

so awkwardly constructed. And they don't like to be awkwardly "jollied."

Mr. Joseph Chamberlain, the British colonial secretary, who is responsible more than any other person for the infamous war of subjugation in South Africa, made a defensive statement in parliament on the 20th, which reveals his possession either of a great deal of ignorance of modern American history or of a very low grade of moral sense with reference to property rights. Referring to the conclusion of the civil war in the United States, he said that—

no political conditions were given the Confederates, while their property was confiscated on a tremendous scale.

As no property was taken by the conquering power from the people of the Confederacy on a large scale, except the slaves, who were not confiscated in the strict sense of the term but were set free, it must be inferred, if Mr. Chamberlain knew what he was talking about, that he recognizes slaves as legitimate property. It is rather late in the history of human progress for a man to be accorded credit for the most ordinary moral instincts who refers to an act of human liberation as a confiscation of property.

Cable correspondence from London to the American papers justifies all the more the position taken by Congressman Kern regarding American special representatives at the British coronation ceremony, upon which we commented last week. It appears that such representatives, instead of being honored envoys to the British people are to be made inferior guests at a royal family party. Says one of the dispatches, that to the Chicago-Record-Herald, of the 19th:

The whole system of etiquette for such occasions is very elaborate. Crown princes, representing the emperors and the elder sons of kings, naturally come first, and after them the special envoys, whose precedence is sometimes arranged according to the date of their arrival, and at other times alphabetically. If the latter method is followed, as is predicted,

the United States would come at the end or just before Uruguay and Venezuela.

At last the veil of secrecy and prevarication is removed, and the reconcentrado order of an American general in the Philippines—J. Franklin Bell—comes to light. From time to time the facts have leaked out regarding modified applications in the Philippines of Weyler's barbarous policy of reconcentration, but now its unmodified application is boldly revealed. Gen. Bell's order, issued early in December, requires the inhabitants of the province of Batangas to come within American military camps under penalty of the confiscation and destruction of their property. This is the policy with which Weyler shocked the civilized world and aroused the indignation of our own country when he originated it in Cuba. It is the policy which the British, to their shame, have adopted in South Africa. It is a policy which means disease, starvation, torture and death in the Philippines just as it did in Cuba and does in South Africa. It is a policy for which the responsibility must be placed where it belongs, not upon Bell, the subordinate, but upon President Roosevelt, the commander in chief. Whether he ordered it or not he has the power to stop it.

Epigrammatic and cutting is the admonition with which Dr. Parkhurst favors Mayor Low, of New York city. "There is not much to choose," he writes, "between a Tammany administration that has bad principles, and a reform administration that has good principles but is afraid to use them." This is apropos of the discovery that New York is as "wide open" a town under Mayor Low as it was under Mayor Van Wyck. It is true that Mayor Low has been only a short time in office. But he was not required to get new laws enacted in order to redeem the anti-Tammany pledges. The laws exist. They need only to be enforced. Why they have not been enforced anyone familiar with New York knows. The administration

that should become responsible in the public mind for their enforcement would be damned beyond resurrection. The laws are "hay-seed" laws, imposed by the state legislature, at the solicitation of a small minority of the inhabitants, upon this vassal city. What the political reformers who manage Mr. Low have hoped to do has been to enforce the laws to flatter the minority, without enforcing them enough to enrage the majority. But Dr. Parkhurst is not yet flattered.

Several bankers of Colorado Springs petitioned the governor of Colorado to include in a call for an extra session of the legislature, as one of its purposes, the repeal of the Bucklin constitutional amendment resolution now pending before the people. They state their belief that this amendment, if adopted, would be detrimental to the interests of the state. That is suggestive of much, as Carlyle might have said. The Bucklin bill is a resolution for the amendment of the constitution so as to allow the people of any county to adopt the popular Australasian method of taxing land values if they want to. It was passed by a clear two-thirds vote of each house of the legislature. It is now under discussion before the people of the state, who are to vote on it next fall. If they adopt it, no change in the fiscal system of the state or of any county would thereupon ensue. Nor could any change be brought about without elections petitioned for by tax payers, and after a popular vote in favor of the change; nor even then except in the county voting. Yet these bankers want the legislature to repeal the resolution so as to cut off a popular vote upon the amendment. It is not difficult to understand that proposition. Lobbies can influence legislatures, whereas the public cannot be approached in that way, and the bankers are evidently disposed to rely upon a lobby. Something else is not hard to guess, which is that the petitioning bankers are more deeply interested in real estate speculation than they are in legitimate