

that any constitution which the Cuban convention frames shall be submitted for approval to popular vote. Every move against that course may be safely regarded as a move against Cuban independence.

In the federal court at New York Judge Brown has decided that as Puerto Rico "is subject solely to the sovereignty and dominion of this country" it is "not a foreign port." This decision was made in a pilotage case, which depended, with reference to pilots' fees, upon whether Puerto Rican ports are American or foreign. Though the decision is not reported in full, there is no probability that it vitally touches the great question of the application of the American constitution, by its own force, to Puerto Rico. Puerto Rico might be American territory, and yet, from the imperialist point of view, not be subject to the American constitution. But two cases are now before the supreme court, to be argued December 17, which do involve the main question. They turn upon the right of the United States to collect tariff duties on goods imported into the United States from the Philippines and Puerto Rico after the Spanish cession. Should these cases be decided against the government, the whole protective system would receive a shock, which could hardly fail to prove fatal either to that system or to imperial colonization. In the event of a contrary decision, the question of the application of the liberty clauses of the constitution to "our colonies" will still be an open one.

An important decision relative to federal authority in the states has been made by the federal court of appeals at San Francisco upon an appeal from the conviction of ten Idaho strikers for obstructing the mails by stopping a mail train. These men had been fined and sentenced to long terms of imprisonment by the lower federal court, but the court of appeals has released them on the ground that

the indictment did not allege that they knew the train they obstructed carried mails. This court held that it is not a federal crime to hinder and delay the passage of a railroad mail train unless the train is actually carrying mails and the obstructors know it. Should the decision be generally recognized as sound, it will serve to protect the country from one of its most menacing dangers—the usurpation of power by the federal government. For the undoubted right of the federal government to protect the mails and to punish their obstruction has been used at the solicitation of great private corporations as a subterfuge to excuse the unwarranted exercise of federal authority, both judicial and military, for the suppression of local disturbances. If the federal authority cannot interfere with strikes, on pretense that they obstruct the mails, unless the strikers intend such obstruction, railway corporations will be obliged to look for protection to the local authorities, where alone it is safe to lodge police powers, and the dangers of concentrated imperial power, directed from Washington, will be to that degree removed.

When George A. Schilling made the speech in English at the thirteenth annual Chicago meeting in commemoration of the execution in 1887 of the so-called Chicago anarchists, he said that if he were ever tried as those men were he hoped it would be by a jury of millionaires.

His reason was that if one of the millionaires were a man of convictions he would hang out for acquittal without fear of losing his job. "Of all the things I should dread," Schilling added, "it would be to be tried by a jury of the hired men of millionaires." This is not an irrational dread. Hired men have come to be so hopelessly dependent for opportunities to earn a living that the most potent fear in the great majority of homes to-day is the fear of losing employment. It is not confined to the poorer classes. The same specter of possible poverty that grins at the struggling me-

chanic invades the parlors of the well to do, glares through the windows of counting-rooms, and even stalks along the corridors of the rich. It does make of the hireling an abject creature, as Schilling says, so abject that even as a juror, with the life and death of a fellow-man hanging in the balance, he swaps his conscience for his employer's favor. For that reason, a jury of millionaires would be safer for an innocent prisoner against whom the prejudice of the rich had been aroused. But millionaires themselves must be men of courage in such circumstances, or they, too, will surrender their convictions. So complex are the ramifications of business that not many millionaires could stand up against the vengeance of their fellows. Among all the millionaires of Chicago there are few who could not be ruined by the others. This is not because such power resides with any one naturally. It is due to the vast system of legal monopolies we have been creating and fostering. In a state of free competition no one could coerce anyone else. By checking competition, until now its regulative power is all but destroyed, we have corrupted our business, our newspaper press, our politics, and even our jury system. We have cultivated a race of cowards by inspiring men with fear of poverty.

Another university professor loses his chair for holding opinions adverse to parasitical pecuniary interests. Prof. Ross, of Leland Stanford university, has learned that if one will not labor for plutocratic privileges he shall not eat of plutocratic crumbs. And so the good work of exposing the claws beneath the velvet of plutocracy goes on, thanks to our friend the enemy.

#### RECOMPENSE.

I have loved justice and hated iniquity; and therefore I die in exile.  
—Pope Gregory VII.

When Bryan was in Jefferson City in 1897 he stated, in a private conversation, that he did not expect his reward at the hands of the people