

# The Public

Dr. HJ Woodhouse  
Nov 2-01 Box 541

Third Year.

CHICAGO, SATURDAY, MARCH 9, 1901.

Number 153.

LOUIS F. POST, Editor.

Entered at the Chicago, Ill., Post-office as second-class matter.

For terms and all other particulars of publication, see last column of last page.

The trustees of the New Brunswick, N. J., free library have honored themselves and their city by refusing to join the procession of municipal beggars to whom Andrew Carnegie is doling out library buildings. The mayor had appeared before these New Brunswick library trustees with a resolution inviting Mr. Carnegie to erect a library building in that city. But the trustees voted the resolution down. They protested that when New Brunswick needed a new library building its own citizens could and ought to furnish the funds for building it. Self-respect in cities has fallen so low, under the influence of such offers as Carnegie's, that this instance of worthy pride deserves especial notice.

With the closing session of the Fifty-seventh congress, one senator returned to private life whose services the country can ill afford to lose. This was Richard F. Pettigrew. Mr. Pettigrew went to the senate from South Dakota, a republican. But he was one of those republicans who were of that party because they were democrats. Such were the men that originally composed the republican party. Fallen under the dominion of the slave power, the democratic party afforded them no political refuge, and they made one, calling their new party "republican" because that was the name of Jefferson's democratic party. But victories and time have brought this party under the dominion of an element in comparison with which the old slave oligarchs were incarnations of the spirit of liberty. Democratic ideals are no longer its ideals. Its saints are no longer Jefferson

and Lincoln. Jefferson has given place to Hamilton, and Hanna has thrown Lincoln from his pedestal. It was Senator Pettigrew's fortune to be in the senate as a republican when the most spectacular part of this transformation occurred, and he rebelled. He has no love for fighting. A typical man of peace, nothing could have been more uninviting. But the call came and he responded. The story of his industry in this conflict is written in the record of the debates. The full measure of his courage can never be quite appreciated. But he has left upon the history of the country a mark that will endure. When this period of mad intoxication shall have passed, Pettigrew's name will stand out in the list of heroic patriots who, if they could not stay the tide of imperialism, lessened its dangers by their warnings.

Mayor Van Wyck has given notice that he will not encourage the use of troops to put down strikes in New York. When a national guard general asked an appropriation for a rifle range, explaining that soldiers who can't shoot are of no use, the mayor answered: "They don't need to shoot in this city; with our excellent police force there is no use for militia." Then the animus of the militia general came out. "There have been strikes," he said, "when the services of the guard were called for." But Mayor Van Wyck's reply was ready. "Not since I have been mayor of New York," he retorted, adding: "The police force is capable of handling any and all disturbances and there will be no shooting." It is reassuring to find a chief executive of a metropolitan city who is not hot for bloodletting at the mention of a strike.

The democratic democrats of Chicago have little room for choice in the

coming mayoralty election. On the one hand is Mayor Harrison, who wears the label of democracy, but is the mere puppet of a ring. He professes to favor public ownership of public monopolies, but pursues a policy which is calculated to postpone such ownership in Chicago indefinitely. On the other hand is Judge Hanecy, a republican boss, who is understood to be the willing servant of the monopoly corporations. There is no third choice. One or the other of these men will be the next mayor of Chicago. Had Harlan been nominated by the republicans, democrats who distrust Harrison could vote for him with satisfaction. But the corporations headed off the nomination that seemed certainly to be going to him. What democrats should do under these circumstances, in order to vote effectively, is a puzzle. Hanecy represents everything they are opposed to. Harrison represents faithfully nothing that they believe in. Many will probably solve the puzzle by voting for Hanecy, upon the theory that the most important thing in the interest of democracy in Chicago at the present time is to unload the Harrison ring. So long as that ring is entrenched in the city hall, with all the patronage of the city at its command, democratic sentiment will be unable to get expression at democratic primaries, and democratic nominees not satisfactory to the ring will be slaughtered by the democratic bosses at the polls. This is not a bad solution.

President McKinley's inaugural address furnished stimulating reading for ex-President Cleveland, to whose administration Mr. McKinley paid his respects in the opening paragraph. Referring to the time when he succeeded Cleveland, Mr. McKinley said: "Then our treasury receipts

were inadequate to meet the current obligations of the government; now they are sufficient for all public needs, and we have a surplus instead of a deficit." Proceeding in this strain, he told how he, immediately after Cleveland's retirement, had been compelled to call an extra session of congress "to devise revenues to pay the ordinary expenses of the government," and by way of contrast boasted of his ability now to announce that "the congress just closed has reduced taxation in the sum of forty millions of dollars." Were the man in Mars to read that paragraph he might suppose that whereas Mr. Cleveland administered the government with so much extravagance as to create a deficit, Mr. McKinley brought such skill to the task as to make possible a reduction of forty millions in taxation. From nothing that Mr. McKinley said could it be inferred that the forty million reduction was not calculated upon the basis of ordinary revenues. No hint gave he that it was a reduction not of ordinary revenues, but of war revenues, and only a partial reduction at that. Far, indeed, was he from explaining that after this reduction a vast burden not only of extra taxation but also of an extra war debt remains. It would be harsh to accuse Mr. McKinley of deceit. But how are we to account for his misleading comparison? The most charitable explanation is that which an acquaintance of his has made regarding similar variations between expression and substance in his writings and speeches, namely, that in English composition Mr. McKinley's feeling is strong for sound and weak for sense.

That comparison of treasury finances was not the only instance, in the inaugural address, of a sacrifice of sense for sound. Another was the reference to the "loyal millions" in the Philippine islands, whose destiny is not to be left to the "disloyal thousands who are in rebellion against the United States." Here is an implication that the Filipinos who resist

American invasion are comparatively few, whereas the fact has been demonstrated over and over again that the people who have resisted us comprise the whole civilized population of the islands. It is implied, moreover, that these people—"the loyal millions" equally with the "disloyal thousands"—owe allegiance to our government. Unless he maintains that they do, what does Mr. McKinley mean when he speaks of "loyalty" and "disloyalty" and of "rebellion against the United States?" Those only can be rebels who owe allegiance. But upon what in this case does the obligation of allegiance rest? Other countries may claim the allegiance of subjects; but the only basis of allegiance recognized by the American principle of government is citizenship. Yet Mr. McKinley's policy denies citizenship to those people. If they were citizens of the United States, any of them who came to this country would be entitled, after a short residence and without naturalization, to vote in any state in the union. That right is denied them. They are treated as aliens. Their allegiance, then, does not rest upon citizenship. But as this country acknowledges no other basis of allegiance than citizenship, Mr. McKinley's charge that the Filipinos are in rebellion is an instance of sound without sense. This is true also of his sapient allusion to the "disloyal" Filipinos, when he says that "force will not be needed or used when those who make war against us shall make it no more." Spain could have said that four years ago, when her soldiers instead of ours were engaged in slaughtering those people. She doubtless would have said it had she been called to account. In fact, she did say it of the Cubans. George III. said it of our own forefathers a century and a quarter ago, and the tory ministry of Great Britain say it to-day of the Boers.

But Mr. McKinley's penchant for sound at the expense of sense is best exhibited, in his inaugural address, by his stirring appeal to the people

to keep up with the imperial procession. This is an "onward movement," he tells them, and he describes it as a continuation of the onward movement our revolutionary fathers began. It would have been awkward to describe it as a backward movement. Though that would have improved the sense, it would have spoiled the sound. While one may heartily agree with Mr. McKinley that the country is moving, one must differ as to the direction. For the sound of it, Mr. McKinley tells us it is moving onward. But how does that compare with the idea that the advance is to the place of a world power? or that we are assigning to ourselves an equal rank, as Mr. McKinley puts it, "in the family of nations"? If this movement toward a partnership in the world policy of the grabbing nations is an onward movement, then those nations must heretofore have been in advance of ours. That is the test. When astronomers would determine the direction of a planet's movement, they calculate its relations to other heavenly bodies. So if we would determine the direction of a nation's movement, we must compare it with other nations. Tried by this test, in which direction has Mr. McKinley's policy carried us? Are we more like Russia and Germany, or less? Have we become imitative of the British Tories or not? Are French Chauvinism and British jingoism more or less in harmony with our new aspirations? Our ambition to be a world power answers these questions. We are moving toward the ideals of European imperialism which our fathers rejected. Either they turned backward then, or we are turning backward now.

Since outward display is important only as it may be actually significant, there is no reason for condemning it when it is merely an exhibition of vanity. A gaudily dressed woman, for instance, is only an object of mirth. She is vain, and that is all. But if her dress betokened arbitrary power, it would be different. So when a con-

stitutional monarch parades with the left-over trappings of a time when kings ruled by divine right, we look on with an amusement that would turn to consternation if we realized that the display of these symbols was significant of a resumption of the prerogatives they once proclaimed. Precisely so with the unprecedented pomp at the McKinley inaugural ceremonies. Were it possible to dissociate this pageant from the presidential policy of absolutism which but a few hours before had been rushed through congress, one might smile at the vanity of it all. But the two things are inseparable. At a time when the president is invested with absolute and irresponsible power over 10,000,000 people, and so invested with it that it cannot be taken from him against his will except by a two-thirds vote of each house of congress, the extraordinary inaugural display described by the press as "distinctly a military pageant" and by McKinley partisans such as Senator Dolliver as characterized by "a pomp and ceremony never before witnessed on such an occasion," is not without baleful significance. So manifest is this, even to Senator Dolliver, that he sends to a Chicago paper a column apology for the display.

Mr. McKinley's policy of absolutism received the sanction of the lower house on the 1st. As in the senate, so also in the house, it was rushed through under the political lash. Filibustering might have been resorted to in the senate to defeat the measure at the session just closed, but the house rules admit of no filibustering. The majority, which in the last analysis is the speaker, makes its own rule for each emergency. In this case of the army appropriation bill, to which the senate had attached several amendments, including those on the Philippines and Cuba which we described last week and which appear this week in our abstract of the Congressional Record, a stringent rule was introduced. It provided that the bill should be taken up forthwith, on

a motion to agree to all the senate amendments in gross, and that after two hours' debate, one for each side, the motion should be put to vote. This rule was adopted and rigidly enforced. In two hours, therefore, the house conferred upon the president absolute authority over the Philippines—legislative, judicial, and executive—without limitation or restriction of any kind.

