

INCIDENTAL SUGGESTIONS

THE DECLARATION OF INDEPENDENCE IN THE PHILIPPINES.*

Cos Cob, Conn., July 4.

I have read your article on the "Declaration of Independence in the Philippines." My recollection of the affair is different and quite consistent with all the official letters quoted. I delivered a lecture in which I stated my recollection when it was still more fresh than now, though unfortunately I made no reference to any source of authority. My recollection is recorded in 1907. It was to the effect that the military authorities had arrested an editor for having republished the Declaration of Independence. It is quite unlikely that the Bureau of Insular Affairs would have any record of the incident, and the arrest no doubt was justified in the mind of the executive authority there by the regulation which you quote on pages 606-7 of *The Public* for June 30, 1911. My memory is usually quite accurate in such matters, and I am sure that I never heard of Mr. Carnegie's statement before, so my source of authority must have been something else, probably was a news dispatch in the daily papers.

THEODORE SCHROEDER.

+ +

Boston, July 3.

In regard to the Declaration of Independence in the Philippines, the whole matter was referred to me by Mr. Carnegie, he desiring to know if I could give him the authority upon which his statement was based. This led to a correspondence with the Secretary of War, and a thorough investigation. My conclusion was the same as yours: that the Sedition Act of 1901 prohibited the reading of the Declaration of Independence in the Philippines on the Fourth of July, 1902, and thereafter. Mr. Carnegie had not unnaturally overlooked the fact that the "coming Fourth of July" and not the "last Fourth of July" was the date when the prohibition went into effect. I can not see that you have made any mistake or that Mr. Carnegie made any other mistake than this one of date. The search was so thorough I am quite sure you will receive no other "authentic contributions" to the question, nor do I see that any others are required. I am very glad that the whole subject has been given such publicity in your pages.

ERVING WINSLOW.

+ + +

RUNNING A PRISON ON THE MUNICIPAL OWNERSHIP PLAN.

Detroit.

The Detroit House of Correction, a local municipally owned prison mainly used for "short termers," and which was fifty years old July 6, has paid into the city treasury, in excess of all costs, the sum of \$965,578.36. Other assets swell the net profits to \$1,254,178.15.

In the early days the profits were mostly on paper, but since 1879 there has been turned over to the city

anywhere from \$25,000 to \$40,000 annually. Chair-making keeps most everybody busy, and the product is sold in the open market at not less than the prices obtained by corporations employing free labor. This point is made by the warden, who is also the superintendent belonging to the Chair Manufacturers' Association.

During these fifty years the institution has had but five wardens. The present warden, John L. McDonnell, has held the position since 1900. No politics has ever appeared in the management, which consists of four members nominated by the Mayor and confirmed by the Council, and these members serve without pay. They have all been merchants, manufacturers and professional men of wealth or prominence, and from the beginning there has been neither grafting nor suspicion of the institution being used for personal gain.

The Jackson, Marquette and Ionia State prisons of Michigan have cost the taxpayers \$5,310,088 during the time they have been in existence, an average of forty-five years each; but these are worked on the contract labor system, in which contractors pay the State a few cents a day for the labor of the convicts, while being furnished free room, light and heat.

Less than 2 per cent of the prisoners in the House of Correction are for a longer term than a year; two-thirds in 1910 were for thirty days or less; only thirty-nine were for more than ninety days. Prisoners' families needing aid because the wealth producer is in prison, are paid some of the prisoners' earnings, averaging \$20,000 a year. The prison and grounds cost the city \$189,841.46. These are now worth \$260,000.

JUDSON GRENNELL.

+ + +

POULTRY AND DREADNOUGHTS.

Elkhart, Ind.

"Out of the increased value of domestic animals and poultry in the State of Wisconsin for the last ten years," said the Milwaukee Sentinel of May 23, "the United States could build four new dreadnoughts of the most advanced fighting type."

Think what that means!

Domestic animals and poultry are the chief product of Wisconsin, and yet its increase in this kind of wealth for ten years only equals the value of four dreadnoughts. If every State in the Union did as well with its chief product, then by taking it all we could build twenty dreadnoughts per annum, or by a tax of five per cent on such chief products we could build one dreadnought per annum.

Is it worth while?

As an individual I have no desire to spend five per cent of my chief source of income for weapons to protect me in my relations with other men. Wouldn't it be silly? Then why should we, as a nation, consider the idea of spending such a vast sum to protect ourselves in our relations with other nations. Isn't that silly, too?

Suppose, for instance, that Germany should announce to the world that it was going to disarm. Suppose Germany should in effect say to the world, "Our army and navy are a stupendous burden on the shoulders of our people. We are going to re-

*See *The Public* for June 30, page 604.