

he did attack it he brought down an avalanche of a decision which invalidates every city charter in Ohio, all enacted by Republican legislatures, and all the cities of the state are in a turmoil. That it was he who did it the successful lawyer in the case now confesses, saying that Mr. Hanna's object was to knock out Tom Johnson. Out of this situation Mr. Hanna is now trying to secure a Hanna municipal code, one which will put all the cities of Ohio under the control of state boards. Meantime, however, the city of Cleveland, having under way a 3-cent fare street railway the construction of which Mr. Hanna managed to stop by an injunction resting upon a thin technicality, has taken the preliminary steps toward granting a new 3-cent fare charter which would avoid that technical objection. And now comes Mr. Hanna again—this time back of the attorney general he nominated to displace Attorney General Monett who, by refusing a bribe, had become persona non grata to the Standard Oil trust—and gets an injunction prohibiting the city council of Cleveland from granting street car franchises. He asks for this injunction on the ground that as the city charter is unconstitutional the city council is not a legal body. Senator Hanna is either playing a low hand for high stakes in a losing game, or the people of Ohio are really what he takes them for.

Rebecca J. Taylor, whose discharge from a government clerkship for political reasons was noted a few weeks ago (pp. 147, 151), has brought mandamus proceedings, based upon the civil service law, to compel her reinstatement. Whether she succeeds or not, she will at least render a public service in putting distinctly upon record the Pecksniffianism of certain vociferous civil service reformers. Miss Taylor's offense, it will be remembered, consisted in publishing a newspaper article criticizing the political policy of the administration with reference to the

Philippines. There has been no pretense that she was not an efficient and faithful clerk. The rather thin explanation that the publication of letters by clerks criticizing political policies is not a political but a clerical offense, is torn to threads by Miss Taylor in a published statement of the 21st in which she writes:

It cannot be possible that officials, such as one of the civil service commissioners, may be permitted to make public addresses in advocacy of the so-called Philippine policy and a humbler employe of the service like myself denied the right of publicly opposing that same policy. If these distinctions are to be permitted then is it not clear that an administration may practically use the whole force of civil service employes to strengthen its position of power, either by converting them into active exponents and supporters of its policies or negatively by silencing every person among them who is opposed to its policies? Surely it never was intended that a person in entering the government service of the United States should surrender his rights as a citizen, among them the right of holding and expressing political and religious opinions.

Miss Taylor's case is not a mere quarrel in connection with the routine of a Washington department. It is one of the characteristic incidents of the imperial policy, as is shown by *The New Age*, of London, one of the able democratic papers which Great Britain's policy of imperialism has brought into useful prominence. Referring to Miss Taylor's case *The New Age* says:

Here is another instance of the detestably mean and cowardly methods of imperialism. It knows its weakness; knows that its sole reliance is on the suppression of discussion, the bamboozling of the public. The imperialists pay an involuntary homage to truth by "chucking Miss Taylor out of her clerical chair into the street." They dread lest even a few articles written by Miss Taylor should upset all their abominable campaign of lies, fraud, concealment, plunder, and murder. All over the world it is the same. Imperialism must forever rest on the negation of all that differentiates man from the beasts of prey. It rests on infamies and can rest on nothing else. Its methods are devastation, murder, concentration camps, courts-martial, the "water cure," hangings and shootings in the presence of the friends of the murdered man, the killing of "everything over ten." Its instruments

are farm-burning generals, "Hell-roaring Jakes," the Morants and Handcocks of ruffianism. It dares not let a Miss Hobhouse come within a thousand miles of the scene of its crimes; it dares not let Miss Taylor criticize the means by which President Roosevelt is "helping the people of the Philippines along the difficult path leading to self-government."

Speaking of the "water-cure," by degrees the truth about that barbarism is leaking out. The latest contribution to the fuller and better public knowledge of the subject which the President and his two friends, Root and Lodge, are doing all they can to suppress, is made by Col. Stephen Groesbeck, an army officer just home from the Philippines. There is no sentiment about Groesbeck. He believes that the "water-cure" is a good thing, and makes no secret of the fact, which worries the administration, that it has been in general and extensive use by the American army in the Philippines for the purpose of extorting information from its victims and their friends. Now this is precisely as the unofficial reports from the Philippines have had it all along, and it is precisely what Roosevelt, Root and Lodge deny. A few more boasting blabbers like Groesbeck, and the administration will have to change its defense. Instead of admitting that the water-cure is inhuman but insisting that to "the honor of the army" it has not been generally practiced, the President will have to admit that it has been generally practiced but insist that to "the honor of the army" it is not inhuman.

The absurdly inadequate punishment of Gen. Smith, upon which we commented last week (p. 227), is now supplemented with that of Maj. Glenn. Although convicted of administering the water torture, Glenn's loyal companions in arms have agreed, for "the honor of the army," to fine him \$50 and give him a vacation of 30 days! In the light of this sentence and that of Gen. Smith, the anti-imperialist speeches in the

Senate, the shocking evidence of the brutal water torture given before the Senate investigating committee, and the whining plea of the imperialists for silence "for the honor of the army," will make altogether very interesting and instructive campaign reading.