In justification of this elevation of an American president to the power of an Asiatic despot, it is pleaded that the amendment provided for is the same in substance and almost the same in terms as the act adopted early in the last century, for the temporary government of the Louisiana territory. If that were true, it would be no justification. It would only go to show the danger of doing things that are wrong in principle, even when the application of the principle is unimportant. It is the unimportant cases that make bad precedents. But the Philippine act is in fact radically different from that which was adopted for Louisiana a century ago. Without considering the wide differences in circumstances, there is one difference in the language of the acts themselves which alone refutes the pretense of identity. The Louisiana act gave power to the president only until the expiration of the then session of congress. That act was to expire at an early day by its own limitation. It was a temporary make-shift. Not so the Philippine amendment to the army appropriation law. That is as permanent as any other act of congress. It is to remain in force until congress amends or repeals it. But as congress cannot amend or repeal any law without the president's consent, or a two-thirds vote to overcome his veto, the Philippine law makes the president an absolute dictator in the Philippines for such time as he himself may elect to retain the power, or until two-thirds of each house can agree to divest him of it.

Criticisms have been made of the

opposition senators for not having defeated the Cuban and Philippine amendments by refusing to allow the senate to come to a vote. There are suspicions, also, that they were induced to permit a vote by that species of bribery which consists in giving to localities in their states slices of appropriation-bill "pork." It is true that a vote in the senate could have been prevented. The previous question is not recognized in that body. Senators may hold the floor, therefore, as long as they can bear the strain. In this way Senator Carter, of Montana, did defeat the river and harbor appropriation. He spoke 13 hours on the morning of the 4th, holding the floor until adjournment, for the unconcealed purpose of preventing a vote. To have done this with the Cuban and Philippine amendments would have necessitated continuous speaking, night as well as day, for a week. The physical strain alone would have been enormous, even if several senators had engaged in this test of endurance, for the republicans would have left the floor entirely to the opposition, lying back confidently upon their majority of at least a score. And if this filibustering had succeeded, the victory would have been of the briefest. Congress would have been called together at once in extra session to pass necessary appropriation bills, which the filibustering would have swamped, and the blame for this costly necessity would have been cast upon the filibustering opposition. And when the extra session had convened the Cuban and Philippine measures would have been passed. Whether it was worth the while of opposition senators to bear the physical strain and submit to the odium of being stigmatized as filibusters, without the slightest possibility of defeating the amendments in the end, was a fair question for them to decide. Since they did oppose the amendment, with speeches as far as reasonable debate demanded, and at every roll call with their votes, they did all that the country has any right

to demand. Even if they were deterred from doing more by threats of having their states slighted in river and harbor appropriations, some allowance must be made for the exigencies of political life. So long as the people themselves solicit these appropriations, politicians cannot be lightly blamed for trying to get them. But what to us seems more important than anything else in this connection, is the duty of placing the responsibility for the Cuban and Philippine amendments where it belongs. It belongs with the president and the majority. To criticise the minority, even justly, for not outmaneuvering the majority is to lighten the burden of responsibility which the president and his supporters ought to bear.

As the Philippine amendment has brought more clearly to light the fact that the McKinley policy is one of imperial absolutism, so a little colloquy in the lower house exposed some of the sordid motives for it. Congressman Hull, of Iowa, chairman of the military committee, made upon the floor what would be called a confession had it not been presented in a boastful spirit of defiance. He said (we quote from page 3641 of the Congressional Record of March 1):

I am the same man that is connected with the Philippine Lumber company. . . . I have something invested in that enterprise. . . . I have not, nor has that company, ever asked a favor of the government of the United States; and we do not propose to do so. Our dealings there are with men who have titles in fee simple of long standing. The business is entirely legitimate. . . . Whenever the time comes that I am not permitted to invest in a legitimate enterprise, I would prefer to leave congress to being a drone, dependent only on politics for my living. . . . While the campaign was on, the company with which I am attached called a halt in their enterprise and notified every one of the stockholders that if Bryan should be elected, not one dollar would we invest in the Philippines, but if McKinley should be elected we would invest all the money that we pleased, believing it would have a favorable return by the restoration of order and good government in the Philippines. Bry-

an's election would mean disorder and anarchy in the islands. McKinley's election would mean order and thrift. Under the one I would not be willing to invest in any legitimate enterprise; under the other the ax and the sawmill would be encouraged, labor benefited and civilization advanced. Now, why? Because the one man was trying to run the country on wind, and the other believed in legitimate enterprise.

The buncombe in that speech but thinly conceals the malfeasance which Hull confesses. It little becomes him to sneer at making a living in politics. What else is he doing, and in the worst sense, when he invests and becomes the leading spirit in a business enterprise which his political influence as chairman of the military committee would enable him to make or mar? It is a painful sign of moral deterioration, that a man in his public position can publicly boast of such an investment. His speech is one of the most brazen declarations since that of Tweed. It implies that the people themselves are corrupt, or else that he is in a position to ask what they are going to do about it. Mr. Lentz was right in challenging Mr. Hull's vote on the Philippine amendment to the army bill, on the ground that he was pecuniarily interested in it, and the speaker was shrewdly kind to Mr. Hull when he dodged the challenge.

#### RECURRENCE OF THE TRUST QUESTION.

The organization of the steel trust, following close upon the consolidation of the railroad and coal interests, recalls a startling public assurance of a national party leader at the height of the presidential campaign. He asserted that there were no trusts. This assurance even then seemed to challenge obvious facts and familiar knowledge. Yet in a narrow verbal sense Senator Hanna was right in making it, and would be right if he repeated it, as we shall try to explain.

The term "trust" comes from the method of organizing trusts originally. The owners of stock in different corporations intending to consolidate would deposit it with trustees, whom they invested with absolute power

over it, subject to the reservations of the trust agreement. In that manner competing corporations concentrated in these trustees' complete control over their business, and the consolidation was consequently called a trust. But this method of making industrial combinations proved by experience to be crude and open to legal objections, and from time to time improvements were adopted until the trust in its original form disappeared. Senator Hanna was right, therefore, in a narrow verbal sense. He was right, that is to say, in the same sense in which the punster is right who tells you that "a door is not a door when it is ajar."

It was only in that sense, however, that he was right, for the name and the trusts have persisted, though the method of which the name was originally descriptive has long since given place to methods more effective. Trusts are more numerous and powerful than ever. But they are no longer in the hands of trustees. They are formed now by selling out competing corporations to corporations especially organized for the purpose of buying their interests and consolidating their power.

That is the method adopted by the gigantic steel trust. A syndicate has been organized, with which the stock of all the steel corporations of the country is to be deposited; and at the proper time this stock is to be turned over in exchange at certain ratios for the stock of the United States Steel corporation, recently organized for that purpose under the laws of New Jersey. Thus the United States Steel corporation, though nominally nothing but a chartered company, like thousands upon thousands of others that have been spawned by our incorporation laws, is in fact an enormous trust. It will monopolize the steel industry of America and reach out for the monopoly of that of the world.

This stupendous consolidation has again stirred public feeling. Not so boisterously as it has been stirred heretofore by disclosures of monopolizing tendencies, but more profoundly. Where is all this concentration of power to end? is a question which if not upon every tongue is making almost every heart throb with anxiety. All our people are not like the

complacent college professor of economics who, while realizing that the steel trust "will have very great power," regards it as an evil only in case it uses "this power to raise prices to the consumer." There are those who have read history thoughtfully enough to dread autocratic power in itself.

The same professor speaks of these great combinations as "a natural evolution of the modern industrial system." That seems to him not only a sufficient reply to all objections, but a complete justification of the trust as a good thing. Yet he would hardly look upon typhoid fever as a good thing, even if some medical professor commended it as good because it was "a natural evolution of a method of drainage." He would form his own conclusions as to the goodness of typhoid fever, and if they were unfavorable would suggest that the learnedly ineffectual chump of a medical professor devise something in the way of improving drainage, so that typhoid fever might cease this "natural evolution." When a method of drainage produces typhoid fever, that does not prove that the fever is good. It only proves that drainage is bad.

So with trusts. If they are a natural evolution from the modern industrial system, so much the worse for the modern industrial system; not so much the better for trusts. Every tree brings forth fruit after its own kind, and by its fruit we know it. If this gigantic steel trust, with the unparalleled power it confers upon two or three men over the industries and even the lives of great masses of the people, is a natural product of the modern industrial system, then it is time to overhaul that system and learn what is wrong with it.

But the idea that trusts are good—or at any rate tend in the direction of good—because they are a natural evolution from historical conditions, is not confined to political economy professors holding briefs from the comfortable classes. There is no lack of well meaning people wanting better things to come, who also embrace it.

The historical school of socialists is in that category. They take the current of history for granted as

good. Either that, or they assume the impossible—that good is a natural evolution from evil. For they believe that history exhibits a process of evolution which, having reached the present deplorable era, is about to pass into what would be a worse, the era of trusts, if it were not that the natural evolution from the trust era is to be an era of equality and good will.

If persons who believe in this way meant that the trust era would stir up the people by its oppressions to a realization of the social disease that had produced it, and impel them to seek the root cause and apply the radical remedy, their position would be intelligible. But they have no such meaning. They mean that out of these diseased social conditions, and by the same natural process of evolution that has been at work through the ages, there will naturally evolve healthy social conditions.

Since that is the reason they welcome trusts, it is not just to say, as has been hinted, that they welcome them from motives similar to those which led the quack doctor to produce fits in his chicken pox patients—because he was death on fits and didn't know much about chicken pox—although their programme does suggest it. They want to see all business consolidated in a few great trusts so that the people as a whole, in an organized capacity, may the more readily acquire and administer it. This programme truly is, upon the surface, somewhat like turning chicken pox into fits and then curing the fits; but that is really not a true interpretation of their reason for exalting trusts as a natural development toward better things. They believe that all through history mankind has been a sick man (not from his own disregard of fundamental laws of social health, but of necessity in the nature of things evolutionary), who from one disease to another has finally got a chicken pox, which, in due course, will produce fits, and that the fits will in turn produce good health.

It is not an encouraging programme. Besides the philosophical absurdity of expecting a natural evolution of good from evil, of health from disease, there is to be considered the commonplace fact that the mas-

terful minds that are able to dominate private trusts would have no difficulty in dominating government trusts even under popular government; yea, more especially under popular government. The invitation to cure the trust evil by perfecting and consolidating trusts and making them government institutions, is an invitation to join in completing the destruction, instead of achieving the restoration, of liberty.

It is because Mr. Bryan's trust remedy is in line with and promotive of that which we have just described, as well as because it would tend to foster centralization of power in the federal government, that without qualification we reject it. To quote from his latest statement, published editorially in *The Commoner* of the 1st, he would "let congress compel all corporations to take out a federal license before engaging in interstate commerce, or, if that is too harsh, let it require that corporations having a capital stock above a designated amount shall take out a license." Mr. Bryan would demand as the first condition of granting a license that there should be "no water in the stock," and as the second satisfactory assurance "that the corporation is not attempting to monopolize any branch of industry or the production of any article of merchandise." He would make the license revocable upon violation of the conditions and would deny to an unlicensed corporation the right "to use the mails, the telegraph lines or the railroads outside of its own state." Mr. Bryan describes the remedy as having been suggested by the Kansas City platform. But the same platform suggested a better remedy, which is also the true one, in these words:

We pledge the democratic party to an unceasing warfare, in nation, state and city, against private monopoly in every form.

