

The Public

Fourth Year.

CHICAGO, SATURDAY, MAY 11, 1901.

Number 162.

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.

Let it not be supposed that Mr. McKinley is ineligible for a third term as president. It is true that there is an unbroken tradition, dating from the days of President Washington, against third terms; but no mere tradition can be allowed to stand in the way of the perpetuation of Mr. McKinley's beneficent rule. No antique fad must be permitted to force upon the country the risk of losing its miraculous and unique prosperity. For the good of his people Mr. McKinley has set aside the Declaration of Independence and recast the constitution; why not for the same gentle purpose break through the third term tradition? Which should we cherish the more, that sentimental tradition or perpetual prosperity?

Hope is sometimes expressed that the overcapitalization of the trusts will force them to impose upon the public such high prices as to stimulate competition and break them up. As to some trusts this hope is well founded. Trusts that are mere combinations of competitive interests, having no legal privileges, neither directly nor indirectly, cannot maintain exorbitant prices. Competition will sooner or later destroy them if they attempt it. The great wall paper trust was obliged to dissolve for that reason. But trusts that combine legal monopolies are impregnable. Nothing can abolish them but abolition of the monopolies.

One of the recent issues of the Hearst papers—New York Journal, Chicago American and San Francisco Examiner—contained a startling edi-

torial, from the pen of Mr. Brisbane, on the subject of the steel trust. It explained that the real steel trust is not the combination of capitalists under Morgan, but the combination of steel makers which the combination of capitalists will yet produce under some unknown leader who will be the man for the occasion; and it predicted that when this combination of steel makers asserts its power, the capitalistic steel trust will give way to the labor steel trust. The thought is impressive. But it isn't true. Only one thing prevents it from being true, however, and that is that the capitalistic steel trust controls not only the capital, which labor can always reproduce, but also the great natural sources of supply, which no one can reproduce.

Texas is furnishing object lessons in land monopoly at a great rate. In the neighborhood of Beaumont, along the Louisiana border, there is a whole bunch of these lessons. Land that was almost valueless a few weeks ago is sold at fabulous prices now, just because it is supposed to contain oil. That tells plainly who is to make money out of oil. It is not to be the workers who produce it, but the "sooners" who monopolize the sources of supply. Another lesson is furnished by the Chicago Farwells. They own Texas ranching land. They have owned large areas for several years. Just now they are beginning to sell. It is bringing them from two dollars to \$4.50 an acre. But they expect to advance the price soon because the demand of workers for small ranches is growing keener. The reason they did not sell sooner is that the state has until recently had a large amount of land open for settlement, which it offered on liberal terms. This cheap supply kept down the price. But it is now exhausted, and prices begin to

rise. Hence the Farwells come into the market with "advantageous offers" to landless denizens of the planet of places on the planet upon which to work and live. Is there not a suggestion here of something wrong in social adjustments? Why should one man pay another for the right to use the earth? It is precisely that, and nothing more, that the Farwells are selling. They throw in nothing. It is not ranches they offer, but places on which to make ranches.

In New York the Citizens' union party has adopted its platform for next fall's municipal election. That party is the local organization which supported Seth Low four years ago, reinforced by many of the leaders at least of the local party that supported Henry George. This is not altogether a natural affiliation, though there is more homogeneity than might be supposed. From the "good citizens" in the movement, those who are nothing else and only that in name, wails are heard because there is catering in the platform to the labor vote, and to that kind of socialism that demands public ownership of public monopolies. These complainers would have the party stick to the simple doctrine of "good men in office." But the convention was too sensible for that. When institutions are bad, good men in office can't make good government. Besides, "our very best men" are as a rule beneficiaries of bad institutions. The platform is really not as good, from any point of view, as it might be; but it is as good as the people it seeks to consolidate against Tammany Hall could be expected to agree upon. If it caters to the labor vote, that is because the working classes, not less than the mugwump classes, have interests to be conserved, and, like the mugwumps, decline to contribute their votes without some pledge as to

their interests. With the labor vote against it, the Citizens' union party of New York might conduct a very proper campaign, but it would make a sorry showing at the polls.

Labor legislation has received a knockout blow from the court of appeals of New York. One of the labor laws of that state requires contractors for public work to pay their workmen not less than the prevailing rate of wages for a legal day's work, and to embody this provision in their contracts, the contract to be void if such wages are not paid. In the case referred to the contractor had accepted these conditions, but he refused to fulfill them. He paid less than prevailing wages. For that reason the city comptroller disallowed his claim for the contract price. But the comptroller is overruled by the court of appeals, the highest court in the state. That tribunal holds that the labor law is a nullity because it requires the expenditure of city money for other than city purposes, namely in excessive wages; because it invades the right of contractors to deal in their own discretion with the question of wages; and because it confiscates the contractor's property rights for a breach of contract which is innocent and harmless. One of the curious effects of the decision is to give to the contractor the benefit of a contract based upon a promise to pay high wages, though in fact he paid low wages. The working classes lose the benefit of the law and the city gains nothing by its nullification. That effect attaches, of course, only to existing contracts, but it is interesting. One able dissenting opinion was written. It was by the chief justice, and went to the root of the whole question, not only of these labor laws, but of all legislation not forbidden by the constitution. "The reasoning by which the decision about to be made is sought to be supported," writes Chief Justice Parker, "fails to persuade me that it is other than a judicial encroachment upon legislative prerogative; for it is that and nothing

less if the statute does not offend against either the federal or the state constitution." That is the nub of the whole thing. No matter how one may regard the wisdom, justice or propriety of the labor legislation in question, there should be but one opinion about judge-made law. If the constitutions, federal and state, do not condemn legislation, the court that assumes to do so oversteps its bounds.

Mayor Johnson, of Cleveland, appears to be having a lively time in his efforts to manage the city affairs in accordance with his public pledges. He runs up against powerful special interests at every turn. But the difficulties are not all on one side. It doubtless surprises these interests much more to be run up against than it disturbs the mayor to run up against them. They are not accustomed to that official indifference to their finer feelings which they now experience. The Pennsylvania railroad, for instance, claims a right superior to the city over all streets crossing its right of way in the city which have been laid out since its right of way was granted. "Former mayors," said the lawyer for the road to Mayor Johnson, "have given us a wrestle on this question, but they have always laid down;" to which Mayor Johnson replied: "Well, I'll give you a wrestle, and I promise you I won't lay down until the highest authority says I must." It is in connection with the taxation question, however, that the Cleveland mayor comes in contact with the most subtle powers of vested privilege.

