

the best I can with it. But I am not a policeman, nor a fireman, nor a builder. It would be foolish for any director to try to tell Chief Wallace, for instance, how to fight fire.

"I will advise with them and attend to the technical part of the work that must legally be done by me, but I shall not interfere with details.

"This whole arrangement puts more power into the hands of the Mayor, and more responsibility on the heads. He makes the appointments of the heads of departments. They are responsible to him and the board of control.

"This plan, which merges safety and service boards, is not as good as the old federal plan, but I think it will work out well."

* * *

A CHINAMAN WRITING OF HIS OWN PEOPLE.

From a Leaflet Entitled "The United States and China," Written by Wei-Ching W. Yen, Second Secretary of the Chinese Legation at Washington.

We have a saying that between right and wrong the public is an equitable judge; or in the words of Sir Robert Hart, "they (the Chinese) believe in right so firmly that they scorn to think it requires to be supported or enforced by might." That this saying is based on a correct philosophical conception, and that our belief is also the guiding principle of the great men of other nations is proved by the numerous foreign statesmen and writers that have rushed to our defense whenever the honor and fair name of China have been unjustly assailed or her actions misconstrued. Nothing in the history of the foreign relations of the Empire has afforded us more gratification and filled us with more pride and hope than the staunch friendship and deep affection which so many foreigners, generally the ones that know us best, have for China.

It is hardly possible to restrain a smile when we read that "no one knows or ever will know the Chinese, the most incomprehensible, inscrutable, contradictory, logical, illogical people on earth." This sounds something like a characterization, in a comic paper, of women, and is not to be taken seriously. The fact is, we are very much like other human beings, with to be sure some peculiarities, due to centuries of segregation from other nations. But we have essentially "the same hopes and fears, the same joys and sorrows, the same susceptibility to pain and the same capacity for happiness." With increased and better acquaintance of the world through travel abroad and reading at home, the representative men of our country will lose many of the traits and discard many of the customs that seem peculiar to Westerners. Indeed, we have already a class of cosmopolitans, men who have enjoyed educational

facilities abroad and who are as much at home in London or New York as in Peking.

In recent years, a revolution has taken place in our world of thought. Always a nation that delighted in books and worshipped literary talent, we have had a literature equal in extent and quality to that of Greece or Rome. Very few Westerners who have mastered our language have not echoed and re-echoed the sentiment that "untold treasures lie hidden in the rich lodes of Chinese literature." This mine of intellectual wealth has been enriched by the translation of the best works of the West. John Stuart Mill, Huxley, Spencer, Darwin and Henry George, just to mention a few of the leading scholars of the modern age, are as well known in China as in this country. The doctrine of the survival of the fittest is on the lips of every thinking Chinese, and its grim significance is not lost on a nation that seems to be the center of the struggle in the Far East. Western knowledge is being absorbed by our young men at home or abroad at a rapid rate, and the mental power of a large part of four hundred millions of people, formerly concentrated on the Confucian classics, is being turned in a new direction—the study of the civilization of the West.

Socially, an agricultural people is being transformed of a sudden into a manufacturing and industrial nation. New desires have given birth to new wants; the railway and the steamship must take the place of the mule cart, the sedan chair and the houseboat; gas and electricity supplant the paper lantern and the oil lamp; the roar of the loom bewilders the factory girl who has been used to the hand-weaving machine; and the smoke of factories and arsenals threatens to soil the blue of our skies and make hideous the exterior form of nature as it has done in the West. . .

There is a public opinion in China now that makes itself heard and obeyed. No longer is it possible to hold to the conception that China stands for a few men in power and that their will is the law of the land. As Mr. Elihu Root has recently expressed it, "The people now, not governments, make friendship or dislike, sympathy or discord, peace or war between nations." The people of China are gradually coming to their own, and with the elaborate preparations now being made for a constitutional government, it is only a question of a few years when a Chinese parliament becomes an established fact, and another member of the human family added to the ranks of liberal government.

* * *

JURIES AND THE LAW.

From the London Daily News of June 24, 1909.