THE FOWLER BILL AND THE MONEY QUESTION.

I.

Mr. Bryan's enemies in both political parties are working industriously to make the people believe that the money question was settled when Bryan was defeated. They are at the same time working as industriously, though much less noisily, to secure the enactment by Congress of what is known as the Fowler banking and currency bill, which specifically prescribes a stupendous financial revolution.

Going beyond the question of bimetalism at the old ratio of 16 to 1—the only phase of the money question that can possibly be considered as having been settled by Bryan's defeats—the Fowler bill would abolish all bimetalism, would retire all silver money, would cancel all greenbacks, and, besides making gold the only legal tender, would establish a government banking system in private hands and for private profit with far-reaching ramifications and enormous political power—a banking system similar in character and design, and even more dangerous to the public interests, than the United States Bank which the people under Jackson's lead deliberately decided to banish.

When was the money question so settled as to authorize this revolutionary measure?

Granted, if you please, that the question of coining silver and gold at the ratio of 16 to 1 has been decided adversely to that ratio. It is a rash concession, as the political wiseacres would speedily discover should a financial storm burst upon us. But grant it. Yet this was only a superficial and temporary expression of the money question. Its defeat was not, therefore, a defeat of the financial principle for which Bryan stood and stands. The essence of the money question, so far

from being a particular ratio of silver money to gold money, is money monopoly; and whatever seems at any time to promote money monopoly may for that time be a money issue.

Mr. Bryan believes that for the prevention of money monopoly bimetalism is necessary. In this respect his views are sustained by leading students of finance. They were also embodied in the Democratic platform of 1880, which demanded "gold and silver" money; in that of 1884, which declared for "the gold and silver coinage of the constitution;" and in that of 1892, which held "to the use of both gold and silver as the standard money of the country;" as well as in the Chicago platform of 1896 and the Kansas City platform of 1900, which demanded free coinage of both metals at 16 to 1. He is supported also by the Republican platform of 1888, which favored "the use of both gold and silver as money;" and by that of 1892, which in terms favored "bimetalism." Believing that bimetalism is necessary to prevent money monopoly, he fought in 1896, under the circumstances of a low production of gold as compared with silver at that time, for the ratio of 16 to 1. If the growing plentifulness of gold were to reach the point of turning the affections of the great financial interests toward silver as the dearer, and therefore from their point of view the better money metal, consistency alone, if nothing else, would for the time make Bryan "a gold man" in the same sense in which in 1896 he was "a silver man." For with reference to money of final redemption he is an advocate of abundance, whereas the great financial interests are advocates and promoters of scarcity.

The money question, we repeat, is in the final analysis not one of ratios, nor of gold, nor of silver, but of the supply and ready availability of legal tender in sufficient volume to make money monopoly impossible. It is a question between those on the one hand who want the money system adjusted for the common good, and those on the other who want to adjust it for the special benefit, behoof and profit of rings of monopolists. That question has not been settled yet. But it will be settled, at least until the avenging Nemesis appears, if the Fowler bill is enacted. And the Fowler bill will be enacted if a Republican or a "re-

organizing" Democratic Congress is elected this Fall.

II.

The Fowler bill was introduced in the lower House at the recent session of Congress by Charles N. Fowler, the Republican representative from the Eighth district of New Jersey. Mr. Fowler is a banker, and in Congress is chairman of the committee on banking and currency. This committee is composed of 11 Republicans and 6 Democrats, whose names may be found at page 210 of the Congressional Record for 1901-02. Mr. Fowler first introduced the measure in one form of bill in March, when it was referred to his committee (Congressional Record, p. 2757). He introduced it in another form on the 3d of April, and this bill also was referred to his committee (Congressional Record, p. 3865). On the 4th of April he introduced it in a third form; and the third bill, like the others, was referred to his committee (Congressional Record, p. 3918). Each of the three bills bore the same title, namely:—

A bill to maintain the gold standard, provide an elastic currency, equalize the rates of interest throughout the country, and further amend the national banking law.

The third of these bills is the one under consideration. It is numbered 13,363, and was reported back to the House favorably and without amendment by Mr. Fowler's committee on the 5th of April (Congressional Record, p. 3959), the day following its introduction.

Accompanying the bill when it came back from the committee was an extended report urging its passage; and both bill and report were thereupon referred by the Republican majority of the House to the committee of the whole. This leaves the bill in convenient position to be taken up and put upon its passage if the Fall elections yield favorable results.

As reported to the House and ready for enactment, the Fowler bill may be summarized as follows:

Section 1. Creates a "division of banking and currency" in the treasury department, under the charge of a "board of control." The board consists of three members, appointed by the President, confirmed by the Senate, and removable only for cause stated in writing. The term of office of each member is 12 years, though the first three hold office for four, eight, and twelve years, respect-