Mr. Johnson's first battle in his tax war he appeared for a few days to have lost. But he won in the end. In order to provide for street lighting, street cleaning and certain other items of important expenditure, including the cost of maintaining his bureau of tax investigation, the mayor proposed to borrow temporarily for those funds \$160,200 from the city hall building fund. He promised to

make the amount good out of increased revenues, which should be secured not by adding to the burdens of small taxpayers, but by greater fairness in taxation. In this proposition he was seconded by Councilman Howe, a republican, who introduced in the council an ordinance for the purpose. The ordinance went to a committee which, by a vote of 4 to 1, refused to recommend its passage. That tied it up unless a three-fourths vote in the council could be secured to pass it under suspension of the rules. The committee intended to protect tax dodgers. One member frankly gave as the reason for its adverse report its opposition to the mayor's tax reform ideas. What these ideas are the mayor himself had explained to the council. He promised with part of the proposed appropriation to secure an equitable distribution of taxes, "so that the rich man who is paying on about ten per cent. of the value of his property may be raised to his full share, and the poor man who is paying on an 80 per cent. basis may get justice." The report of the council committee, virtually against this reform, would not have obstructed its progress. For, referring to the item of \$7,000 which he required for that purpose, the mayor said to the council: "Strike out that item, if you wish, but I want to say to you right now that if you do, the work will nevertheless be done and it will be paid for." But the mayor won his point in spite of the committee. After a little preliminary sparring in the council on the 6th, he gained a parliamentary advantage out of which he got the three-fourths vote he needed, and the entire appropriation he had asked for was granted.

Mayor Johnson had not waited for this appropriation. He went on with his tax investigation at his own expense. We have already told of his appointment of Peter Witt to gather the data necessary to expose the inequalities of tax valuations in Cleveland. He selected in addition an expert accountant, William L.

Torrance, to manage a tax information bureau, to which complaints of unfair taxation will be made and by which they will be investigated. He also employed Prof. E. W. Bemis, the well-known expert, to investigate the subject of taxation on railway rights of way in Ohio cities. Meanwhile Mr. Witt's work had progressed so far that the mayor was able to deliver an illustrated lecture on local taxation to the state and the city equalization boards. It proved to be an eye opener, and the equalizers who had come fully assured that Cleveland valuations were equitable went away convinced that those at least of the Second ward, the subject of the lecture, were surprisingly unjust. At the end of the illustrated lecture the mayor gave to these boards an indication of his fiscal policy. "Take the Lake Shore railroad," said he; "it is paying on less than \$500,000 in Cleveland, and it should pay on at least \$15,000,000. The railroads owning property in this city should pay on \$75,000,000 more than they do pay on; and what I want to know is, if I show you people that this is true will you place this property against them on the duplicate?" One of the equalizers promptly replied in the affirmative, but thought the state auditors would take it off, or if not that the railroads would enjoin the collection. "That's all right," the mayor responded; "that will take us into court, and I want to say that I am positive that if the matter is presented to the supreme court in the right light the city is bound to win."

It is no part of Mayor Johnson's policy, however, to stop with taxing the railroads in fair proportion. There is in Cleveland a local bi-partisan board of equalization, and, according to the Cleveland Plain Dealer, every member will soon be—in consequence of expirations of terms and promotions of present members—"a Johnson democrat or a Johnson republican." As this board, though it cannot raise or lower the aggregate of the tax duplicate, can shift valua-

tions from ward to ward, lowering excessive valuations and increasing undervaluations, it is not difficult to surmise the ultimate uses of the two tax bureaus which the mayor has put under the charge respectively of Witt and Torrance. The council committee mentioned above did surmise.

In the remarks on the need of prudence, in the first of the speeches of the touring president, may be detected a certain nervousness—the uneasy consciousness that the "McKinley prosperity" is mainly a paper prosperity, a marking up of values in hysterical Wall street, a thimble-rigging of watered stocks in trust combinations—just as the "glory" of the acquisition of the Philippines and Cuba by combined force and fraud is in reality a national infamy and degradation. It is true that everything seems to be coming the president's way: the boom in stock gambling (now under suspicion), the capture of Aguinaldo, the apparent acquiescence of the country in the appalling breach of the national word to Cuba with the apparent acceptance of the situation by Cuba itself, and the apparent enthusiasm of the old slaveholding south in the triumph of the old southern filibustering in Cuba. But Mr. McKinley has seen apparent triumphs turn to dead sea apples on his lips before, and his temperamental nervousness was fully justified when the triumph of the McKinley bill was immediately followed by a democratic clean sweep of the house of representatives. Who can say what might not be the outcome in national politics of the bursting of the overblown bubble in Wall street? The collapse of the overblown bubble of colonial commercialism would soon follow, and the reaction of the popular mind would demand retribution from those who have so grossly betrayed the national honor and well being.

At least two grave and specific violations of the law, besides his general violation of the spirit of our institutions, lie at President McKinley's

door, that might be made the basis of an indictment to be answered at the bar of the high court provided for the impeachment and trial of presidential misdemeanants. The first of these high offenses was his declaration of war upon the Philippine islands, in his proclamation of December 21, 1898, usurping therein the right exclusively belonging to congress to make war. Senator Towne, in his great speech of January 28, in the United States senate, described this offense better than it has been presented before:

When the president of the United States, their (Filipinos') ally in the operations against Spain, having negotiated at Paris a treaty, not yet in force, which assumed to dispose of their country, . . . solemnly announces by proclamation to the world . . . that the military government of the United States is to be extended with all possible dispatch to the whole of the ceded territory; and that all persons refusing to submit to this assumption of power are to be brought beneath it "with firmness if need be"—in short, that we propose to take the islands for ourselves and to shoot everybody that refuses to acquiesce in the arrangement—has he not in effect declared war against the supporters of the Filipino republic? If this is so, what becomes of the war power specifically reposed by the constitution of the United States in congress alone? It cannot be said that the president was by this act repelling invasion. . . . Nor can it be claimed that he was suppressing insurrection. . . . There had been no insurrection and his proclamation alleges none, nor could there be among those who owed us no allegiance. The treaty had not been ratified. . . . The high contracting parties had not yet formally struck the bargain. . . . The blood money had not yet been paid. The Filipinos were their own men, at least till the ratification of the treaty. They were not rebels when it was written. They were not rebels when it was published.

Senator Towne refrained at the time from pushing this indictment of President McKinley any further, but he did ask what use it was to inquire who fired the first shot after that proclamation, and did remark that nothing like proper attention had been given to this breaking of the faith of the nation plighted in the protocol by the issuance of the proclamation of Decem-

ber 21, 1898. There may be an efficient attention paid to it in the house of representatives of the next congress. Then there is the other count in the indictment. A treaty ratified is the law of the land as much as any statute. As Mr. Bryan has pointed out in the Commoner, the Paris treaty recognizes the independence of Cuba and we have no more right to deprive her of that independence than we have to march to Mexico and assert our sovereignty there. What duty would lie at the doors of a new house of representatives, elected to reverse the high-handed course of the McKinley administration, clearer than to press charges based on these two main violations of law.

