

ble taxation" The chief battle, as every one in Ohio understands, is for the possession of the legislature, because it is only through the legislature those ends can be attained. The governor of Ohio has no constitutional voice in making laws that will affect either object, favorably or adversely.

IMPERIAL CENSORSHIP.

The Milwaukee Daily News (Dem.), Aug. 22.—It is, perhaps, not startling that the Philippine authorities have undertaken to muzzle the American teachers in the islands. The American people have become quite accustomed to press censorship, tampering with the mails and lese majeste proceedings since they embarked upon the Philippine expedition. They are no longer surprised at Russian measures in their "new possessions." It has come to be accepted as a matter of course that anyone that undertakes to tell the truth about conditions in the islands will be muzzled if he is within reach of the imperial authorities.

PAGAN ATROCITIES.

The Columbus Daily Press (Dem.), Aug. 22.—If these things are atrocious in the Balkans almost to bringing on international war, what shall we say of the water cure and rice robberies and kill and burn horrors and other atrocities resorted to to "benevolently assimilate" the Filipinos, to civilize them, Christianize them and Americanize them?

MISCELLANY

FRUITION.

September, must thou with the meteor's fall
Proclaim sweet summer's eventide and end?
Spread reverently and lingeringly her pall
With loitering blossoms, as a faithful friend.
The glory of the morning hallows still
The misty land, and though the birds depart,
The cadent waterfall, the stirring mill,
The reaper's song re-echo on the heart.
Nature extends her own enchanted art
To thy white arms, spring promise to fulfill,
And from beginnings round the perfect whole,
O joy of all the year! Earth's harvest-time;
Thou fair foreshadowing whisper of sublime
Eternal life—the harvest of the soul.

GERTRUDE COLLES.

THE DEAD WILL.

An English minister, who several times preached at the Dartmoor prison, says that the first time he faced his congregation he saw stamped on each vacant immobile countenance Dartmoor's notorious and awful brand. "Not vice, not despair, nor yet cunning or indifference, but something appallingly worse—decay of volition and death of free will. For five, ten or fifteen years every convict hangs up as it were to rust in disuse his inalienable birthright as a man—his will. No exercise is provided for it; every act he performs—dressing and undressing, eating, waking, making his bed, putting out his light, marching to

the basket-making shop, the farm, or the peat-cutting on the moors—he does at the word of command."—The Churchman.

AN ENCROACHMENT OF IMPERIALISM.

When the Queen was permitted to assume the title of Empress of India, a positive pledge was given that this title, expressive of autocratic rule, should not be assumed in the constitutional dominions. That pledge is now being disregarded. The King, in the constitutional dominions, signs himself "King and Emperor." It is evident that for some time past there has been an assiduous endeavor, by dazzling the people with pageantry and stimulating the worship of royalty in all its forms, to restore the personal power of the court. In the present state of British society, due largely to the ascendancy of vulgar wealth, there is no saying how far this reaction may go. But its ultimate fate is not doubtful. Great unquestionably are the difficulties and perils of democracy; long probably and arduous will be the effort required to make a government of the people a government of patriotism and intelligence, not of faction or a mob. But the world, having once emancipated itself from hereditary rule, is not likely to go back to the middle ages, or even to George III. It may, nevertheless, be seasonable to remind ourselves of the fact that Edward VII., though he may be an Emperor in India, is in a free British colony not an emperor, but a constitutional King.—Goldwin Smith, in the Toronto Sun.

WHY THE KAFFIR WON.

In the gold mines of the Rand, before the great war, there were some 90,000 black men working, and these men were paid the wage of £2 10s. a month. When the war was over the great mine owners of the Rand all agreed that in the future they would only pay these natives £1 10s. a month. Then, too, like the Denaby miners, these ignorant Kaffirs refused to work, and they stayed in their homes. . . . At last the mine-owners of the Rand, the millionaires, the multi-millionaires, submitted. They raised the wages of the black miners to £3 a month, and the black miners, getting all they asked for, poured into work.

So ended the strike of the black miners.

And now, what was the reason the ignorant Kaffir succeeded in maintaining his freedom, while the free-born Englishman has to acknowledge himself a slave?

This it is.

When the Kaffir struck work he returned to his kraal. There he was part owner in the tribal lands. He grew maize and pumpkins to eat, there was milk and beer for him to drink, and a roof to shelter him. He did not starve, for he had access to the land on which he could support himself till he cared to go back to work.