In that declaration against monopoly the Kansas City platform placed the democratic party upon solid ground regarding the trust question.

It is possible to assume either of two attitudes toward that question. For one thing, we may advocate

what will tend to strengthen and centralize monopoly; for the other, we may advocate what will tend to abolish monopoly. Every proposition regarding trusts will classify under one or the other of those two heads.

The republicans, speaking of their tendencies as a party and not of individual opinions, cling to the first category. They are consistently disposed to create and buttress systems of monopoly. Here they are in harmony with the socialist programme as far as they go. That proposes monopoly, with the state as monopolist; whereas republicans incline to foster monopoly with favorites and bosses as the monopolists. But they also advocate centralization and restrictive laws. In that respect their policy is reflected in Mr. Bryan's remedy for trusts. And this feature of their policy needs only to coalesce with the other, that regarding monopoly, to make of the republicans a socialist party. For the programme of socialism is simply an arrangement of restrictive and centralized monopoly regulations, such as the general republican policy would be if its monopoly tendencies were homogeneous with its restrictive and centralizing tendencies.

Whether the development of trusts will stimulate the spirit of opposition to monopoly is yet to be seen. At present the drift of discussion seems rather to be toward more restriction, more centralization, more monopoly.

An unfortunate slovenliness in analyzing the question has immensely contributed to that result. It has been carelessly assumed that mere combinations make monopoly. Hence attention has been centered upon the problem of checking combinations, and thereby diverted from the vital point, which is the nature of the thing combined. When the principle of industrial combination is analyzed, so as to distinguish combinations of monopolies from combinations of productive forces, the trust problem will have been solved.

And this analysis is by no means difficult.

The idea to be grasped is the patent fact that it is not trusts that make monopoly, but monopoly that makes trusts. In other words, the evil power

of the trust depends not upon mere combination, but upon the kind of interests that are combined.

A combination of fishermen, for instance, could not make a fishing trust. They have no monopoly. Their only advantage would be their skill, and that could soon be acquired by others. Even with all the advantages of such special privileges as dockage rights and transportation opportunities, it has been found impossible to make an invincible fishing trust. An attempt to form a camera trust has failed, although there are patents to buttress such a combination. The great wall paper trust was once supposed to be an example of the power of mere combination, but it was obliged by outside competition to dissolve. Instances of this kind might be multiplied. What gives power to the cigar trust is similar to what gave power for a time to the wall paper trust—its trademarks; and it, too, is destined to collapse. So long as an individual or corporation possesses only such interests as are freely open to competition—except in so far as the combination itself may interfere—it can exercise no oppressive power. To hold the field to itself it must render and continue to render superior service to all.

If, while doing that, a combination seems to injure people by displacing employes or other houses in the same line, the injury is not attributable to the combination. For if men are displaced in a business because they are not needed, and so suffer for lack of employment, their suffering is due, not to their displacement, but to the fact that employments in which they really are needed are closed. Why those employments are closed we cannot consider here, but it is not because, it is rather in spite, of producing combinations.

With such combinations, moreover, there is a limit of efficiency which any thoughtful student of the problem must infer, and which the business community is beginning to detect. Up to a certain point there is economy in combination. It saves expense in many ways. But that point reached, the saving becomes less and less proportionately as the combination expands, until further combination ceases to be economical and becomes

positively unprofitable. With that factor at work in every industrial organization, the natural limit of combination is at the point of highest efficiency.

In some degree all combinations are subject to this limitation, because all are to some extent combinations of interests that are open to competition. But to the degree that the combination is of interests that are monopolistic, to that degree the limitation is lifted. A combination of nothing but monopoly interests, controlling the sources of supply for imperative demands, would have no limit of highest efficiency (except the necessity for the opportunities monopolized), and would be invincible. The evil power of trusts depends, consequently, upon the extent to which the interests they consolidate are monopoly interests.

Though a combination of fishermen could not monopolize the fish trade, a combination of fishermen and dock monopolists, or of fishermen and railroad monopolists, could monopolize it. Indeed, the fishermen would not be necessary factors. The dock monopolists or railroad monopolists could control both fish market and fishermen. This is what the Standard Oil trust has done. By railroad privileges at first and afterward a pipeline from the oil regions to the sea, it has dictated terms to oil consumers at one end and to oil producers at the other. Recurring to the fishery illustration, if the railroad monopoly were a more important factor than the dock monopoly, its owners could dictate to the fish market, to fishermen and to dock monopolists. So the substance of it all is that trusts acquire evil power by consolidating monopoly interests, and that the more fundamental these interests are the stronger is the power of the trust.

The correctness of this analysis is confirmed by the story of the all-absorbing steel trust now in process of organization. Not merely to manufacture steel on a large and economical scale is this combination formed. That is only incidental. It is a function which might be relegated to others without weakening the trust. The real purpose, so plain that no one can deny it without reflecting upon

his own intelligence, is to combine the patent monopolies in steel production, and also the natural sources of steel supply. And by means of another great combination—that of the railroads—controlled ultimately by the same little coterie that is to control the steel trust, monopoly of transportation also is secured. Combination of these monopolies is the thing. It is not combination in production that is sought especially, but combination of productive opportunities. These trusts are not organized to do things, but to do the people.

Make a simple test analysis and you prove it.

Imagine the withdrawal from the two great combinations, the steel trust and the railroad pool, of every monopoly, and what would come of those combinations? Suppose the iron mines were outside the pool. Suppose the coal mines were out. Suppose there were no patents to be combined. Suppose the railroad rights of way belonged to hostile interests, which were free to regulate traffic. Yet, let these two great combinations own everything else, and what power would they have?

Or, to put the same idea in another way, suppose the ore mines, the coal mines, the railroad rights of way, and the patents, all belonged to one trust, while the steel works, the railroad equipment, the machinery at the mines, and everything else of a competitive nature belonging to these two great combinations, were owned by another. What would be the relative power of the two? Would not the latter be as a pigmy to a giant?

Again: Suppose that ownership of the coal and the iron mines were so adjusted that they could not be monopolized profitably by anybody. Suppose the same thing were so far true of the railroad rights of way that anybody's transportation facilities were on a level, and suppose the steel making patents had expired, who, then, would care a picayune whether Mr. Morgan combined the steel and railroad interests or not? Nobody. It would in that case be evident to everyone that these combinations would have to render the best possible service to the public or disintegrate.

All that is evident upon a little re-

flection. And when perceived it almost makes one impatient with the multifarious skin remedies that are concocted for this constitutional disease that evolves trusts. Every injurious trust is built upon some monopoly. Upon one that is conferred by the government directly, or upon one that is acquired from a direct beneficiary of government. Scores upon scores of little monopolies, and some big ones, rest upon the subletting of special privileges by railroad monopolists. Take away these monopolies, and trusts will take themselves away. Monopolies of ore mines, of salt mines, of railroad rights of way, of territorial privileges, and so on, fortified by tariffs which protect American monopolies from the competition of foreign monopolies—such are the things, and such alone, that make trusts possible.

## NEWS

The senate amendments to the army appropriation bill—including those provisions regarding Cuba and the Philippines which we quoted in full last week in reporting their adoption by the senate on the 27th, and which appear this week in our Congressional Record abstract—were incontinently accepted in a lump by the lower house on the 1st. This was done under the lead of the committee on rules, which brought in and under the previous question carried a rule requiring all the amendments to be disposed of as one. There was, consequently, no opportunity to reject either the Philippine or the Cuban amendment without rejecting the other and all the additional amendments besides. The same rule limited debate to one hour on each side of the question. Very speedily, therefore, the amendments were forced through in gross, by a vote of 161 to 136—56 not voting. This was a strict party vote, with the exception of four republicans whose names are recorded with the democrats against the bill. They were McCall, of Massachusetts; Loud, of California; Driscoll, of New York, and Mann, of Illinois. In the senate the only republicans to vote with the democrats and populists against these amendments had been Teller, Hoar and Pettigrew.

From this time on till adjournment the lower house was in a turmoil over appropriation bills. Both houses held

night and Sunday sessions. In the senate, Carter, of Montana, signaled the expiration of his term of office by holding the floor from 11:40 Sunday night until the dissolution at noon Monday, for the purpose of preventing a vote on the river and harbor appropriation bill. He succeeded; the bill fell through. At noon on Monday (the 4th) both houses adjourned, and the last session of the Fifty-sixth congress then came to an end.

Immediately upon the adjournment of the senate, Vice President Roosevelt took the oath of office and called the senate of the Fifty-seventh congress to order, pursuant to a presidential proclamation assembling it in special session for executive business. New senators having been sworn in, the senate proceeded in a body to the east front of the capitol to attend the inauguration of President McKinley, returning at the close of that ceremony and adjourning for the day.

The inaugural ceremonies are reported to have been the most magnificent in the history of presidential inaugurations. The president rode with Senator Hanna by his side from the white house to the capitol, where, at 1:17 in the afternoon, the oath of office for his second term was administered. In his inaugural address he began by comparing the heavy deficit of Cleveland's administration with the surplus of his own, and the industrial depression of that period with the prosperity of this, when "every avenue of production is crowded with activity, labor is well employed, and American products find good markets at home and abroad." Then leading up to the Cuban question he said:

The declaration of the purpose of this government in the resolution of April 20, 1898, must be made good. Ever since the evacuation of the island by the army of Spain the executive with all practicable speed has been assisting its people in the successive steps necessary to the establishment of a free and independent government prepared to assume and perform the obligations of international law which now rest upon the United States under the treaty of Paris. The convention elected by the people to frame a constitution is approaching the completion of its labors. The transfer of American control to the new government is of such great importance, involving an obligation resulting from our intervention and the treaty of peace, that I am glad to be advised, by the recent act of congress, of the policy which

the legislative branch of the government deems essential to the best interests of Cuba and the United States. The principles which led to our intervention require that the fundamental law upon which the new government rests should be adapted to secure a government capable of performing the duties and discharging the functions of a separate nation, of observing its international obligations, of protecting life and property, insuring order, safety and liberty and conforming to the established and historical policy of the United States in its relation to Cuba. The peace which we are pledged to leave to the Cuban people must carry with it the guaranties of permanence. We became sponsor for the pacification of the island, and we remain accountable to the Cubans, no less than to our own country and people, for the reconstruction of Cuba as a free commonwealth on abiding foundations of right, justice, liberty and assured order. Our enfranchisement of the people will not be completed until free Cuba shall be a reality, not a name; a perfect entity, not a hasty experiment bearing within itself the elements of failure.