Impeachment is a harsh and repellant business, and public opinion instinctively recoils from any assault upon the head of the state or impairment of its dignity and powers. There have been only seven impeachments altogether in the history of our government, and in only two of these cases, both of minor officials, was a verdict of guilty given; but our system provides no other means of changing rulers except at the end of a presidential term. In the English system, where the chief magistrate reigns but does not govern, a change of policy can be effected by a vote of the lower house of parliament, followed by the resignation of the ministry in power. Our way is to suffer until the full end of the presidential term, under a president, it may be, who does not represent the whole people as a king does, nor more than half, and yet is driving them on to what they consider destruction and dishonor. Moreover, this irremovable ruler is the head of a party and may strengthen himself by rewarding its friends and punishing its enemies while pursuing an odious policy. As Mr. Towne pointed out:

The vast patronage of the presidency, to be almost immeasurably increased, should this policy be persevered in, by army and navy appointments and by places in the colonial

administrations, taken in connection with the fact, whose significance in many ways has not, I think, been fully appreciated, that in our political system the president is the head of a great party organization, which when in power is bent on increasing its means of self-perpetuation, and whose congressional and senatorial members are by their very relation toward the executive converted into abettors rather than critics of executive usurpation, makes the danger I am pointing out a very real one and a constantly increasing one. . . . A president cannot be at one and the same time a constitutional chief magistrate and an autocrat, and president in America with imperial powers in the orient.

This situation Mr. Towne set forth to exhibit the central vice of the whole theory of colonies and dependencies, namely, that in the secrecy, swiftness and independence in which the central control must act, it inevitably aggrandizes the executive. The pendulum seems still to be on the swing towards the aggrandizement of the executive. Is there anything more important before the country than to give it the most violent resistance, even if we should drive it to the other extreme of impeaching this self-aggrandizing executive? Is it not worth even the turmoil that the attempt would produce if out of these nettles the country should pluck the flower of safety?

Much is made in some quarters of the increase in the value of stocks as indicating prosperity. In this connection a comparative table has been published, showing an enormous increase in certain railroad shares since 1897. We reproduce the table:

	1897.	1901.
Atchison	10½	82¾
Atchison pfd.....	19½	104½
Baltimore & Ohio.....	12	109
Chicago, Burlington & Quincy	74¼	198
Chicago & Northwestern.....	104½	207¼
Chicago, Milwaukee & St. Paul	73½	185
Chicago, Milwaukee & St. Paul pfd.....	131¼	198½
Chicago, Rock Island & Pacific	63	164
Missouri Pacific.....	14	114½
New York Central.....	99½	162
Northern Pacific	12¼	110
Union Pacific.....	5¼	122¼

From this table it is argued that the

country is more prosperous in 1901 than it was in 1897. But how does the table show that? The enormous increase in values there exhibited does not in any important degree represent augmented wealth. It implies, not that locomotives, cars, station buildings, rails and other equipment have so enormously increased, but that the power of levying tolls has done so. The increase in the value of railroad shares is largely speculative, and is based almost entirely upon franchises.

The Commoner of May 3 furnishes additional proof that Mr. Bryan has dropped his gloves and gone into the political battle with naked fists. His story of the party treachery of 1893, whereby President Cleveland threw tariff reform to the wolves and forced the money issue, is a simple recital, but full of forcible suggestion. This article is an assurance, if any were needed, that the struggle of the "re-organizers" to place the democratic party once more under the control of its plutocratic manipulators, will not succeed without a fight to the finish. The issue of the 10th gives further and still stronger assurances to the same effect.

A successful burlesque of a burlesque is commonly regarded as a literary impossibility; but a contributor to the Chicago Tribune has accomplished it in his series of "Bilious-tine" skits on the "Philistine."

Lyman Abbott's equipment, or lack of it, for writing on "The Rights of Man," as he is now doing serially in the Outlook, is sufficiently indicated by his attack upon the theory of self-government, or "government by consent of the governed." This is his epitome of that theory: "In a state of nature every man was free; by a covenant with one another men agreed to surrender this freedom for the greater advantages of government; and this covenant and surrender constitute the foundation of government." Mr. Abbott mistakes

an antiquated and obsolete argument in support of the theory for the theory itself.

TRIAL BY JURY.

Several months ago a boy was kidnaped at Omaha by unknown men. They blindfolded him, put him in a carriage which they drove many miles now in one direction and now in another to confuse him, imprisoned him in a house subsequently discovered to be in the suburbs of Omaha, and finally extorted from his father, a very wealthy man, a large sum of money under anonymous threats of burning out the boy's eyes with acids. After submitting to the extortion and thereby releasing his son, the father offered a rich reward for the conviction of the dastardly criminals.

Stimulated by that reward, the police produced a man named Callahan whom they charged with the crime. The man was identified by the boy as one of his kidnapers, the identification being made, however, by recognition of the prisoner's voice, for the boy had not seen either of his captors. A few days ago the case was tried. What influenced the jury in arriving at its verdict no outsider is competent to say. It is reported to have suspected detectives of manufacturing a case to get the reward. However that may be, it presumably weighed all the facts before it and decided conscientiously. At any rate no substantial charge of incapacity or corruption has been made against the men who composed it. It returned a verdict of "not guilty."

Now, in accordance with the Anglo-Saxon idea of trial by jury that verdict made a complete legal determination of the matter. In the eye of the law the prisoner was innocent; and whether in fact he was innocent or guilty, the judge had no other duty to perform than to order his discharge.

If, in doing that, the judge took occasion to reflect upon the wisdom of the verdict, he offended against judicial decorum quite as much as a juror would have done had he, during the progress of the trial, openly criticised a ruling of the judge upon a question of law. But the judge in this Omaha kidnaping case, unmindful of the proprieties of the place and the occasion,

forgetting that a judge is not the court and may by disorderly conduct or language be guilty of contempt none the less because there is no one to punish him when he fails to hold himself in restraint—this judge, officiously and in manifest contempt of court, addressed the following language to the jury, a functionary of the court, which, within its sphere of action, namely, authority to adjudge the facts in the case, was his judicial superior and entitled to his respect:

If Callahan had made his own choice of a jury he could not have selected 12 men who could have served him more faithfully. If the state had made the selection, I know of no men it could have named who could have been less careful of its interests. The jury is discharged without the compliments of the court and the prisoner is likewise released, as to this trial, I presume to continue the criminal practices in which you have failed to check him. I do not know what motive actuated you in reaching this decision, but I hope none of you will ever again appear in this jury box.

That insult to the jury was worse than contempt of court. It was worse than a breach of judicial decorum. It was a crime against republican government. For it was calculated, by intimidating jurors, to undermine the independence of juries and destroy the integrity of the system of jury trial. And the worst of it all is that this instance is only one among many that indicate a disposition on the part of judges generally to reduce trial by jury to an empty form with only a curious historical meaning.

This disposition, or rather, this tendency, for it has really come to that, is so dangerous to individual liberty as to demand some serious elementary consideration of the subject of jury trial.

In their Anglo-Saxon origin, juries were composed of witnesses. They testified under oath to the innocence or guilt of the person accused, whom they personally knew and of whose alleged offense they had either personal or hearsay and inferential knowledge. The idea was that a man's guilt should be adjudged by his neighbors, who might be presumed to know all about him and it. And so by their testimony, formulated into a verdict, they acquitted or convicted.

