ratification, he could prove that the Federal patronage for South Carolina had been given to Mr. McLaurin, a Democratic senator from that state; and to this he added, referring to McLaurin:

After having made a speech in this body two weeks before, replete with cogent arguments and eloquence, against the ratification of the treaty, and after having told us in confidence that he would not vote for it, he did; and since then he has been adopted by the Republican caucus and put upon committees as a member of that party, and has controlled the patronage in South Carolina.

There are four facts in this statement. One is that Mr. McLaurin made a strong speech in the Senate against ratifying the treaty. Another is that he told his Democratic associates in confidence that he would not vote for it. A third is that he did vote for it. And the fourth is that although a Democratic senator he has since been peculiarly favored by the Repub-

lican majority in the Senate and has controlled the distribution in South Carolina of Republican patronage. Mr. Tillman infers from these circumstances that Mr. McLaurin was induced by promises of patronage to change from opposition to support of the treaty, and Mr. McLaurin says that this is a malicious lie.

That Mr. Tillman's inference is mistaken may be true. It may even be true that he is mistaken maliciously. For it is possible that Mr. McLaurin changed his mind under the influence of Mr. Bryan's arguments, and that Mr. Tillman knows this. If that were the case, however, it would have been easy to say so instead of provoking the fight on the floor of the Senate by calling Mr. Tillman a liar. The probability is that Mr. McLaurin was not influenced by Mr. Bryan: first, because if he had been, to say so in response to Tillman would have been the obvious thing to do; and, second, because Mr. McLaurin, though a Democrat, was not a Bryan Democrat.

But to nothing besides Mr. Tillman's inference, and to his statement that McLaurin had told his associates in confidence that he would vote against the treaty, could Mr. McLaurin's denunciation of Mr. Tillman's accusation as a lie possibly apply; and the remaining facts are known to all men to be true. It is a matter of record that Mr. McLaurin made a speech in opposition to the treaty; it is matter of record that he thereafter changed his mind and voted for the treaty; and it is well known that he has ever since been favored with reference to his place in the Senate and to the distribution of Republican patronage in South Carolina in ways in which Republicans in power are not accustomed to favor the minority without a quid pro quo—without some sort of "understanding between statesmen."

Did such an understanding exist between Mr. McLaurin and the administration? The inference that one did is from the known facts unavoidable. If that is not a true inference, why is no explanation of the circumstances made? So long as an explanation is withheld, the impartial public are justified in believing, as they doubtless do, that Mr. Tillman was right in his inference that the vote of a minority senator was won over for

the treaty by party promises of favor from the party in power.

While this inference remains reasonably probable, the fist-fight in the Senate, and even the verbal assault that provoked it, are matters of minor consideration. Such misconduct concerns questions of external decorum only. It does, indeed, disturb the dignity of the Senate, and is not to be tolerated. But one man may in anger call another a liar in a place sacred to dignified conduct, the other in the passion thereby excited may reply with a physical blow, and the two may in consequence get into a rough-and-tumble fight within the sacred precincts, without either having any real disrespect for the sacredness of the place. These indignities may be attributable to sudden and overwhelming passion, and if sincerely repented of and apologized for leave no stain on the dignity of the deliberative body which they disturb. Not so with the conduct with which Senator McLaurin stands charged—reasonably charged upon the known circumstances, which he does not explain and into which the Senate refuses to inquire. This kind of misbehavior leaves a stain which no apology can erase and for which there is no atonement save the disgraceful expulsion of offenders.

How viciously absurd would it have been, then, while well grounded suspicions and circumstantial charges regarding offenses of this profound nature against the dignity of the Senate are ignored by that body, to expel Tillman for his comparatively trifling and altogether superficial delinquency. His is an offense against the dignity of senatorial form, which is highly important, but not against the dignity of senatorial character, which is vital. Yet we are asked to regard him as the great offender.

Are we prepared in these affairs to subordinate dignity of character to dignity in form? Are we ready to place mere externals, no matter how important, above what is essential? Shall we prefer polite behavior, good and useful as it is, to honorable conduct? Has our craze for "blood and breeding" gone so far that we are content to adopt as typical of our code of public morals the inverted notion of

that scion of European royalty who "committed perjury like a gentleman?" Shall we punish severely for ungentlemanly outbursts of sudden passion on the floor of the Senate, repented of and apologized for, while ignoring circumstantial evidence of "gentlemanly" understandings of dishonor within the body of that august assemblage, though the understandings are commonly believed to exist and the incriminating circumstances are defiantly unexplained?

