into making a characteristic excursion into the Negro question; but he came back quickly to the real issue, and in words which sounded the keynote of his whole speech, all but the discord which has been so magnified by the press, he begged the imperialists to put the "bloody shirt" back again into its grave. Said he:

But do not let us discuss these questions. We want you to vindicate before the people your policy toward the Philippines, to exonerate the American army from the stigma now resting upon it, and we propose to hold you to the issue. We will discuss the South; we will discuss the Negro; we will discuss carpet-bag government; we will discuss anything you want if you will bring in a bill affecting those questions, but we are not going to run off after foxes just now. We are after this Filipino coon, and we want his hide. . . . . I think that if Congress had the authority, sustained by the Supreme Court, to pass an act forbidding any member of either body ever injecting into debate any discussion of the civil war or the revival of any of those bitter feelings of the past, it would be a blessing to our country.

No decision has yet been made by the President on the question of the American breach of neutrality at New Orleans, nor has any authentic report of the investigation appeared. But the general nature of the decision, should the matter ever come out of the pigeon hole in which it seems at present to be resting, may be surmised from an article in the North American Review for May, from the pen of an official of the state department. It is hardly probable that an officer so closely related officially to the question under advisement (or at rest) would have been allowed to publish an argument upon it in a popular magazine unless his argument were in harmony with the views of the head of his department and the probable decision of the President. It is interesting, therefore, to learn that this official concludes that the British mule and horse station at New Orleans, and the operations in connection with it, do not amount to a breach of American neutrality. It is also interesting to observe that he evades the vital point at issue. This point is not whether American citizens may sell munitions of war to a belligerent, "in the ordinary course of commerce," which is the point upon which the state department official places his emphasis. No one disputes their right to do that. Nor does anyone dispute the right of the British to buy munitions of war in this country, "in the ordinary course of commerce." The question is whether they may establish on American soil an army supply station for the reception and shipment of munitions of war, not "in the ordinary course of commerce;" and whether they may enter an American port with naval transports and anchor there while they load those war vessels with munitions of war, "not in the ordinary course of commerce." On that question the state department official is silent. Will the state department, the law department, and the President also be silent on that point? At any rate, the legislature of Louisiana is not. A concurrent resolution passed both houses on the 13th, fully sustaining Gov. Heard in his protest to the President, and urging him "to take any such further steps, conformable to law, as in his judgment may be necessary to establish and maintain in this state obedience to the law of nations and respect for the treaties of the United States." Here is an earnest that, in at least one state of this Union, the merry dollar is not the advance agent of that "Destiny which determines Duty."

The supreme court of the District of Columbia, through Judge Bradley, has made a group of gratifying decisions on the subject of second-class postal matter, a subject to which we have heretofore had occasion to refer at length in terms of criticism (vol. iv., pp. 596, 628, 643) of the postal law, the postal regulations and the post office department. The court has by these decisions restored to second-class privileges some of the publications which the department had excluded, and has issued injunctions restraining the exclusion of others which the department had threatened. Judge Bradley bases the decisions upon the ground that the post office department cannot legislate under the guise of making rules and regulations. It cannot exclude publications by a ruling, which Congress does not exclude by law. This principle is so simple, so sound and so obvious, if government by law and not by bureaus is to prevail, that it is inconceivable that a public officer should ever have questioned it. Yet it was questioned, or else deliberately defied, by the postmaster general when he made rulings—now reversed by the supreme court of the District — for which his department had vainly sought the sanction of Congress. Congress having refused to amend the law as he desired, he proceeded to amend it himself. This has now been stopped by the interpretation of the courts of the District.

—

The Postal Progress league, of which James L. Cowles, of Farmington, Conn., is secretary, proposes to settle all questions regarding second-class mail matter in the only fair way. This league suggests two classes, and only two classes of matter—letters and parcels—to be carried on the basis of cost. The second, or parcel class, would include periodicals; and as the charge would be based upon cost of service, the only just arrangement, there could be no discrimination such as now prevails, nor any danger of the censorship of new or small papers which is now threatened. From the biggest daily to the smallest weekly, every publication would be equal before the postal law. If the established rates would not pay, the necessary increase would be assessed pro rata, as it should be. Deficits would not then be reduced by excluding from equal mailing rights papers that were distasteful to the administration.

Whenever the post office department has given reasons for its crusade against unwelcome publications, it has