But in the course of time this idea of the jury was reversed in its formal aspects. Instead of empanelling jurors who know most about a case, we now select those that know least. This is so, at any rate, in cities. In the country, jurors are still made up of men familiar with the general setting of the cases they try. That difference would naturally exist, because jurors are still drawn from the vicinity, from the neighborhood, and in cities "the neighborhood" may be an unknown country to its own inhabitants, whereas in the country, "neighborhood" still has a meaning. But the theory that jurors should be familiar with their cases and render verdicts upon their own knowledge of the facts was long since displaced by the theory now prevailing that juries should decide cases, not upon the basis of their own knowledge, but in accordance with their judgment of the testimony of witnesses who appear before them.

In measuring the value of trial by jury, it is customary to glance down the line of this historical evolution, and draw conclusions solely from that source. But like all sociological conclusions resting upon the historical basis alone, these are quite unsatisfactory. Students who adopt them assume too readily that historical evolution is right evolution. When, therefore, they observe that the jury has passed from the stage of witnesses to familiar facts, on to the stage of judges of unfamiliar facts, and observe a growing general tendency toward expertism, they incline to the conclusion that in the progress of historical evolution, the jury must, and because it must therefore it ought to, give way to judicial experts.

But this is not the true function of history. As the man who from being a moderate drinker had become a drunkard would be a fool to conclude that he must, and therefore ought to, go on with his historical evolution to delirium tremens and a drunkard's grave, so society would be guilty of the greatest folly to infer that it must, and therefore ought to, keep on in a certain direction merely because that direction is historical. The true function of history is not to confirm us in evil courses; it is to warn us away from them. Though experience (and that is all that history is) be a good teacher,

it is not necessarily either a good or an inevitable master. Society is, indeed, an organism. By the action and reaction of individual minds, from greatest to least, a distinct social force is generated. But this force was not set in motion years ago in one direction irrevocably. The historic impulses are always subject to the influence of present conceptions of moral right and wrong. And these, if rationally applied, may divert or even reverse the course of history, instead of promoting further evolution along the old pathway.

With the question of jury trial, then, the real point is not whether it is historically evolving into a system of trial by judicial experts, but whether the people should allow it to so evolve—that is, whether they should regard trial by experts as right, whether they should regard it as tending to increase or diminish individual liberty.

In thus making individual liberty the test of morality, we do so advisedly. We are unable to conceive of any test of moral right and wrong more fundamental than that of the relations of man to man. He who said that "slavery is the sum of all villainies" was right. Immorality as between man and man consists in the imposition of one man's will upon another. Conversely, morality consists in practical recognition of the complete liberty of each, limited only by the equal liberty of all. Assuming this liberty to be the desideratum, what relation to it does the existing system of jury trial bear—the system, that is to say, which makes the jury the absolute judge in criminal cases?

In his treatise on the American constitution, Judge Story described trial by jury in criminal cases (book 3, chapter 38) as "essential to political and civil liberty." Similar quotations from men whose names Americans ought to honor might be made. But the opinion of any man, however wise and good, is after all only an opinion. It is entitled to no weight as authority. It does not decide. Such opinions, however, are entitled to profound respect and candid consideration. It is by weighing them, in an earnest search for essential truth, rather than by surrendering mind and

conscience to the demands of historical evolution, that civilization has been promoted.

One of the most thoughtful of these opinions is that of Alexis de Tocqueville, the earliest foreign observer of American institutions. It derives added value from the fact that as a Frenchman his observations of the jury system were uninfluenced by favorable prejudice. He came to a consideration of the subject much as a philosophical historian approaches the consideration of an obsolete institution. Anglo-Saxons might claim too much for this palladium of their liberties. A Frenchman of the early part of the century could regard it with unbiased mind. And that is what De Tocqueville seems to have done.

He considered the jury system only with reference to its political, and not to its judicial, influences, since his general subject was not the judicial but the political aspects of American life. And this makes his observations the more important, for it is as a political institution that the jury system now demands attention in consequence of the tendency of judges to usurp its functions.

De Tocqueville said (vol. 2 of "Democracy of America," chapter 4):

To look upon the jury as a mere judicial institution, is to confine our attention to a very narrow view of it; for, however great its influence may be upon the decision of the law courts, that influence is very subordinate to the powerful effects which it produces on the destinies of the community at large. The jury is above all a political institution, and it must be regarded in this light to be duly appreciated.

By the jury I mean a certain number of citizens chosen indiscriminately, and invested with a temporary right of judging. Trial by jury, as applied to the repression of crime, appears to me to introduce an eminently republican element into the government, upon the following grounds:

The institution of the jury may be aristocratic or democratic, according to the class of society from which the jurors are selected; but it always preserves its republican character, inasmuch as it places the real direction of society in the hands of the governed, or of a portion of the governed, instead of leaving it under the authority of the government. Force is never more than a transient element of success; and after force comes the notion of right. A gov-

ernment which should only be able to crush its enemies upon a field of battle would very soon be destroyed. The true sanction of political laws is to be found in penal legislation, and if that sanction be wanting, the law will sooner or later lose its cogency. He who punishes infractions of the law is therefore the real master of society. Now the institution of the jury raises the people itself, or at least a class of citizens, to the bench of judicial authority. The institution of the jury consequently invests the people, or that class of citizens, with the direction of society.

In England the jury is returned from the aristocratic portion of the nation; the aristocracy makes the laws, applies the laws, and punishes all infractions of the laws; everything is established upon a consistent footing, and England may with truth be said to constitute an aristocratic republic. In the United States the same system is applied to the whole people. Every American citizen is qualified to be an elector, a juror, and is eligible to office. The system of the jury, as it is understood in America, appears to me to be as direct and as extreme a consequence of the sovereignty of the people as universal suffrage. The institutions are two instruments of equal power, which contribute to the supremacy of the majority. All the sovereigns who have chosen to govern by their own authority and to direct society instead of obeying its direction, have destroyed or enfeebled the institution of the jury. The monarchs of the house of Tudor sent to prison jurors who refused to convict, and Napoleon caused them to be returned by his agents. . . . The jury is preeminently a political institution; it must be regarded as one form of the sovereignty of the people; when that sovereignty is repudiated, it must be rejected; or it must be adapted to the laws by which that sovereignty is established. The jury is that part of the nation to which the execution of the laws is entrusted, as the houses of parliament constitute that part of the nation which makes the laws; and in order that society may be governed with consistency and uniformity, the list of citizens qualified to serve on juries must increase and diminish with the list of electors.

These comments of the great Frenchman might be very much expanded, but to them nothing could be added. The whole argument for the jury system as a political force is there. And it admits of no possible refutation which does not proceed from a denial of the right and wisdom of government by the people.

Popular government being conceded, it follows that criminal cases must be tried by juries drawn from the masses of the people, and that the verdict of the jury in such cases must be absolute. For as De Tocqueville truly says: "He who punishes infractions of the law, is therefore the real master of society."

Those who oppose the system of jury trial would have accused persons tried by judges, by experts in the law, who are skilled in unraveling tangled evidence. And this is what such conduct as that of the Omaha judge quoted above tends to. It is the tendency of all the rebuking of jurymen which judges are now, almost as with one accord, indulging, from the judge who officiously probes the general opinions of jurors at the beginning of the term, and dismisses them, sometimes insolently, if he doesn't like their point of view, to those who, like the Omaha judge, chastise the juries that acquit prisoners whom the judge would have convicted. Whatever may be the purpose, the manifest effect is to intimidate jurors, thereby making them responsive to significant words and shoulder shrugs from the bench, and constituting the judge a thirteenth juror, with the independence, the intelligence and the conscience of the other twelve wrapped in the folds of his silken gown. It is to reduce the jury system to a barren formality, and for juries drawn from the people to substitute an autocratic bench of experts.