What we felt it necessary to say the other day about Mr. Justice Ridley's hectoring of a jury on circuit, as reported in a Wolverhampton paper,

receives some learned support from Mr. Kenelm D. Cotes, the editor of the "Social England" series. "May I," he writes, "lay before you the facts as to trial by jury? The jury, as Palgrave pointed out, were originally in a way the lawgivers, and this right they never lost till quite lately; at least, the right to declare the law. William I. summoned twelve men from every shire to declare the English law, and Lord Hale called this as full and sufficient a Parliament as ever was held in England. In, I think, Bushell's case (temp. Car. I.) it was decided that the jury need not take the law absolutely from the Judge. 'The jury resolve the law complicately with the fact.' When the Stuarts were prosecuting men for seditious libel the juries frustrated the Crown by refusing to find a verdict; they insisted on finding 'Guilty of publishing'; and the Judges did not like to declare that a verdict of guilty in law. In a Quaker's case the jury found a verdict of not guilty for unlawful assembly, and a medal was struck to commemorate the action of the jury, who were 'the judges of law as well as of fact.'"

+

In the old time, as Palgrave put it, "the obstinacy of one sturdy yeoman in a distant shire might stand firm against all the thunder of the Exchequer at Westminster." "It is only in our later times," says Mr. Cotes, "that it has been forgotten what the functions of a jury really are; that is, not to stand out against king or nobles only, but also against the king's judges. 'We all know,' Selden wrote, 'what twelve men in scarlet can do.' I am sorry not to quote the authorities with certainty," adds Mr. Cotes, who writes from Cheltenham, "but provincial towns have practically no books."

+

"Judges and barristers now assert that the jury must take the law absolutely from the judge," concludes our correspondent. "It seems from the case you quote that they are beginning to say they are to take the facts also. Mr. Justice Ridley is right in saying that juries were bound to return a verdict, but that was because, as men of the neighborhood, the facts were supposed to be within their cognizance, so that they were obstinately refusing. But what verdict they returned was left to themselves. They need not even bring the verdict on the facts in court; for one of their number might reasonably know of something that he brought to the knowledge of his fellows. They swear to find a verdict, not, of course, as the judge directs, but 'so help them God.'"

+

Referring to the same interesting case, a reader in Manchester writes:

Your comment on the hustling of a jury by Mr.

Justice Ridley at the Shropshire Assizes recalls an experience we once had in Manchester. In January, 1892, the last time the late Lord Coleridge attended here, he took the civil business. A commercial case came before him.

Now, it had often been noted that judicial decisions in commercial cases had too frequently been unsatisfactory, and an agitation for specially arranged commercial courts and the appointment of special judges versed in commercial usages had set in.

Lord Coleridge, in the action now referred to, summed up for a certain verdict, and, to his amazement, the jury disagreed with him. What in the world a jury is for, except to well and truly try to use their own brains, is hard to say. Evidently his lordship considered their business was to do as they were told.

"He became intensely angry," says our correspondent, "at their daring to differ from him, and contemptuously compared the twelve good men and true to a lot of Dorsetshire laborers. (Why Dorset I can't say. His lordship lived on the Dorsetshire border, and may have remembered that Dorsetshire laborers had suffered in the early forties the martyrdom of transportation as pioneers of trade unionism.)"

+

"His lordship told the jury their verdict was perverse, refused to accept it, and ordered a new trial," concludes our friend. "The new trial took place a fortnight later before another Judge and another jury, and the second jury confirmed the verdict of the first—establishing, as the Press pointed out, that the perversity lay on the side of the Judge."

+ + +

THE SUFFRAGETTE "HUNGER STRIKE."

From a Letter in the Westminster Gazette of July 22, 1909, Written by Elizabeth Robins.

For several years women have endured for their political opinion's sake such treatment as is meted out to drunkards and to thieves. Suffragettes have endured this for a cause which has been before the country for forty years, a cause to which 420 members of the present Parliament have given their adhesion, a cause of which a majority of the present Cabinet are in favor. Now, if the traditional avenue through which voteless citizens can carry a grievance (the orderly petitioning of the King's representative)—if that be barred, what are voteless citizens to do?

If they are men their practice has been either to make the general public suffer for its apathy (by burning down buildings and by indiscriminate bloodshed) or else they have made their opponents suffer in person.

The women's way has all along been to take the brunt of the suffering upon themselves.