His policy as to the Philippines was stated in these words:

The congress having added the sanction of its authority to the powers already possessed and exercised by the executive under the constitution, thereby leaving with the executive the responsibility for the government of the Philippines, I shall continue the efforts already begun until order shall be restored throughout the islands, and as fast as conditions permit will establish local governments, in the formation of which the full cooperation of the people has been already invited, and when established will encourage the people to administer them. The settled purpose, long ago prevailing, to afford the inhabitants of the islands self-government as fast as they were ready for it will be pursued with earnestness and fidelity.

We are not waging war against the inhabitants of the Philippine islands. A portion of them are making war against the United States. By far the greater part of the inhabitants recognize American sovereignty and welcome it as a guaranty of order and of security for life, property, liberty, freedom of conscience and the pursuit of happiness. To them full protection will be given. They shall not be abandoned. We will not leave the destiny of the loyal millions in the islands to the disloyal thousands who are in rebellion against the United States. Order under civil institutions will come as soon as those

who now break the peace shall keep it. Force will not be needed or used when those who make war against us shall make it no more. May it end without further bloodshed, and there be ushered in the reign of peace to be made permanent by a government of liberty under law.

The president has reappointed his former cabinet, having sent to the senate on the 5th the following nominations:

John Hay, of the District of Columbia, to be secretary of state; Lyman J. Gage, of Illinois, to be secretary of the treasury; Elihu Root, of New York, to be secretary of war; John W. Griggs, of New Jersey, to be attorney general; Charles Emory Smith, of Pennsylvania, to be postmaster general; John D. Long, of Massachusetts, to be secretary of the navy; Ethan A. Hitchcock, of Missouri, to be secretary of the interior; James Wilson, of Iowa, to be secretary of agriculture.

These nominations were promptly confirmed by the senate. For secretary to the president, George B. Cortelyou was reappointed.

Meanwhile the people of Cuba are agitated over the American breach of faith involved in the passage by congress of the Cuban amendment to the army appropriation bill, which may be found in our abstract of the Congressional Record; and the constitutional convention at Havana is earnestly debating the matter. Its concessions of last week (page 745) have been delivered to Gen. Wood for transmission to Washington, and Gen. Wood has sent to the convention an official copy of the senate amendment, subsequently adopted by the house, being the Cuban provision mentioned above. This was done on the 4th. No action upon it has yet been made public.

In the Philippines there appears to be no material change. The president's commission is proceeding with the organization of provincial governments, but from an interview with Gen. Grant it now appears that in these provincial organizations there is but "little real authority or self-government in the people themselves, the actual control remaining with the American Philippine commission." This remark was made in connection with a statement by Gen. Grant that he could not yet recommend the organization of either Bulacan or Bataan provinces. Still, the commission

has organized both, though in Bataan, if not in Bulacan also, it has appointed American army officers as provincial officials. Gen. Grant's intimation that the natives are not yet pacified is confirmed by scattering reports of fighting. An attack upon Suog, in South Ilocos, Luzon, and one upon Santa Maria, was repulsed after doing considerable damage. A body of armed natives was surprised by Americans near Posacao, on the coast of Camarines province, Luzon, a quantity of supplies being captured and a commissary general made prisoner. A similar capture was made on an island in the lake east of Manila. And an American detachment, attacked in Cavite province, lost three in killed and two or more in wounded. These indications of continued warfare are thus explained by President Taft, in a congratulatory dispatch of the 3d to President McKinley:

Fragmentary cable dispatches detailing small engagements, which are only the result of the increased activity of the army after the close of the wet season, and the efficient policing of the country, made possible by active native cooperation, create a wrong impression on the mind of the public as to the probable continuance of the war, and as to the conditions, which have in fact never been so favorable to the restoration of complete peace and the accomplishment of the declared purposes of the president.

There are reports of natives surrendering at various points, including that of Protesio Montejar, leader of the Filipinos on the island of Panay. The Americans now hold at Manila 4,500 Filipino prisoners of war.

There has been no news of any important change in the Chinese situation.

The latest trap laid by Lord Kitchener for the Boers in South Africa is now known to have failed, like all the others. This was the trap for Gen. DeWet. When our report of last week was written the British war office believed that DeWet, then in Cape Colony west of the Free State and south of the Orange river, near Hope-toun, would be caught between the British pursuing columns and the fast rising river. The expectation was shattered on the 1st by an official dispatch from Kitchener saying that DeWet had been "forced" across the Orange river and was then outside of Cape Colony. The same dispatch told of the capture of 200 Boers by the

British, and also of a fight in which "a superior Boer force" attacked 80 of Gen. Kitchener's scouts and after killing 20 captured the rest. In a dispatch of the 4th Kitchener reported that DeWet was moving toward Philippolis, in the southern part of the Orange Free State, but being headed off by the British, had turned north and marched toward Fauresmith.

This long-drawn-out struggle in South Africa is having a wearying effect upon the spirits of the ministerial majority in the British house of commons. We told two weeks ago (page 727) of a vote in which the ministry with a normal majority of 130 were on the 19th saved from defeat upon an important issue by only 45; and now, on the 28th, they have carried an appropriation measure, which had suffered severe criticism from the opposition, by only 52.

A disgraceful physical encounter upon the floor of the house has added to the embarrassments of the ministry. This occurred about midnight of the 5th in an effort to throw out Irish members for passive resistance to a voting rule. Educational appropriations were under debate. The Irish members had not yet been heard, and it was understood that in order to give them a hearing no vote would be taken that night. Consequently the Irish leaders were absent from the house, when, disregarding the understanding, Mr. Balfour, in behalf of the ministerial party, moved "the closure," which is the European equivalent for the American "previous question." Indignant at this attempt to deny them a hearing upon educational appropriations for Ireland, the Irish members present, some 30 or 40, refused to vote on the motion for closure, denouncing it as an attempt at gag law. They were asked three times to retire to the division lobby for the purpose of voting on the motion, but refused. Some of their number were thereupon "named" by the speaker, and their suspension from the privileges of members was moved by Mr. Balfour. Upon the adoption of this motion, without division, the speaker ordered the suspended members to withdraw. They refused. The sergeant-at-arms repeated the request. They still refused. Then a body of police were called in, which ejected the suspended members by force. As the suspended members resisted police interference, a most undigni-

fied manifestation of police violence ensued, and all attempts on the part of liberal leaders to quiet the tumult were drowned by hooting from the ministerial members. After an hour of this rioting, the house adjourned, on motion of Mr. Balfour, without coming to a vote on the question of closure. Indignation is freely expressed by leading Englishmen at the unprecedented and shocking spectacle of a force of police appearing on the floor of the house of commons during its proceedings and assaulting members.

Scenes of violence not essentially very different from that just recorded are an almost daily occurrence in the Austrian reichsrath. Here the party divisions are along the lines of race, language and nationality, and the conflicts are furious. On the 27th, for instance, the Associated Press thus described a free fight between pan-Germans and Czechs on the floor:

The session opened with a promise of storms. Herr Schoenerer was especially prominent in creating disturbance. Later the Czechs resorted to obstruction, making speeches in their own language. The pan-Germans protested against the abuse of freedom of speech, and a party of them invaded the Czech benches. The result was a fierce fist-cuffs fight. A pan-German named Stim attempted to chastise a Czech named Fressl, whereupon the radical Czechs surrounded him. Stim's friends rushed to his rescue, and the various groups became mixed in a free fight, during which the president's bell and voice were drowned in the uproar. Eventually the president succeeded in making it known that the session was suspended. Before the house could be cleared, however, the rival members again clinched and fierce blows were exchanged.

A similar disturbance occurred on the 5th. A Czech began speaking in his own language, and the president stopped him, whereupon another Czech, Fressl, rushed to the presidential chair, and, as the Associated Press correspondent describes the scene—

seized the papers from the desk and crushed them into a ball. A member of the German people's party named Malik sprang upon Fressl and belabored him. Berger, a pan-German, joined in the fray and showered blows upon Fressl. Others joined in the fighting and the noise became terrific. The combatants were separated finally and the sitting of the house was suspended.

The perilous political conditions in Spain, reported some weeks ago (page

713), have improved. The marriage of the king's sister, then mentioned, to a reactionary Bourbon took place at Madrid on the 14th, with the city under martial law and Gen. Weyler, of Cuban fame, in command as captain general. Martial law has been since continued and is still in force, but Weyler promises to remove it as soon as a government capable of restoring constitutional guarantees has been organized. The first step in this direction was the selection of the liberal leader, Sagasta, to form a new cabinet. This he succeeded in doing on the 6th, the composition of the new cabinet being as follows:

Premier, Sagasta; minister of foreign affairs, Almodovar; minister of finance, Urazaiz; minister of war, Gen. Weyler; minister of the interior, Morot; minister of marine, duke of Veragua; minister of public works, Villameva; minister of public instruction, Romanones. The portfolio of minister of justice has not yet been allotted.

The new cabinet is composed throughout of liberals.

Returning to American politics, the item of principal interest for the week was the opening of the municipal campaign in Chicago. A large petition urging John M. Harlan, a son of the supreme court justice, to be a mayoralty candidate before the republican convention had been regarded as certain to secure the selection of that gentleman. But, although he was at first in the lead, a combination of the republican "machine" (bossed by William Lorimer) and the corporation interests, carried the convention for Elbridge Hanecy, one of the Chicago judges. The "machine" tried to strengthen the ticket by offering Harlan the place upon it of nominee for city attorney, but he refused. That was on the 2d, and on the 5th Mayor Carter H. Harrison was nominated for reelection by the democratic "machine."

In Toledo, Mayor Samuel M. Jones has formally announced his acceptance of a nomination for reelection made by a petition signed by 3,500 voters; and in Cleveland, Tom L. Johnson, the democratic candidate, whose conversion to low fares and municipal ownership of street car lines is charged to be recent, has issued a pamphlet of his "past utterances on present issues—three-cent fares and other municipal questions." As it contains information of general interest, copies can doubtless be obtained for the asking.

## NEWS NOTES.

—Montagu White has been appointed by the American Transvaal league as envoy and delegate to the Transvaal congress to be held in Paris on the 12th.

—By a vote of 52 to 35 the lower house of the Indiana legislature adopted on the 5th a resolution for amending the state constitution so as to allow women to vote.

—John E. Searles, formerly secretary-treasurer and director of the American Sugar Refining company and now president of the American Cotton company, a well-known millionaire, made an assignment on the 5th for the benefit of his creditors.