There is about the idea of trial by experts something extremely plausible. It is suggestive of getting a shoemaker to make your shoes, a watchmaker to mend your time piece, or a farmer to raise your grain. Why not a judge to try your criminals?

But the analogy doesn't hold. Men learned in the law and skillful in twisting and turning through the mazes of legal principles and conflicting testimony, are no more expert than laymen at drawing common sense conclusions. Judge McAdam, of New York, being short of a jury panel once, drew a panel from the bystanders, all lawyers—all experts. This was by common consent, of course, the lawyers

agreeing for the sensation of the thing. But that jury disagreed! Decisions of questions of fact by judges, even when there is only one judge and consequently no disagreement, are no more satisfactory than verdicts by jurors. On the whole they may be said to be less so. And as to medical experts, is not the community justly tired of their jarring opinions? The truth is that there is something unbalancing about expert qualifications, when they are brought into common or general relationships.

So far as the judicial function is concerned, no better way of deciding questions of fact has been discovered than that of trial by jury. Under this system the expert is put in his proper place. If a mechanical question is involved, experts inform the jury as to the mechanical technicalities necessary for it to know. If a chemical question, chemists perform that office. So with the whole range of technical knowledge, including the law of the case, about which the jury is advised by the legal experts on the bench. When thus informed and in possession of the facts in the case, the chances are vastly greater that a jury of twelve intelligent men will marshal those facts in a common-sense way and reach a just conclusion than that any of the experts would.

Juries are sometimes corrupt and they sometimes make mistakes. But the innocent prisoner has better guarantees of acquittal at the hands of a jury, than at the hands of a judge expert in the work of "railroading" criminals; and the guilty man has but little better chance of escape. Though juries do make mistakes in deciding questions of fact, it is hardly conceivable that they make as many as it appears from the law reports that judges make in deciding questions of law; and though they be occasionally corrupt, neither are judges always immaculate. There are few lawyers of large experience who will not concede that as a rule, even when they seem to be mistaken, juries get at substantial justice.

But the judicial function of juries is not the important one. As De Tocqueville says, the jury's function as a judge in particular cases is subordinate to its func-

tion as a political institution. In the nature of things in criminal cases, if the jury decides at all it must decide both fact and law. Legal experts may advise, but the jury must decide. So long, therefore, as the independence of the jury can be preserved, individual liberty cannot be quite destroyed. All other free institutions might go, even the suffrage might be restricted to the very rich or the highly educated, yet, if the penal law were administered by independent juries drawn from the body of the people, the grosser forms of tyranny would still be held in check.

That explains the tendency to minimize the function of juries. With the jury system out of the way or become a mere form, and experts invested with power to punish infractions of the law, our government would go on developing into a government by experts until it had reached the inevitable climax, government by a single expert born to his place and specially educated to his function—the government of a tsar.

Whoever will stop this tendency will be a benefactor. Some exceptionally courageous juror may yet volunteer for that duty. If, when a judge in some other case berates the jury after the manner of the Omaha judge, a member of the jury will rebuke him, the man who does so will have performed a most valuable public service. It should not be done pertly, nor lightly, nor rashly; but in self-respectful manner, seriously, earnestly, decisively, and with confidence in his rights as a juror and consciousness of his imperative duty as a citizen of asserting those rights.

Such a protest might call out an apology from the bench, for doubtless many judges offend in this way thoughtlessly, and that apology would not be without beneficial influence. At the worst, the protest could only provoke proceedings for contempt of court, and in these proceedings the juror's contempt in protesting against judicial outrage would be a minor issue in comparison with the judge's contempt in disturbing the course of justice in his court by intimidating jurors.

Unless jurors do assert themselves

by insisting upon a due recognition from the bench of their rights and dignity, the process of reducing juries to a place in which they will perfunctorily record the decisions of judges will go on apace; and judges, having usurped the functions of juries, will become the real masters of society.

NEWS

Last week's report of President McKinley's continental tour left the presidential party at New Orleans, where they arrived on the 1st and were ceremoniously received. On the 2d the speeches were made. The president spoke several times, but, as reported by the Chicago Tribune, the leading administration organ of the west, the only one of his speeches that went beyond local allusions was that which he made to the colored students of the Southern university, in which he said:

What you want is to get education, and with it you want good character, and with these you want unflinching industry, and if you have these three things you will have success anywhere and everywhere.

In the evening of the same day the presidential party left New Orleans for Houston. They were met at Houston by the governor of Texas, who had come down from Austin for the purpose. One speech by the president was made here, but its allusions were wholly local. At Prairie View, on the way from Houston to Austin, the president addressed the students of the colored normal and industrial school, which is situated there. In that speech he told the colored people how to succeed. We quote, as before, from the Chicago Tribune:

What we want more than anything else, whether we be white, or whether we be black, what we want is to know how to do a something well. If you will just learn how to do one thing that is useful better than anybody else can do that one thing you will never be out of a job, and all employment is honorable employment.

This was the most important part, and, indeed, the substance, of his speech. Late in the afternoon of the 3d the party arrived at Austin, the capital of the state, where they had an enthusiastic reception. No speeches are reported, though the president made one at the capitol. They resumed their journey the same evening, and on the 4th the presi-

dent spoke at San Antonio. His speech, as reported by the Chicago Tribune, was composed exclusively of local allusions and compliments. El Paso, on the Mexican frontier, was reached on the 5th. It had been intended to have the presidents of the neighboring republics meet upon the border at this point; but President Diaz was unable to leave the Mexican capital, the Mexican congress being now in session. A complimentary address from President Diaz was, however, presented to President McKinley, who returned a complimentary reply. On the 6th further congratulations were extended to Mr. McKinley by the Mexican general, Hernandez. The former responded with a public speech in which his allusions were of wider general interest than in any previous one. We quote from the same paper as before, omitting only the local or merely complimentary parts:

I am glad to know that this city believes in expansion; that it has been doing a great deal of it itself in the last four years; that it has more than doubled its population in the last half of the present decade, and given promise of still greater advancement and prosperity in the decade now at hand. . . . My fellow-citizens, if there ever was any doubt about ours being a united people, if you could have traveled with me 2,800 miles from the capitol at Washington to the city of El Paso that doubt would have been completely dispelled. There never was such unity in the United States as there is at this hour. There never was so much for a nation of 75,000,000 of people to be proud of as at this hour. We have sent our army and our navy to distant seas, and they have only added glory to our flag. They have brought no shame upon the American name. We have sent them to China to rescue our beleaguered representatives, and they did the work and did it magnificently, with the approval of the civilized world. But it is not in the art of war that we take our greatest pride. We are not a warlike people. We are not a military people. We never go to war unless we have to make peace. Our pride is in the arts of peace, in material and intellectual development, in the growth of our country, in the advancement of our people in civilization, in the arts, in the sciences, and in manufactures. This is the great pride of the American people. Here we are on the border line between the United States and another great republic, and on this side of the line we have 35 American soldiers and on that side of the line there are less than 150 Mexican sol-

diers. So that we are dwelling in peace and amity, causing "peace on earth and good will to men." We want to settle our differences, if we ever have any, with any of the powers of the world by arbitration. We want to exhaust every peaceable means for settlement before we go to war. And while we have authority to raise 100,000 troops, the necessity does not exist for that number, and we do not propose to raise but 75,000. So don't be alarmed about militarism or imperialism. We know no imperialism in the United States except the imperialism of a sovereign people.