The free-born Englishman, the Denaby miner, had no land of his own to go to. From that on which he lived he was ejected by the owner. He had to work in the mines, on the mine-owners' terms, or starve.

The land of the Kaffirs belongs to all of the Kaffirs.

The land of the English belongs to only a few of the English.

That is why the English miner was beaten in the strike and the Kaffir succeeded.—The Johannesburg Tribune.

POLICY ADVOCATED BY THE ANTI-IMPERIALISTS.

A statement furnished to the Springfield Republican of August 7, by Erving Winslow, secretary New England Anti-Imperialist league.

Perhaps the opinions of the great Republican statesmen at the time when the treaty with Spain was made by Mr. McKinley's administration may be considered to be only of academic interest at the present moment. It is well known that ex-President Harrison, Carl Schurz, Speaker Thomas B. Reed, ex-Gov. George S. Boutwell, John Sherman, George F. Edmunds and many other prominent Republicans stood with all the leading Democrats of the country and with Senator Hoar in opposition to the imperialistic policy (which seems to have had really only one responsible author, President McKinley himself), and especially to the retention of the Philippine islands and to the reversal there of our policy in Cuba.

But at this moment the policy of the administration is condemned, and the declaration to the Filipinos of our intention to give them independence as speedily as possible is advocated by hundreds of thousands of anti-imperialists of all political parties represented by the anti-imperialist league, which is devoted to the carrying out of the following resolution, one of many of a similar sort adopted at public meetings throughout the United States:

Whereas, The Philippine islands belong of right to their inhabitants, and the inhabitants belong to themselves, all treaties and bargains and sales among outside parties to the contrary notwithstanding; therefore,

Resolved, That Congress, at its ap-

proaching session, ought, in the most unambiguous and unqualified terms, to acknowledge this absolute right of the Filipino nation, invite them at once to reorganize their independent republic under our protection and with our friendly help, and thereby put an end forthwith to a wicked war of conquest by which this great American republic is digging its own grave.

The Democratic party, which polled 6,351,008 votes at the last national election against the Republican vote of 7,215,696, and which is girding up its loins for a struggle which may not improbably be successful for the next campaign of 1904, is still committed to the cause of Filipino independence. Its views are expressed in the substitute for the "Philippine bill" adopted by the Republican majority last year, this substitute being supported by the Democratic representation, both in the Senate and the House of Representatives. The preamble to this bill is as follows:

That, subject to the provisions hereinafter set forth, the United States of America hereby relinquish all claim of sovereignty over and title to the archipelago known as the Philippine islands.

Section 2. That the United States shall continue to occupy and govern said archipelago until the people thereof have established a government in accordance with the provisions of this act, with sufficient guaranties for the performance of our treaty obligations with Spain, and for the safety of those inhabitants who have adhered to the United States, and for the maintenance and protection of all rights which have accrued under the authority thereof, as hereinafter provided.

Four out of nine of the justices of the United States supreme court, the final court of appeal, have ruled as follows:

Congress has no existence and can exercise no authority outside of the constitution. Still less is it true that Congress can deal with new territories, just as other nations have done or may do with their new territories. This nation is under the control of a written constitution, the supreme law of the land and the only source of the powers which our government, or any branch or officer of it, may exert at any time or at any place. Monarchical and despotic governments, unrestrained by written constitutions, may do with newly acquired territories what this government may not do, consistently with our fundamental law. To say otherwise is to concede that Congress may, by action taken outside of the constitution, engraft upon our republican institutions a colonial system such as exists under monarchical governments. Surely such a result was never contemplated by the fathers of the constitution. If that instrument had contained a word suggesting the possibility of a result of that character, it would never have been adopted by the people of the United States. The idea that this country may acquire territories anywhere upon earth, by conquest or treaty, and hold them as mere colonies or provinces—the people inhabiting them to enjoy only such rights as Congress chooses to accord to them—is wholly inconsistent with the spirit and genius as well as with the words of the constitution.

In the near future the composition of the supreme court may not improbably find itself so changed that this decision would be that of the majority of the court, discrediting the usurping status of the present administration in the Philippine islands.