—William M. Evarts, once the leader of the American bar, a senator from New York, attorney general of the United States, and founder of the law firm of which the American minister to England, Mr. Choate, was long a member, died on the 28th at New York city at the age of 83.

—A general strike of marine engineers engaged on the lakes was called on the 27th by the National Marine Engineers' Benevolent association. The cause was the refusal of the Lake Carriers' association to consider a request for re-classification of vessels and other reforms.

—M. Deroulede and Marcel-Habert, the French deputies who were sentenced for treason (see Public of second year, No. 93, page 10, and No. 100, page 10) were unseated by the French chamber on the 4th by a vote of 352 to 117 as to Deroulede and 307 to 133 as to Marcel-Habert.

—A valuable taxation document, the "Report of the Ontario Assessment Commission," has been issued by the Ontario government. It is interesting to students of fiscal questions everywhere, and may be had, without charge, of the Ontario premier, Hon. G. W. Ross, parliament buildings, Toronto.

—The monthly statement of the treasury department for February shows on hand February 28:

Reserve fund.....	\$150,000,000.00
Available cash balance.....	148,915,149.33
Total .....	\$298,915,149.33
On hand at close of last fiscal year, June 30, 1900.....	305,705,654.78
Decrease .....	\$6,790,505.45

## IN CONGRESS.

This report is an abstract of the Congressional Record, and closes with the last issue of that publication at hand upon going to press.

Feb. 22 to March 1, 1901.

## Senate.

A bill regarding details of government in Puerto Rico (printed at page 3246) was passed on the 25th, on which day also a report of the secretary of war, dated February 19, 1901, was received from the president in response to a request for information regarding ecclesiastical lands in the

Philippines. After this the consideration of the army appropriation bill was resumed, in which connection the committee on military affairs offered the following amendment relative to the government of the Philippines:

All military, civil, and judicial powers necessary to govern the Philippine islands, acquired from Spain by the treaties concluded at Paris on the 10th day of December, 1898, and at Washington on the 7th day of November, 1900, shall, until otherwise provided by congress, be vested in such person and persons and shall be exercised in such manner as the president of the United States shall direct, for the establishment of civil government and for maintaining and protecting the inhabitants of said islands in the free enjoyment of their liberty, property, and religion: Provided, That all franchises granted under the authority hereof shall contain a reservation of the right to alter, amend, or repeal the same.

Objection was at once raised that this amendment was in conflict with the senate rule forbidding general legislation in the form of amendments to appropriation bills; but the point of order was overruled by 39 to 23—26 not voting. The Philippine amendment was then discussed until adjournment, 11:20 at night, principally by Morgan in opposition to it. On the 28th its consideration was resumed, and continued until 11:35 at night. After agreeing on the 27th to the conference report on the fortification bill, the senate again resumed consideration of the Philippine amendment to the army appropriation bill. As an amendment to the amendment Vest moved—

And provided, further, That no judgment, order, nor act by any of said officials so appointed shall conflict with the constitution and laws of the United States.

Mr. Vest's amendment was rejected, 45 to 25—18 not voting. Rawlins moved—

Provided, further, That the government of the United States declares that it is its purpose and intention not to retain or exercise permanent control or sovereignty over the Philippine islands, but only to the extent necessary to secure their pacification and the establishment of a stable government therein by their people; and upon the accomplishment of these ends, and after securing by amicable arrangement suitable naval, military, and coaling stations, and proper guaranties for the safety of those who have adhered to the United States and for the performance of the treaty obligations of the United States to other nations, the government of the United States intends to withdraw from the said islands and leave the government and control thereof to their own people, and the powers hereinbefore conferred upon the president and the persons selected by him are to be exercised to the ends herein provided.

Mr. Rawlins's amendment was rejected, 45 to 24—19 not voting. Bacon moved—

All the military, civil and judicial powers necessary to govern the Philippine islands, acquired from Spain by the treaties concluded at Paris on the 10th day of December, 1898, and at Washington on the 7th day of November, 1900, shall, until the 4th day of March, 1903, or until otherwise provided by congress, be vested in such person and persons, etc.

Mr. Bacon's amendment was rejected, 45 to 26—19 not voting. Pettus moved—

Sec. —. That the constitution of the United States is hereby extended over and declared to be in force in the Philippine islands so far as the same or any provision thereof may be applicable.

Mr. Pettus's amendment was rejected, 41 to 25—22 not voting. Teller moved to add— and secure to them such participation in the affairs of the civil government so to be established as shall be consistent with the safety of the government.

Mr. Teller's amendment was rejected, 39 to 23—26 not voting. Teller further moved—

All persons shall be balliable unless for capital offenses where the proof shall be evident or the presumption great. All fines shall be moderate, and no cruel or unusual punishment shall be inflicted. No

man shall be deprived of his life, liberty, or property but by the judgment of his peers and the law of the land. If the public exigencies make it necessary for the common preservation to take the property of any person, or to demand his particular services, full compensation shall be made for the same. No ex post facto law or law impairing the obligation of contracts shall be made. No law shall be made which shall lay any person under restraint, burden, or disability on account of his religious opinions, professions, or mode of worship, in all of which he shall be free to maintain his own and not burdened for those of another.

Mr. Teller's further amendment was rejected, 41 to 23—24 not voting. Hoar moved—

In the government of the Philippine islands no person vested with legislative powers shall ever exercise the executive or judicial powers, or either of them; no person vested with executive powers shall ever exercise the legislative or judicial powers, or either of them; no person vested with judicial powers shall ever exercise the legislative or executive powers, or either of them; to the end that it may be a government of laws and not of men.

Mr. Hoar's amendment was rejected, 43 to 26—19 not voting. The original amendment then, coming up, as amended meantime by the committee itself so as to read—

All military, civil, and judicial powers necessary to govern the Philippine islands, acquired from Spain by the treaties concluded at Paris on the 10th day of December, 1898, and at Washington on the 7th day of November, 1900, shall, until otherwise provided by congress, be vested in such person or persons and shall be exercised in such manner as the president of the United States shall direct for the establishment of civil government and for maintaining and protecting the inhabitants of such islands in the free enjoyment of their liberty, property, and religion: Provided, That all franchises granted under the authority hereof shall contain a reservation of the right to alter, amend, or repeal the same.

Until a permanent government shall have been established in said archipelago, full report shall be made to the congress, on or before the first day of each regular session, of all legislative acts and proceedings of the temporary government instituted under the provisions hereof, and full reports of the acts and doings of said government, and as to the condition of the archipelago and of its people, shall be made to the president, including all information which may be useful to the congress in providing a more permanent government: Provided, That no sale or lease or other disposition of the public land, or the timber thereon, or the mining rights therein, shall be made: And provided, further, That no franchise shall be granted which is not approved by the president of the United States, and is not, in his judgment, clearly necessary for the immediate government of the islands and indispensable for the interests of the people thereof, and which cannot, without great public mischief, be postponed until the establishment of a permanent civil government, and all such franchises shall terminate one year after the establishment of such civil government—

It was agreed to, 45 to 27—16 not voting. On the same day, the 27th, and immediately after the adoption of the Philippine amendment, the committee on relations with Cuba offered the following amendment to the army appropriation bill:

Provided, further, That in fulfillment of the declaration contained in the joint resolution approved April 20, 1898, entitled "For the recognition of the independence of the people of Cuba, demanding that the government of Spain relinquish its authority and government in the island of Cuba, and to withdraw its land and naval forces from Cuba and Cuban waters, and directing the president of the United States to use the land and naval forces of the United States to carry these resolutions into effect," the president is hereby authorized to "leave the government and control of the island of Cuba to its people" so soon as a government shall have been established in said island under a constitution which, either as a part thereof or in an ordinance appended thereto, shall define the future

MISCELLANY

TOWARD THE LIGHT.

For The Public.

This old gray world is weary of the struggle and the strife,  
The shell-torn fields of battle, and the waste of human life;  
And she trembles to her center at the bugles' brassy blare,  
She shudders when the thunder of the cannon thrills the air.

This old gray world is weary of the arrogance of might,  
Of wealth that binds men captive, and knows no law of Right;  
Of millions of her children born to misery and toil—  
Robbed by deeds and charters of their birthright to the soil.

This old gray world is weary of the ignorance that rules,  
That robs mankind of liberty, and makes men helpless tools.  
She is weary of intolerance, the bigotry that binds  
The feet of searching Science, and the eyes of Reason blinds.

But the list'ner at the portal of the newborn Century hears  
A whisper and a promise come drifting down the years—  
The whisper of a promise, a prophecy of peace,  
When men shall live as brothers, and war's red wrath shall cease.

The dreamer looks farsighted across the sea of Time;  
He sees the end of ignorance, the abolishment of crime,  
He sees the golden dawning of a better, brighter day—  
Mankind no longer shackled beneath a despot's sway.

Then, grand old World, be patient, you've struggled through the years  
Toward the daylight's glimmer, through bloody sweat and tears.  
Behind the distant hilltops the sun of Freedom gleams  
With comfort for thy children—with healing in its beams.

ROBERT T. WHITELAW.

A BREACH OF NEUTRALITY.

If the camel is "the ship of the desert," the horse is the ship of the veldt. American horses have done far more direct and indirect damage to the Boer cause than the English Alabama and the consorts did to American shipping.

The treaty of 1871 stipulates for the exercise of due diligence to prevent the use of ports to furnish military supplies. But the United States government has permitted New Orleans to become a remount base for Britain's war in Africa.

If the Boers could hale the United States to a new Geneva arbitration court they would be mulcted in heavy damages. But the African republics are weak and small. So the great

relations of the United States with Cuba, substantially as follows:

I. That the government of Cuba shall never enter into any treaty or other compact with any foreign power or powers which will impair or tend to impair the independence of Cuba, nor in any manner authorize or permit any foreign power or powers to obtain by colonization or for military or naval purposes or otherwise, lodgment in or control over any portion of said island.

II. That said government shall not assume or contract any public debt, to pay the interest upon which, and to make reasonable sinking fund provision for the ultimate discharge of which, the ordinary revenues of the island, after defraying the current expenses of government, shall be inadequate.

III. That the government of Cuba consents that the United States may exercise the right to intervene for the preservation of Cuban independence, the maintenance of a government adequate for the protection of life, property, and individual liberty, and for discharging the obligations with respect to Cuba imposed by the treaty of Paris on the United States, now to be assumed and undertaken by the government of Cuba.

IV. That all acts of the United States in Cuba during its military occupancy thereof are ratified and validated, and all lawful rights acquired thereunder shall be maintained and protected.