At Deming, on the 6th, the presidential party was welcomed by the governor of New Mexico. Both at Deming and at Phoenix the president made speeches; but as they are not telegraphed they were presumably local in their references. After a ride of nearly three days across the desert, the president and his party arrived on the 8th in Los Angeles. He had been met by the governor of California at Redlands, and from that point to Los Angeles the party was welcomed at every station with floral displays. The president's speech at Los Angeles on the 8th in response to that of the governor was local and complimentary except when he said:

This republic never can fail so long as the citizen is vigilant. But our triumphs are not the triumphs of war. Our triumphs are those of a free, self-governing people looking to the development and upbuilding and extension of liberty to all humanity. We have problems on our hands, but the American people never ran away from difficult questions or from a well defined duty. We will meet those problems in the fear of God and will carry and maintain the blessings of liberty wherever our glorious banner floats.

While the president and his party journey over the country the Wall street barometer of prosperity plays eccentric pranks. The 3d and 8th are reported as unhappy days in that run-way of financial bulls and bears and lambs. There was a great slump in the price of stocks on the 3d, and many a confiding investor was divested not only of the profits he had hoped for, but also of the savings he had risked. The number of shares traded in mounted up to 3,000,000. For the week it rose to 15,567,062, of the par value of \$1,546,706,200, besides \$41,119,000 of bonds. On the 8th the condition was worse. Speculative values fell with a thud. The

shrinkage in 28 leading stocks in that one day, as compared with the closing prices of the day before amounted to \$146,668,646. By observers of reputation for shrewdness these slumps are regarded as preliminary warnings of the business paralysis in which prosperity of the speculative kind inevitably culminates. Two days before the public had any inkling of the first premonitory break, Russell Sage was reported as saying that—

Another "Black Friday" is pending. It will be the worst our financial world has ever known. Anyone who knows the value of stocks and studies the prices at which many of them are selling to-day cannot fail to realize this. When the drop sets in and the public have had their fill the consequences will be awful. It may mean ruin for thousands. I don't think this is very far away, either.

Meantime the consolidation of industrial interests into gigantic trusts goes on under the general direction of Mr. Pierpont Morgan. To the steel trust, the coal mine combination and the railroad terminal combination Mr. Morgan is now adding, as noted last week, an ocean steamship terminal combination. Besides the Leyland line, the purchase of which by Morgan was noted last week (p. 56), Mr. Morgan is reported to have now acquired the International Navigation company, which operates the New York and Southampton line and the Red Star line. The ocean terminals which these lines control would give the syndicate complete command of the ocean freight carrying service. The sale of the Leyland line was confirmed without opposition at a meeting of the shareholders at London on the 7th. The agreement gives them an option until May 25 to remain in the company or to sell their shares at a stipulated price. Of the other purchases the reports are still unconfirmed, and that regarding the Red Star line is denied.

To the public of Great Britain these reported acquisitions by American trust mongers, of the British merchant marine are disturbing, but not nearly so much so as the revolutionary action of parliament in putting an export duty on coal. Two weeks ago (p. 41) we reported the adoption of this duty by a vote of 171 to 127, but that appears to have been a cable error. The duty was not adopted un-

til the 6th. After an acrimonious debate, in which party lines were broken, the duty was on that day imposed by a vote of 333 to 227. It is 25 cents a ton on all coal exported from Great Britain. This is a radical departure from the traditional fiscal policy of the British government. Not since the repeal of the corn laws and the acceptance of free trade principles—more than half a century ago—has the British parliament adopted taxes obstructive to trade until now. In this departure the ministers have been spurred on by the necessity of meeting the obligations incurred and to be incurred by the Boer war.

The British coal interests, both employers and workmen, were greatly wrought up over the proposed export duty on their product, and a meeting of the council of the Miners' Federation was called. It convened on the 7th in secret session and considered the expediency of a general strike. Being divided on this question it adjourned until the 8th, when it decided that inasmuch as the British ministry aver that the export tax on coal will be paid by foreign purchasers no strike should be ordered; but that if a reduction of wages results the conference will be reconvened to consider the strike question. At a meeting of the Mine Owners' association on the same day a resolution was adopted condemning the coal tax.

Prussia is in political commotion over a different phase of the obstruction to trade question. The landlord and protectionist interests of that kingdom, represented by the agrarian party, have again (vol. 2, No. 73, p. 9) defeated the German emperor's cherished project of a canal system connecting the Rhine with the Elbe. They oppose the project because they fear that by opening Germany to the introduction of foreign grain it would destroy the German home market and reduce German agricultural rents. In consequence of the success of the agrarians in committee on this canal project, the Prussian diet was dissolved on the 3d by royal message, the chancellor, Count von Buelow, explaining that "as the government is convinced, in view of the course taken in committee, that an agreement on the canal bill is at present out of the question, it does not wish to offer any aid in a continuance of fruitless discussions." The finance minister, Dr. von Miquel, resigned. It is reported

that he did so at the royal request. Other ministerial resignations are said to have been similarly requested. A new ministry has been formed, and there are expectations of a dissolution of the diet and general Prussian elections at an early day.

Another ministerial crisis furnishes part of the political news of the week. It has occurred in Japan, and closely follows a similar cabinet break-up in that country. Last fall (vol. 3, p. 409) Count Yamagata, then the Japanese premier, resigned along with the rest of his cabinet. The mikado thereupon commissioned Marquis Ito, of Japan-Chinese war fame, to form a new cabinet. Ito succeeded in doing so. But now he and his ministry have been obliged to resign. All the ministers except Vatanabe or Watanase, the minister of finance, handed in their resignations on the 2d. The crisis was reached over a cabinet dispute with the finance minister, the nature of which is not clearly reported. It relates, however, to his neglect to provide for carrying on projected public works. Count Yamagata, whom Ito succeeded, has been invited to form a new cabinet.

The foreign occupation of China, so far as the United States is concerned, was relinquished on the 5th, when the American troops withdrew from Peking and proceeded to Taku, where they are to embark upon transports.

Since the reports as to the amount of Chinese indemnity agreed upon by the foreign allies were given out from Washington three weeks ago (p. 25), the foreign ministers in Peking have come to an agreement which raises the amount claimed at that time by more than \$11,000,000. This decision of the ministers was made on the 8th. They then addressed a collective note to the Chinese government informing it that a joint indemnity of 450,000,000 taels (about \$326,250,000) would be demanded, and asking what method of payment the Chinese government proposes. On the same day Li Hung Chang gave out a proposition from the Chinese court offering to the foreign allies the control of the Chinese salt monopoly. From this and other sources it is estimated that an annual income of about \$2,000,000 could be derived; and the court indicates its willingness to raise a foreign loan at four per

cent., running 50 years, to be secured by a pledge of those sources of income.