Mr. McLaurin, if guilty, is not the only offender against this greater, this supreme, dignity of the Senate. Other senators who changed their minds about the Philippine treaty without explanation, have fared well. One of them, under Federal indictment and about to be pushed to a third trial after two mistrials, was saved from further annoyance from that quarter. He was from the same state as the Democratic member of the treaty commission who signed the treaty though he had opposed the Philippine purchase, and was fortunate enough immediately afterward to be appointed by a Republican administration to a place upon the Federal bench. More senators than one who are bitter against Tillman and would expel him if possible, have acquired their seats solely because they are very rich men and under circumstances which bring their wealth into suspicious political associations. There are others who, besides being involved in "understandings between statesmen," are not unreasonably believed also to have understandings with corporation lobbyists. Yet these instances of passionless and deliberate disregard for the essential dignity of the Senate are ignored by senators and newspapers and a respectable rabble that have the temerity nevertheless to insist that Tillman ought to have been expelled for momentarily and in the heat of sudden passion disregarding the dignity of its forms!

Mr. Tillman has a full quota of faults. In some respects we are wholly out of sympathy with him. To us his attitude toward the Negro race, for instance, is abhorrent. We could wish him, also, to have more regard for the proprieties of time and place in some of his actions and utterances. But he is not a hypocrite. If he were,

the Pharisees would like him better. Even with reference to the Negro question he is more to be respected than some Republican senators who think of the Negro precisely as Tillman does, and act toward that race with even less regard for its rights, but for political purposes profess to be its very good friends. Neither is Tillman a bribe giver nor a bribe taker. Be it for good or bad, when he votes in the Senate on any great public question the country and his state get the benefit of his own unpurchased convictions.

With all his faults, there are senators who, though immaculate in the particulars in which he offends, could be better spared from the Senate than Tillman. Outward polish and inward purity make an ideal combination for high statesmanship; but when the choice lies between the two, outward polish can be the better dispensed with. Moral sepulchers in the Senate, even when they are whited on the outside, do not best comport with the true dignity of that body. Better for the Senate and better for the people, if the dignity of the Senate must be assailed at all, that it be by an occasional unpremeditated rough-and-tumble fist-fight, than by dishonorable but unrebuked "understandings between statesmen."

## NEWS

Later accounts of the British-Boer battle near Klerksdorp on the 23d, of which we were only able to say last week (p. 745) that "there is no further news of the affair than that the fighting was severe," tell of a furious fight resulting in a British disaster with extraordinarily heavy casualties. All the essential facts of the report are official, coming from Lord Kitchener, and were not made public until the 3d. The British troops were serving as convoy to an empty wagon train. Three attacks were made by the Boers, under command of Delarey, in the face of a murderous fire, which included shelling from two field guns with which the British force was armed. The British resisted the Boer onslaughts for two hours of the summer morning, but some of them having exhausted their ammunition all became demoralized, and by seven o'clock, after a feeble bayonet resistance, the battle was over and the Boer

victory complete. Dead and wounded were scattered all over the field, and broken wagons and panic-stricken horses are reported as making the scene one of indescribable confusion. Boers are charged with stripping the British dead, but it is admitted that as soon as Gen. Delarey came up in person he stopped this and restored order. The British casualties reported by Lord Kitchener amounted to 632—killed, wounded and prisoners—and both field guns were captured. The number of British killed is put at 50 and the wounded at 122. Lieut. Col. Anderson, who commanded the British force, escaped with 9 officers and 245 men.

As an offset to this Boer victory, Lord Kitchener forwarded on the 28th a report of his closing-in operations in the region of Harrismith, in which he summarizes, though "not very clearly," say the London dispatches, the result of several days' operations over an area of about 2,500 square miles, and places the Boer losses at 600 men either killed or captured, and 2,000 horses, 28,000 head of cattle, 200 wagons, 60,000 sheep, 600 rifles and 50,000 rounds of ammunition. Gen. De Wet's son, who has acted as his secretary, is reported as being among the prisoners. British losses are not yet published, although the Boers are said to have made desperate attacks upon the British troops and to have poured into them a heavy fire.

The situation in South Africa came up in the British parliament on the 27th, when Mr. Chamberlain explained on the floor that the proclamation of last summer condemning to banishment all Boers who should not surrender by September 15 (p. 298), did not preclude Lord Kitchener from accepting surrenders on modified conditions, and that in fact he has done so. On the 4th the war secretary introduced and explained his proposed army appropriations of \$346,550,000. In the course of a long defense of his department, which he made in this connection, he argued that the war department had done its work well, considering that a war had never before been waged on such a scale as the South African war, and stated that the department is to-day feeding 300,000 men and 243,000 horses in South Africa. He also dwelt upon the subject of conscription. The limit to voluntary enlistments has, he said, in his belief, been reached. To avoid the necessity, however, of re-