V. That the government of Cuba will execute, and as far as necessary extend, the plans already devised or other plans to be mutually agreed upon, for the sanitation of the cities of the island, to the end that a recurrence of epidemic and infectious diseases may be prevented, thereby assuring protection to the people and commerce of Cuba, as well as to the commerce of the southern ports of the United States and the people residing therein.

VI. That the Isle of Pines shall be omitted from the proposed constitutional boundaries of Cuba, the title thereto being left to future adjustment by treaty.

VII. That to enable the United States to maintain the independence of Cuba, and to protect the people thereof, as well as for its own defense, the government of Cuba will sell or lease to the United States lands necessary for coaling or naval stations at certain specified points, to be agreed upon with the president of the United States.

VIII. That by way of further assurance the government of Cuba will embody the foregoing provisions in a permanent treaty with the United States.

Jones (of Ark.) moved to strike out paragraph 3. The motion was defeated, 43 to 21—24 not voting. Morgan moved to amend paragraph 6 so as to read:

VI. That the Isle of Pines shall be omitted from the proposed constitutional boundaries of Cuba.

It was rejected without division. Jones (of Ark.) moved to amend paragraph 5 so as to read:

V. That the government of Cuba will execute, and as far as necessary extend, the plans already devised or other plans for the sanitation of the cities of the island, to the end that a recurrence of epidemic and infectious diseases may be prevented, thereby assuring protection to the people and commerce of Cuba, as well as the commerce of the southern ports of the United States and the people residing therein.

It also was rejected without division. Foraker moved to amend paragraph 3 so as to read:

That the government of Cuba consents that the United States may exercise the right to intervene for the reservation of Cuban independence and the maintenance of a government adequate for the discharge of the obligations with respect to Cuba imposed by the treaty of Paris on the United States, now to be assumed and undertaken by the government of Cuba.

Mr. Foraker's amendment was rejected, 42 to 21—25 not voting. The Cuban amendment, as proposed by the committee, coming now to a vote, was agreed to, 43 to 20—25 not voting. But before the vote on the appropriation bill as thus amended, Morgan offered the following additional section:

Sec. —. The constitution of the United States is the supreme law of the land in

force in the Philippine Islands to control the official conduct of every officer or agent of the government of the United States who now holds or shall be appointed to any legislative, or executive, or judicial office or function in the civil government of said islands under the provisions of this act, and it shall be so respected and obeyed by such persons in their official conduct relating to the government of the people of said islands.

Mr. Morgan's amendment was rejected, 41 to 16—31 not voting. Morgan then offered the following additional section:

Sec. —. No appointment to office in the Philippine islands shall be made by the president, after the date of the approval of this act, without the advice and consent of the senate, but the president may issue commissions to persons selected for appointment in the manner provided by the laws of the United States which apply to offices in the states and territories thereof.

This amendment also was rejected, 41 to 14—33 not voting.

The army appropriation bill, as amended, was now passed, 43 to 18—27 not voting.

Thereupon, at one o'clock in the morning of the 28th, the senate adjourned, coming together again at the regular hour on that day, and agreeing to conference reports on the military academy appropriation bill, on the agricultural appropriation bill, on the Spanish war claims bill, on the reduction of war revenue bill, on the diplomatic and consular appropriation bill and on the amendatory bill for the government of Puerto Rico. It also agreed, on motion of Butler, of North Carolina, to print as a senate document the Bucklin or Colorado report on land value taxation in Australasia.

On the 1st of March the senate agreed to conference report on the Indian appropriation bill, and at the evening session, which lasted until 1:40 a. m. on the 2d, it passed the sundry civil bill.

House.

The 25th was spent chiefly in the consideration and disposal of conference reports on appropriation bills. On the 26th Lenz raised a question of privilege on the interference by the speaker with his rights under a general leave to print, which produced a sharp debate that was terminated by adjournment. Conference reports were agreed to on the 27th, upon the military academy appropriation bill, upon the District of Columbia appropriation bill and upon the fortifications appropriation bill; and on the 28th upon the bill to prevent failure of military justice, the agricultural appropriation bill, and the bill to reduce the war revenues. A tabulation of the effect of the latter is printed at page 3694. On the 1st, conference reports on the amendatory government bill for Puerto Rico, and the Indian appropriation bill were agreed to; and the senate amendments to the army appropriation bill, including those with reference to Cuba and the Philippines, were disposed of under the following rule, submitted by the committee on rules:

Resolved, That immediately upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to take from the speaker's table the bill (H. R. 14017) making appropriations for the army and without intervening motion to move to concur in the senate amendments thereto in gross; after two hours' debate (one hour on each side) the previous question shall be considered as ordered on said motion, and a vote then be had thereon without delay or intervening motion.

Upon proposing this rule the committee demanded the previous question, which was thereupon ordered, 139 to 120—94 not voting. The rule was then adopted, 145 to 127—81 not voting; and after two hours' debate the senate amendments to the army appropriation bill were concurred in in gross, 161 to 136—56 not voting.

republic, nominally neutral, can afford to supply the indispensable means for their destruction. — W. T. Stead, as reported by cable in Chicago Chronicle of Feb. 24.

#### A FABLE.

For The Public.

A Man went down from Jerusalem to Jericho (in the State of Ohio), and he fell among Thieves, who robbed and beat him, and left him for dead on the Old State Road.

Some Passers By, seeing that the Traveler was in need of assistance, told him to break stone on the pike. But this work the Traveler was unable or unwilling to do, and declined, and asked alms.

Finally a Good Samaritan, passing that way, saw the plight of the Traveler, bound up his wounds, and took him home to supper.

Whereupon the State's Attorney had the Traveler indicted under the State Tramp Law, recently held constitutional by the Ohio Supreme Court, and sent him to the penitentiary for two years.

The Good Samaritan thought it over, and said: "Verily, neither Christ nor Magna Charta have vogue in the State of Ohio."

C. H. R.

#### AN EXTRACT FROM MAGNA CHARTA.

20. A freeman shall not be amerced for a small fault, but after the manner of the fault.

#### WHAT THE CHINESE ARE GOING TO THINK OF US.

Sir Chih Chen Lohfengluh, Chinese minister in London, in interview reported by correspondent of the Chicago Record and cabled to Record of Feb. 26.

I regret to be forced to the conclusion that the record of the powers in China will live in history as the record of ruined opportunities. Not the mere signing of peace terms can remove the preconceived impressions which events, in the popular mind, have not only justified, but intensified.

Our people have not experienced any of the refining influences which they were told belonged to the occident. They have seen European soldiers murder, outrage and steal. They have seen diplomats demanding exactions somewhat out of keeping with the philanthropic motives which brought the great nations to our shores. They have seen, in short, the policy of an open door with the door slammed in China's face.

Years ago I translated the lives of Cromwell, Shakespeare, Bismarck,

Napoleon, Washington and Lincoln. I wanted to show my countrymen the sort of character that grew and flourished in the west. I am grieved, as a believer in that character, that the last year's history has failed to support the ideals which I sought to picture.

#### A REPUBLICAN PROTEST.

A letter written by Col. Henry L. Turner, First Reg. I. N. G., to the Chicago Times Herald (Republican), and published in its issue of Feb. 28.

I cannot forbear expressing my admiration for your courageous and manly course in opposition to the present programme of our government in its relations to Cuba.

And at the same time, as an American citizen interested in the good of my country, I desire to protest against the course laid out by the administration and congress.

When congress, in 1898, in the name of the American people, solemnly announced our purpose in entering upon the war against Spain in the following words, viz.: "That the United States hereby disclaims any disposition or intention to exercise sovereignty, jurisdiction or control over said island, except for the pacification thereof, and asserts its determination when that is completed to leave the government and control of the island to its people," I understood, as I believe did every other honest, intelligent citizen, that in case of success we were to make a free gift, without conditions of any kind, of freedom and independence to the Cuban people.

I believed that we were entering upon a great philanthropic, beneficent, wholly disinterested struggle for the liberation of a suffering people.

I believed that our government by that resolution had made a holy and inviolate contract with the nations of the world, with Cuba and with me as a soldier, that as soon as we had driven Spain out of the island and its people had established a government capable of preserving law and order and protecting life and property we would withdraw and leave the people as untrammelled as to their future as we ourselves are.

But that citizen is not "free and independent" whose entire relations with his neighbors are subject to the supervision of a guardian, nor is that country free and untrammelled whose relations with other countries are dictated by a stronger nation.

And as every citizen whose expenditures of his own moneys are subject to the direction of another is a bonds-

man, not a freeman, so is that country a subject nation whose debt-incurring power is limited by another.

And that is but a mockery of independence which makes the right of national self-defense subject to the uncertain intervention of a neighboring power.

We pledged ourselves to give Cuba freedom and independence without money and without price, and yet with a picayunish greed we are demanding as recompense valuable naval and coaling stations and the little Isle of Pines.

By as solemn a pledge as was ever made—made by the light of day—made with a full knowledge of all the sacrifice of blood and treasure which it entailed—made with the free and intelligent concurrence of the entire American people—we promised Cuba a wholly untrammelled national independence, and no amount of casuistry or argument can make the proposed "cribbed and confined" similitude of freedom anything but the baldest and most dishonorable repudiation.

It may have been, as is claimed, quixotic, it may have been egregious folly to have so bound in chains our ambition and our opportunity for conquest. But if so, it was the sublimest piece of national folly in the world's history. And it was the one absolutely vital thing which put the great liberty-loving heart and conscience of the American people solidly behind the war.

But whether it was wisdom or folly, we voluntarily made as solemn, as clear and explicit a compact as human language could embody, and no matter what evils may follow we are bound in honor to make good that promise. If evils and dangers follow let us meet them when they come, not commit a giant wrong to avoid them.

In the name of national truth and honor I protest against any repudiation of the letter or spirit of our obligation.

As a republican for life, I protest against it. In the name of that party, which I believe means to be true, honorable and faithful to all its promises, I protest against such misrepresentation of the party's wishes and purposes.

I protest against it as one of that great army which gave us possession of Cuba—which enlisted under a people's assurance that we were to fight in a war which should have nothing of gain or self-seeking in it.

I have rejoiced and gloried in my service as the grandest gift in my life in the interest of downtrodden hu-

manity. I protest, therefore, against the violent wrenching of that great war of beneficence into a war of greed and conquest. I protest against the clouding of a soldier's honorable service with the shadow of repudiation and infamy. I protest against turning the glorious, freedom-giving campaign of Santiago into a black and disgraceful story of national rapacity and unfaithfulness.

#### A PROPOSED SOCIOLOGICAL EXPERIMENT.

An interview published in the Detroit Evening News, of January 22.