We have come now in this news tour of the world for the current week to the Philippines, where the United States government is struggling to establish its sovereignty over alien subjects. Gen. MacArthur reported on the 1st that with the surrender in Iloilo of Quentin Sales, April 21st, "all organized opposition in that island is ended." Some kind of civil government was reported on the 3d to have been established in Manila, but what kind is not clear, for the same report explains that the American commission is unwilling at present to permit the experiment of elections there, "although they have been authorized in all other municipalities." The board of health has taken a census of Manila and finds the population to be 244,732. It is classified as follows: Americans, 8,642; Filipinos, 181,360; Chinese, 51,567; Spaniards, 2,383; other foreigners, 960. We take the figures from the Chicago Tribune of May 4, in which the discrepancy between the total of 244,732 and the aggregate of the classes is as above. Other papers give the same general total, but do not give the class totals.

American casualties in the Philippines since July 1, 1898, inclusive of the current official reports given out in detail at Washington to May 8, 1901, are as follows:

Deaths to May 16, 1900 (see vol. iii., page 91).....	1,847
Killed reported from May 16, 1900, to the date of the presidential election, November 6, 1900	100
Deaths from wounds, disease and accident, same period.....	468
<hr/>	
Total deaths to presidential election	2,415
Killed reported since presidential election.....	37
Deaths from wounds, disease and accident, same period.....	220
<hr/>	
Total deaths.....	2,672
Wounded since July 1, 1898.....	2,433
<hr/>	
Total casualties since July, '98..	5,105
Total casualties to last report..	5,095
Total deaths to last report.....	2,671
Total wounded to last report....	2,424

The Cuban commissioners, who sailed from New York for home on the 1st, arrived at Havana on the 5th,

and presented their report to the convention on the 7th. As this was done at a secret session of the convention, the character of their report is not positively known, but dispatches from Havana credit it with assuring the convention that—

President McKinley said the right of intervention authorized by the Platt amendment would be limited to the following cases: 1. In case of an attack on Cuba by a foreign power. 2. If a state of anarchy exists in Cuba the United States is to intervene and restore order.

NEWS NOTES.

—The National Municipal league met at Rochester on the 5th.

—According to the British census recently taken, the population of London is 4,536,034.

—The American minister to China, Mr. Conger, was given a public reception at Des Moines on the 3d, upon his return to Iowa.

—Against a strong protest from Harvard graduates Harvard university has decided to confer upon President McKinley the degree of LL. D.

—The Illinois Central railroad has made a horizontal increase of five per cent. in the wages of its shop employes. The road has also adopted a pension system.

—The San Francisco Star reports three municipal elections recently in New Zealand at which the single tax was adopted for local purposes, namely, Sydenham, by a vote of 353 to 163; Onslow, 140 to 8; and Grey Linn, 140 to 71.

—Charles G. Seymour, one of the best known newspaper men in Chicago, died of consumption at Los Angeles on the 8th. He was a brother of Horatio Seymour, the publisher of the Chronicle, who acquired a national reputation in the presidential campaign of 1892 by his free trade editorials in the Chicago Herald.

—The mandamus proceedings against the Illinois state board of equalization to compel that body to assess the value of the capital stock of Chicago corporations (vol. 2, No. 105, p. 2; vol. 3, pp. 426, 530, 548), which was instituted by the Teachers' federation, has been decided in their favor. Appeal has been taken to the supreme court.

—A terrible conflagration in Jacksonville, Fla., on the 3d destroyed \$15,000,000 worth of property and made 10,000 people homeless. It raged unchecked for nearly ten hours, sweeping a district 2½ miles long by half a mile wide, and consumed the principal hotels, the leading churches, the municipal buildings, scores of whole-

sale and retail business houses and acres of residences.

—The Bucklin report on the Australian system of taxation, made to the Colorado legislature, and on the basis of which the people of Colorado are to vote in 1902 upon the question of adopting local option in taxation, may be obtained free by any person upon addressing his congressman. The report is embodied in United States senate document No. 209, of the Fifty-sixth congress, second session.

—The monthly statement of the treasury department for April shows on hand April 30:

Gold reserve fund.....	\$150,000,000 00
Available cash balance.	156,494,208 49
<hr/>	
Total	\$306,494,208 49
On hand at close of last fiscal year, June 30,	1900
	\$305,705,654 78
<hr/>	
Increase	\$ 788,553 71

—There are reports from Spain of the conviction by drumhead court-martial, and the consequent shooting, of several labor strikers at Barcelona. From these and other occasional reports, Spain appears to be in a badly disordered condition, with strikes and riots prevailing and involving conflicts between citizens and troops; but martial law is in force, and the military censorship prevents the truth about the disturbances from becoming known.

MISCELLANY

FREEDOM TO COLUMBIA.

For The Public.

Said Freedom to Columbia: "There's blood upon your hands;
The flag that I have loved, now floats o'er subjugated lands—
Waves over weaker peoples you've humbled to the dust.
Oh, where is now the symbol I left with you in trust?
Oh, where is now the symbol I placed within your hand—
The sacred lamp of Liberty to light your favored land;
A lamp to guide all nations to lead them into peace—
To one great Brotherhood of Man where bitterness should cease?"

Said Freedom to Columbia: "My trust has been betrayed—
Sold for a dream of Empire. I see your hosts arrayed
To carry on the conquest. You glory in your might;
Forgotten are the early days, your struggle for the right.
Most favored of the nations, I built my hope on you.
A future lay before you far greater than you knew,
Grandeur than any empire the world has ever known—

The triumph of Democracy—mankind to manhood grown."

Said Freedom to Columbia: "Turn from your evil course.
No lasting good was e'er attained by the maled hand of force.
Turn, to the Constitution your first great children laid;
That early Declaration is a truth that cannot fade.
Turn to the path of honor, back to the way of peace;
Then shall thy hands be stainless, and this mad warfare cease.
Turn to the great uplifting of the people in thy land;
This is the greater conquest—most noble, and most grand."

ROBERT T. WHITELAW.

THE PRESIDENT'S VISIT TO NEW ORLEANS.

From the New Orleans Times-Democrat of May 5.

Nlle Orleans, 2 Mai, 1901.—Mon cher Sylvestre—Ah, bot thass a gret day fo' the creole, w'ich it mean that visite we receive f'om M'sieu' Mackinley an' hees gov'ment by the r-r-railroad, us, yes.

An' mon cher Sylvestre, I say to yo', if I was not r-r-rippublican befo', me, no, I am now convince' the bess thing fo' yo' an' me, is fo' tie ou'se'f to the pa'ty w'ich have a man lak that Mackinley fo' head boss, it, him, yes.