Archbishop John Ireland, one of the most prominent ecclesiastics of the Roman Catholic church in the United States, has recently declared: "Abiding appendices cannot be the appanage of a republic." Andrew Carnegie, a representative of the greatest manufacturing interest of the United States, is on record as follows:

All communities, however low they may be in the scale, have the germ of self-government. Without this they could not exist; there could not be communities. No tribe, not even the Afriids, the most warlike of all, but has its governors, orders and degrees. Whether a people are fit for self-government according to our standard is unimportant. They are fit to improve if they are permitted, and in no other way has man improved in this domain than by experience. . . . I submit that we made a grave mistake in not following in the Philippines the American policy which has triumphed in Cuba. . . . Let us hope the American nation is to repeat this sublime act of self-abnegation with the Philippines, and establish under her protection the first republic of the Orient. This accomplished, what a position for the future is ours—the greatest of republics, the mother of other republics. Here lies true glory, which no other nation can attain.

Jacob Gould Schurman, president of Cornell university and of the first Philippine commission, declares that "any decent kind of a government of Filipinos by Filipinos is better than the best possible government of Filipinos by Americans."

Charles A. Towne, official orator at the Democratic celebration of the Fourth of July of this year in New York, speaks for his party in the following testimony addressed to the Republican administration:

In August, 1898, you signed a solemn compact, the peace protocol, by the third article of which you bound yourselves to occupy and hold the city, bay and harbor of Manila until the conclusion of a treaty of peace, which should determine the fate of the Philippines; that treaty was not ratified and did not go into effect until the following April; why, therefore, in early January, before there was any treaty in force, and while your restricted faith, as evidenced by the protocol, restricted you to Manila city, bay and harbor, did you issue a proclamation taking possession by alleged right of conquest of the entire archipelago, and threatening force in case your usurpation should be resisted? Why was war thus declared without the action of Congress, in whom alone the constitution vests the power to declare it? Why did you denounce as traitors millions of people not born under your jurisdiction, and who had never vowed you allegiance? How can the descendants of the American

revolution purchase the bodies, the country, and the allegiance of 10,000,000 of unwilling people for \$20,000,000? If you had already got them by right of conquest, why did you pay \$20,000,000 for them? If you had agreed to buy them, why did you state in your proclamation that you had won them already by the sword? Why did you not treat the Filipinos as you treated the Cubans?

Ah! Americans, these questions cannot be answered consistently with our national character and honor. We must not, indeed, leave them to be asked by future generations. We must set ourselves right while yet there is time. We who have done the wrong must repair it.

These are simply examples of recent formal and representative utterances of organizations and individuals in the United States, such as have been made by persons like ex-President Cleveland, President Eliot, of Harvard university; Bishop Spalding, of Peoria; Bishop Huntington, of Central New York; William J. Bryan, Bishop Hall, of Vermont; Samuel Gompers, president of the American Federation of Labor; Richard Olney, Ernest H. Crosby, Dr. Felix Adler, Bishop Conaty, Samuel L. Clemens (Mark Twain), Fiske Warren, William D. Howells, Edwin Burritt Smith, Edward M. Shepard, W. Bourke Cockran, Herbert Welsh, Alfred H. Love, Benjamin F. Trueblood, William J. Palmer, Louis R. Ehrlich, Henry B. Metcalf, Moorfield Storey, Judson Harmon, Rufus B. Smith, Charles B. Wilby, David Starr Jordan and hundreds of others.

The question of Filipino independence can therefore be discussed by your debaters, not as a theoretical or academic or even a remotely future question, but one in the righteous settlement of which they may hope to take an immediate and active part.

THE TAXATION OF THRIFT.

A portion of an address delivered by C. O'C. Hennessy, of New York, at the annual convention of the U. S. League of Co-operative Building and Loan Associations, held in Boston in June. The meeting was remarkable in respect of the fact that all the great States were represented by delegates, and by the fact that the report of Secretary H. F. Cellarius, of Cincinnati, showed that the co-operative savings and home-building movement is growing rapidly in most of the States; the only decrease of assets worth noting being in the States of Illinois, New York and Missouri. The report showed membership in these associations aggregating 1,530,707, holding assets chiefly consisting of small mortgages upon homes, amounting to \$67,228,014. Mr. Hennessy's argument for untaxed small dwellings created a very active discussion, and it is believed that at the next annual convention of the League it may be possible to get action looking to the taking up of this matter for active consideration by many of the State leagues which are represented in the national organization.

Thrift, as the dictionary defines it,