Frank H. Warren is the senior member of the firm of Warren & West, proprietors of the Hammond building barber shop. Mr. Warren has been a barber for something over ten years. He is also a large owner of very valuable Mackinac Island property, and is now taking a full course in the Detroit law school. Between tonsorial efforts, Mr. Warren takes down yellow-bound law volumes from a bureau, and bones assiduously on Blackstone and other gentlemen who have taken the law rather seriously.

It is rather unusual to see a barber go from lather to international law; from an egg shampoo to constitutional history.

The spectacle invoked the inquiry, and Mr. Warren talked enthusiastically of a sociological experiment which, if successful, will be the solution of a great national problem. In a few words, Mr. Warren is preparing himself for a great lifework, to take to the heart of Africa a colony of his own race; in the center of the dark continent to hew out the form of a commonwealth, making its own laws and bringing civilization to the millions of wild blacks, their primeval forefathers.

The only evidence that Mr. Warren shows of his African extraction is a slight swarthy complexion. He has entered upon the great work with full knowledge of its magnitude and the difficulties that he will inevitably encounter.

Mr. Warren said to the News:

"It is about ten years ago now that I first began to think of the great benefit it would be to the colored race. I went through the grammar schools of Saginaw and got as far as the ninth grade. Then I was obliged to leave school. As the practical side of the movement dawned upon me, I made up my mind to devote my time to the work and to prepare myself to take an active part in

the work. I had to wait for a good many years before I was in a position to study law. I felt that a knowledge of law was indispensable in the execution of such a work. I am in the first year of the law school now, and it will be three years before I am prepared to take up the great work actively.

"In outline the plan is this: There is an organization in this country called the African Colonization society. Their headquarters is in Atlanta Ga. Bishop H. M. Turner is really at the head of the work. For years this society has been active in this work, to take back to their native Africa a colony of American negroes. They have raised for the purpose a fund that already amounts to something between \$70,000 and \$80,000. It is being agitated all over the country. Circulars are being written and distributed, and even the rough outline of the form of government to prevail is being discussed.

"With this movement I have decided to cast my lot, and in this enterprise I have decided to risk what property I have accumulated, about \$10,000.

"The purpose of the colony is really threefold: It will be an outlet for the negroes of this country, and, in that way, a solution of the race problem of the south. It will tend to civilize the natives of the continent, and I believe that is the religious duty of the American negro. And, third, it will be a practical test for the single tax theory, in which I have the most implicit faith. The single tax will certainly be one of the fundamental principles of the government.

"My idea is to start for Africa with not less than 1,000 American negroes and their wives and families. The country that I have decided upon is about 300 miles southeast of Liberia and north of the Congo. It is in the heart of the wilderness, but communication can easily be opened with the coast and the coast trade. The question of what flag flies over the country is of little importance. When James G. Blaine was secretary of state we exchanged a great deal of correspondence in the matter of suzerainty. Mr. Blaine said he had no doubt that any nation would not only offer no objection, but would assist materially in the work of colonization. In every way possible we would retain the American methods and customs and national character, and, if possible, the American flag.

"That part of the continent has

been selected principally because of its favorable climate and remarkably fertile soil. The temperature never falls below 70 degrees and never rises above 90 degrees. The soil gives two crops a year. A man there can cultivate five acres of ground, and each crop of five acres will produce at the minimum \$800, and at the maximum \$2,000.

"All this can be accomplished with a great deal less labor than the average negro is now made to do in the south, practically for nothing. He will be free to make his own way.

"England will offer a ready market for our crops. The steamer lines with England are direct and the commercial communications are excellent.

"I believe that this will be a solution of the race problem in the south. Those that go will have abundant opportunities to succeed. Those that stay will get the advantage of more opportunities, and they will be better considered by the white employers of the south.

"I have read extensively books of sociology and economic reforms. I do not believe that Bellamy's theory in 'Looking Backward' is practical in any way. I believe in free and equal opportunity. Every man should be given an opportunity to rise or to fall. I shall advocate the exclusion, at first, of all intoxicating liquors. I am not a prohibitionist, but a free liquor trade might mean the ruin of a young colony.

"We are encountering a great deal of opposition among the American negroes. They do not understand it. They fancy that it is a plan of the white people to get rid of them, and they are stubborn and imagine that they are being abused. Then most of them do not feel that it is their duty to go back to their country and assist in the work of civilizing their own race. They have no moral scruples. But they must be instructed and shown their duty in the matter. We will try to take skilled artisans of all kinds. I am anxious to secure the services of educated and intelligent Africans to help me in the administration of government and to mold the life of the young commonwealth.

"When can we go? I don't know. When we are prepared. It may be three years and it may be more."

Mr. Warren is at work on a little booklet, which will receive its circulation in the spring. It will be distributed among the colored people,

and is entitled: "Is It Our Duty to Go Back to Africa?"

Mr. Warren's brother, now attending the Booker T. Washington school, will assist in the work of colonization.

#### PROPORTIONAL REPRESENTATION.

The principle of proportional representation has been adopted by several widely separated countries, among them being Belgium, Denmark, Brazil and Tasmania. It is in Belgium that the most thorough trial of the system has been given. Five years ago a system of proportional voting known as the "free list" was adopted for municipal elections throughout the kingdom.

The system was applied in a partial and imperfect form by an opportunist ministry who wanted to stave off a full application of the principle. Notwithstanding this, the reform worked exceedingly well, and the general testimony is that it has promoted purity and efficiency of government, whilst markedly decreasing party bitterness and rancor. This success led to a further extension of the principle, and in December, 1899, an act was passed applying the free list system to the Belgian parliamentary elections, both for the senate and the chamber of deputies. In May last the general elections came on, when a million and a half of voters cast their ballots under the new system. It was a pronounced and remarkable success. There are three parties in Belgium—the clericals, the liberals and the socialists. At the previous election, under the old system, the clericals was grossly over-represented, chiefly at the expense of the liberals, but the new system set this right and had the effect of giving each party a fair and proportional representation in accordance with the numerical strength of each, thus proving its right to the name it bears. Party virulence was much lessened, because each party realized that the system was one which prevented any unfair advantage being taken.

We get these particulars direct from an able French book, "La Representation Proportionnelle en Belgique," written by Count d'Alviella, professor of the University of Brussels, and also an ex-senator. He gives a most interesting history of the struggle to obtain this great reform, which was finally carried by the help of the wiser heads amongst

the clericals, who realized that they were driving the liberals and socialists to combine against them.

Switzerland also uses the free list system. Several of the cantons (provinces) have used it for some years in their legislative elections, with great success.

Tasmania is the first English-speaking community that has adopted the proportional principle for legislative elections. In February, 1897, the two cities of Hobart and Launceston used the Hare-Spence system of proportional representation in electing ten members of parliament. In March last the same two cities again elected their ten members on the same proportional system. Tasmania is now a state in the new commonwealth of Australia, and will elect six senators and five representatives to the federal parliament. The house of assembly has just rejected a proposition to adopt the system of single-member electorates for the federal elections, and the whole island is to be one electorate, returning the senators and representatives on the Hare-Spence system of proportional representation.

The results of the last election in Belgium under the old system gave 112 clericals, 12 liberals and 28 socialists. The results of the first election under proportional representation gave 86 clericals, 33 liberals, 32 socialists and one independent.

#### PROPORTIONAL REPRESENTATION IN BELGIUM.

Extracts from "La Representation Proportionnelle en Belgique," by Count d'Alviella, translated for The Public by Miss Kate L. Johnston, of Toronto.

The moment seems to have arrived for formulating the conclusions which are made clear by the first application of proportional representation to the legislative elections of Belgium.

The first result has been to awaken political life in numerous districts where for a long time it had seemed to be extinguished, especially in the Flemish provinces. In the heart of the two Flanders, notably, at Anvers and even at Limbourg, liberal associations have been born or revived in localities most devoted to the conservative Catholic party. At the time of the earlier elections, in 1896 and 1898, the liberals abstained in many districts from any serious struggle for representation in the chamber of deputies. As for the senate, the elections took place without a ballot in 25 districts out of 36. This time the seats were contested in all the divisions of the country, as well

for the senate as for the chamber, with but one exception. The socialists entered into the struggle wherever they could find candidates, and the Catholics raised their flag in districts in the Walloon country, where they had never succeeded in electing a candidate within the memory of man.

Among other indirect advantages, proportional representation has thus put an end to the perilous coincidence which tended to establish itself between political divisions and racial or linguistic divisions. (In Belgium, as in Canada, there are two distinct races, speaking different languages.) The Flemish liberals have to-day in the chamber of deputies members who know their country and speak their language; just as the Catholics of the industrial districts find other representatives of their interests than "Luxembourgeois" — country squires, or Flemish proprietors.

A second result has been to diminish the virulence of the electoral campaign. Candidates have been able to organize their propaganda without their adversaries trying to prevent them, or troubling their meetings. Fewer personal attacks are recorded in the press; and recourse was seldom had to those maneuvers of the last hour ("roorbacks") which were but lately the culminating point of all electoral strategy.

At Brussels the public "assisted" at the curious spectacle of "La League" and "L'Association," both hard at work, without attacking each other in their meetings or in their journals. In a great number of divisions the socialists have openly adopted the candidature of liberals who were running for the senate, although the two parties were presenting opposing lists for the lower house. Even between Catholics and liberals the struggle has not reached the pitch which characterized it under the old system. This is, say the advocates of the old regime, because the real battle will be waged henceforth within the parties themselves. But is it not rather because the powerlessness to crush adversaries will be felt henceforth, and that it will be indeed necessary to recognize their right to existence? However that may be, it is an amelioration as notable as necessary in our political methods; and it will be fortunate should this amelioration be felt in parliament also. "We have in Belgium," confessed (after the elections) Hon. Jan Van Ryswyck to an editor of *La Metropole*, "the habit of exaggerating everything. It is a detestable method of reasoning. Exaggeration has invaded all our po-

litical life, our journals, our clubs, our administrations, our parliament. Proportional representation, instead of exaggeration, promotes calm consideration and thought; it tends to wisdom and pacification."

What has become of the reproach that proportional representation tended toward the disintegration of parties? The event has shown that it is not the parties which are parceled out—at least, it is not the parties having, as Monsieur the Minister Van den Henvel, says "cohesion, discipline, a programme truly conciliatory of great interests;" it is, on the contrary, eccentric groups, undecided shades, isolated candidates, that have been absorbed, or put "hors de combat."

The moral of the last legislative election is that Belgium has room for three parties, but only for three. Even in the city of Brussels, which was one large constituency, returning 18 members, so that to carry a seat less than one-eighteenth of the votes cast was required, the lists of the commercials, of the industrial commercials and of the P. O. L. obtained with difficulty some thousands of votes; but further, neither the independents, in spite of the personal influence of M. Theodor, nor the Christian democrats, in spite of the intense propaganda of Abbe Daens, have succeeded in reaching the electoral quotient which gives a seat. Except the one follower of Abbe Daens elected at Alost, not a dissident has entered either the chamber or the senate. The three parties are certainly more homogeneous to-day than they were under the last parliament.

On the other hand, proportional representation has put an end to the heterogenous coalitions which have tended for some years to be introduced into our politics, and which end in reciprocal disappointments. Everywhere the radicals, who generally form the mainspring of anti-clerical combinations, have had to resign themselves to go with the moderate liberals or to struggle alone. At Brussels, the independents have been constrained to break with the Catholics, and thus is terminated an equivocal alliance which had monopolized for 14 years the "representation" of the district. Each party, freed from the care of seeking at any price allies which it hoped to dupe on the morrow, has been able to present itself with an integral and homogeneous programme which, for the first time, perhaps, in an electoral contest, was

distinguished for clearness and sincerity.

A superficial observer would be tempted to conclude that the disappearance of electoral coalitions must above all profit the Catholics, since it is against this party that these combinations were directed. In reality, it seems that the liberal party will gain still more by it; not only because it can henceforth take again its place openly, without passing under the caudine forks of the socialist party, but, further, because its new independence has had for consequence the drawing together of its two divisions—the progressives and the moderates. On the one side the progressives, being no longer constrained to handle socialism tenderly, have caused to disappear one of the chief reasons of the distrust of the moderates. On the other side, these latter, having no longer to occupy themselves in retaining at any price the support of certain elements, have been able to make a step forward, notably in the electoral question and in the labor question. So well has all this been done that the two sections of the liberal party have succeeded in meeting each other on a ground which represents the integral application of their common principles.

No one to-day would dare to still reproach the new system with complexity. Proportionalists themselves were not without uneasiness in this respect, in view of the novelty of the system, the use of two ballots, one for the chamber of deputies, the other for the senate; and finally the considerable masses of voters, too often illiterate or nearly so, whose votes had to be collected and counted. Take, for example, the district of Brussels. Divided among 517 polling places, nearly 170,000 voters each received there from one to six ballot papers, the pink for the senate, the white for the chamber. Each ballot paper contained the names of either of 25 senatorial candidates or of 167 candidates for the chamber. In each case the candidates were divided into lists under party headings. After having entered the isolated compartment where he marks his ballot with the stroke of a crayon, each voter comes back to deposit his white ballot paper in one urn, his pink ballot paper in another. All this part of the operations, which was carried out in perfect order, terminated at one o'clock in the afternoon. At two o'clock the 177 scrutineers' offices were in possession of the ballot pa-

pers. Everywhere the scrutiny, commenced at about three o'clock, was finished between eight and ten o'clock in the evening; that is to say, all the operations were carried out with as much precision and more rapidity than under the old system. The central office of the district met, conformably to the law, the next day at midday, to add up the votes of each list, establish the common divisor and proclaim the names of those elected. Although it could not finish its task until Tuesday night, it was because among the 177 presidents of scrutineers' offices there were one or two unequal to the task. One of them had replaced by a blank sheet of paper his official report, which was not found again until the next day.

Advocates of proportional representation have frequently affirmed that this system would lead parties to choose the best possible candidates. Now some people are artlessly manifesting their disappointment that the newly elected Belgian parliament is not peopled with "national illustrations." It is certain that in this regard some of the choices of the electors have left something to be desired, and that "parish politics" as well as "vested rights" have kept too great a place. However, the improvement is marked—the progress is incontestable. One could hardly dream of a parliament inferior to the last legislature which the old system of voting produced. To convince oneself of this, it is sufficient to read the funeral orations which the journals of all parties pronounced over its tomb. The new parliament represents, as yet, a transition from one system to another; representation based on the subdivisions of territory giving place to representation based on the groupings of opinions. Nor should we demand from institutions more than they are able to give. Parties will never represent themselves except by politicians; and all that ought to be wished, for the sincerity of the representative system, is that parties will elect their true chiefs. Now in this respect one must recognize

## THE PUBLIC

will be sent to any address in the United States, Canada or Mexico.

**ON TRIAL**

for the purpose of introducing it to new readers, for the term of

**SIX WEEKS**

for

**TEN CENTS**

Send subscriptions with addresses to **THE PUBLIC, Box 697, Chicago.**

that proportional representation has sent into parliament the best representatives of our three great parties. More than one newcomer among the liberals and the Catholics will contribute to raise the level of debates. As for the socialists, we do not know the value of their recruits; but it is incontestably a merit of proportional representation that it has permitted MM. Vander Velde and Bertrand to take their natural place among the representatives of Brussels, M. Anseele among those of Gand and M. Terwagne among those of Anvers.

### SOLDIER, OR PRESIDENT?

For The Public.

We met outside of Manila,  
He with his stalwart son;  
I was a man of Nebraska,  
And he was of North Luzon.

Our rifles cracked in the silence,  
And the youth lay dead at his feet,  
Dead in the morn of his manhood,  
And life to the young is sweet.

The father knelt beside him,  
As I ran and shouted the word  
That bade the man surrender,  
But he neither saw nor heard.

The rifle untouched beside him,  
(Would God I could hide the sight!)  
And the still face gazing upward—  
(It comes to me in the night!)

That the flag of his young republic  
Might wave o'er the eastern seas  
He gave his life—and a shudder  
Rose till it shook my knees.

But, God! I had done my duty,  
The duty I owe to slay,  
For mine is a trade of slaughter  
For the regulation pay.

Yet I knew when I aimed my rifle  
He had never done me harm,  
But my rulers had made me kill him,  
And the president held my arm.

Oh, statesmen, who sit in council,  
And fearfully work your will,  
I think your hearts might falter  
Were yours the trade to kill.

And yet the stain is upon you  
Of this young blood that was spilt,  
And if God is God, you shall answer  
As much as I for the guilt.

It was your hands aimed the rifle,  
By yours the ball was sent;  
And God shall punish the guilty,  
Soldier or President.

But the sight of the father bending  
Above his boy that day,  
Till death my soul shall summon  
I may not put away.

I shall see the bronzed dead lying  
Full in my startled view—  
Open your eyes, ye rulers,  
That ye may see it, too!

JOSEPH DANA MILLER.

The Boer—I understand that the steamer Alabama was built in England, and that the English people permit-

ted it to leave their territory and destroy property of a neutral nation?

The Mc—Yes.

The Boer—And that the neutral nation, because of this breach of international courtesy, was enabled to collect indemnity for the damage that had been done?

The Mc—Yes; what of it?

The Boer—Why, I was thinking of the chances we had of collecting indemnity from the United States for having permitted to be built on its territory, and to leave same to damage us, the American mule.

G. T. E.

The politician's wife was startled by a sound below stairs.

"John," she cried, "there's a robber in the house!"

"The house," replied John. "What's the matter with the senate? That's worse."—Philadelphia Press.

Rep.—I am surprised that such a violent opposer of the administration as you are went to Washington to attend the inauguration of Mr. McKinley!

Dem.—I didn't go there to attend his inauguration. I went to celebrate his first term's finish.

G. T. E.

The edition of "The Public" this week is 6,000.

### ATTORNEYS.

#### Chicago.

**CHARLES A. BUTLER,**  
ATTORNEY AT LAW,  
Suite 616, Ashland Block, CHICAGO.  
Telephone, Main 2711.

**HARRIS F. WILLIAMS,**  
ATTORNEY AT LAW,  
806 Chamber of Commerce Building,  
CHICAGO.

**WALTER A. LANTZ.** T. G. MCELLIGOTT  
Telephone Central 2254.

**LANTZ & MCELLIGOTT.**  
ATTORNEYS AT LAW,  
1025-1030 Unity Building, 79 Dearborn St., Chicago.

**CHARLES H. ROBERTS,**  
ATTORNEY AT LAW,  
ESTATES, CLAIMS, PATENTS,  
614 Roanoke Building, Chicago.

#### Houston.

**EWING & RING,**  
ATTORNEYS AND COUNSELLORS,  
HOUSTON, TEXAS.  
Presley K. Ewing. Henry F. Ring.

#### New York.

**FRED. CYRUS LEUBUSCHER,**  
COUNSELOR AT LAW,  
BENNETT BLDG.  
89 Nassau St., Borough of Manhattan,  
Tel. Call, 1353 Cortlandt. Rooms 1011-1015.  
NEW YORK.

## The Public

is a weekly paper which prints in concise and plain terms, with lucid explanations and without editorial bias, all the really valuable news of the world. It is also an editorial paper. Though it abstains from mingling editorial opinions with its news accounts, it has opinions of a pronounced character, which, in the columns reserved for editorial comment, it expresses fully and freely, without favor or prejudice, without fear of consequences, and without hope of discreditable reward. Yet it makes no pretensions to infallibility, either in opinions or in statements of fact; it simply aspires to a deserved reputation for intelligence and honesty in both. Besides its editorial and news features, the paper contains a department of original and selected miscellany, in which appear articles and extracts upon various subjects, verse as well as prose, chosen alike for their literary merit and their wholesome human interest. Familiarity with The Public will commend it as a paper that is not only worth reading, but also worth filing.

### Subscription, One Dollar a Year.

Free of postage in United States, Canada and Mexico. Elsewhere, postage extra, at the rate of one cent per week. Payment of subscription is acknowledged up to the date in the address label on the wrapper. Single copies, five cents each.

Published weekly by  
**THE PUBLIC PUBLISHING COMPANY,**  
1401 Schiller Bldg., Chicago, Ill.

Post-office address:  
**THE PUBLIC, Box 687, Chicago, Ill.**

To Smoke  
or  
Not to Smoke  
is  
Not the Question  
if they are  
**MOOS' CIGARS.**

**J. & B. MOOS,**  
95 Randolph Street, 58-64 Dearborn Street,  
CHICAGO, ILL.

**GIBSON ART GALLERIES**  
CHICAGO'S GREATEST  
PHOTOGRAPHERS .:

N. W. Corner Wabash and Adams.

P. S.—Group pictures of Chicago  
Single Taxers on sale at our galleries.

For any Book on Earth  
Old or New Write to  
H. H. TIMBY,  
Book Hunter,  
Catalogues Free. Connecticut, Ohio.

## HENRY GEORGE

Shortly before his death wrote: "I most heartily commend 'From Earth's Center.' It contains in entertaining form an explanation of the practical workings of the Single Tax. 'From Earth's Center' is a book of 274 pages. We mail it to any address for 25 cents, 8 copies for \$1.00; 100 copies by express for \$7.50. We prepay express within 500 miles of Chicago. CHAS. H. KERR & CO., Publishers, 56 Fifth Ave., CHICAGO.