Yo' was not at that banquet, no, mon cher cousin, bot ou' family they was theh, in evidence, yes, an' the way that president laugh, yes, w'en those band they play those song, "Pauvre piti Mamselle Zizi," it do me good, yes. Bot at the sem time I mos' say, w'en I see w'at those menu, they fo'ce him fo' h'eat, him—oui, mon cousin, I mos' say, I bleev' w'en M'sieu' Mackinley finish that diner, he go'ne find the second verse of that song ver' true, him, an' then he see w'y we call Mamselle Zizi "Pauvre piti," us, her, yes.

An' the way M'sieu' Mackinley he poke the fon on those democrat w'ich they sit an' think he say good thing.—yes, mon cousin, the way those president show to those peeps they ver' little diffunce between one Louisiana democrat, an' one Ohio ripublican, ah, it mek me think M'sieu' Mackinley, he h'only h'acquaint wit' Louisiana democrat' by the way they cas' they vote in congress, yes, an' not by the way they save the pa'ty w'en they mek spich in Claiborne strit, them, yes. An' w'en he talk, I notice ver' strong they was one gret man w'at he don' say not'ing, bot he twis' hees moustache, an' he wink the h'eye,—an' thass ou' fren' Murphy Fostaire, him.

An' I feel ver' moch oblige to the president fo' the kin' word he spik

of this place, him, an' the h'only thing I didn't lak, me, was that w'en he spik of Louisiane congressmen, he hold his head op, an' spik wit'out hesitate', him, bot w'en he spik about l'histoire of la Louisiane, he got fo' rid f'om paper, him. As fo' me, I lak him mo' if turn that thing the otheh way, yes.

Bot ees not the banquet w'ich it affor'd M'sieu' le President the mos' pleasure, no. Ees the parade an' the reception the nex' day, yes, w'at he lak, him. . . .

Me, I was at those history reception, yes, in those second ricorder court building, yes, w'en we hear spich by Professeur Fortier, in w'ich he ricall to M'sieu' Mackinley we got Historical museum in this ville, us, yes, an' he h'explain to M'sieu' Mackinley the dif-funce they is between buying a contry of w'ich the peeps is glad to be purchase', an' the payment of planty cash fo' peeps w'at riffuse to deliver theyse'f h'after they is pay for. At w'ich M'sieu' Mackinley, he smile ver' fonny smile h'on the lef' side hees face, an' say to the professeur he moch h'oblige, an' that he go'ne tek that rification into consideration, him, w'en he return to Washington, yes.

An' then, afteh he drink some pink lemonade, w'ich it don' go to hees haid, no, M'sieu' le President, he go h'on the balcony an' say to the peeps w'at they kip on the outside 'ow sorry he feel he can't stay yeh fo' the res' of his life, an' he tek ride on stimboat fo' see the place General Meyer go'ne convert into dry dock, yes, if M'sieu' le President don' h'objec', an' then afteh li'l' mo' spich, they turn him loose by the Morgan r-r-railroad by w'ich he liv fo' Beaumont fo' h'examine one oil mine of w'ich Hamrobinson he sell him the h'option.

An' thass h'all, mon cher cousin; bot thass a gret deal, yes. Thass the firs' time a president comes yeh since President Andrew Jackson come, an' he was not yet h'elect' w'en he come, that General Jackson, no.

An', between yo' an' me, Sylvestre, I h'agree wit' M'sieu' le Maire, w'en he say this a day fo' be mark wit' tombstone of w'ite kalsomine, fo' we will nevaire fo'get w'at tol' us by the president of les Etats Unis, no; if I don' mek mistake, some peeps w'at bleev they represent those democratic pa'ty in le congress, they ain' go'ne fo'get that visite, them, no, not fo' long time, them. Thass h'all. Vive l'empereur!

JACK LAFAIENCE.

ONE WAY TO CLEAN A CITY.

An interview with Charles A. Joslyn, Jr., published in the Chicago Record-Herald of May 5.

"The 'clean street' and 'beautiful city' problems that confront Chicago could be easily solved if each individual property owner took the proper interest in his own piece of ground and surroundings," says Charles A. Joslyn, Jr. Mr. Joslyn is perhaps better known to the public as the owner of "Golden Rule Park," a creation of his own, illustrating his own ideas, in his own way.

"I think I can safely say that I have the cleanest place in Chicago," he continued, "and considering the condition of the surroundings, the cleanest street in front and the cleanest alley behind my place. It doesn't take me an hour a week to keep it so, either. Any other man can do the same as I, and if every other property owner did, or had it done for him, the city would be a model of neatness.

"Now, if you'll just come out in the yard with me I'll show you how I do it," he went on. "I guess if we take in the street and the alley first it will be more methodical. Now, you see we have cedar block paving in the street, and though it is in rather bad shape, it is clean."

And it was clean, swept as thoroughly as a neat housewife's kitchen floor. Not a scrap of paper or a bit of dirt to be seen.

"I sweep this, with the help of my son, every Saturday morning. I sweep the length of my lot and half the width of the street. You see a few of my immediate neighbors have become imbued to some extent with my ideas, consequently nearly all the block is swept. The dirt is taken out in my chicken yard, where it soon turns to good soil, which in turn I use in my garden.

"The city street cleaning department hasn't been in this neighborhood for a year, and they wouldn't find anything to do if they should chance to put in an appearance. If I had my way I'd abolish the department—it's of no use. I believe that every property owner should do his own cleaning and have it done. As it is, we all pay taxes to have it done, and few of us ever get any benefit from it. If we had to do our own cleaning we would be sure to have it done properly.

"They make a lot of fun of the Hollanders, call them slow and all that, but they have the right idea about these things. In Amsterdam it has been the rule for years that every man should keep his own street front and

premises clean, and Amsterdam is the cleanest city in the world. The Dutch law is right. The man who makes the dirt ought to clean it up."

"But everyone doesn't live in a house, as you do," was suggested. "What would you have flat dwellers do?"

"The owners of the buildings should see to the cleaning—not necessarily do it themselves, but bear the expense. They might as well, they don't get their money's worth out of the city street cleaning department. And, besides, doesn't it add to the value of the property when the surroundings are cleanly? Now, come out in the alley and I'll show you something that will open your eyes." And he led the way through "Golden Rule Park," where the new grass is just beginning to peep out of the ground, the tulips and hyacinths are getting ready to bloom and the trees are blossoming out in all their springtime glory. There was a smell of fresh paint in the air and the seats and swing in the park shone brightly.

"You ought to see the park in the summertime," said Mr. Joslyn. "It's a regular Garden of Eden compared to some yards in this town. Come through the chicken yard into the alley, look out for paint there. Now, what do you think of this? Did you ever see such an alley?"

To tell the truth, it didn't look like an alley. The rear of the houses and sheds were the only incriminating features about it. But for these it could have easily passed itself off as a little side street in a real estate folder. The ground was swept as clean as the street in front of the house, with not a tin can, a scrap of paper or a bone in sight.

"Why, this isn't an alley, you have no garbage box," was said.

"What of it! I don't need one. We have no garbage. The refuse from the table and kitchen is put in an iron kettle and given to the chickens. Tin cans are put in a big box in the shed yonder and at intervals are buried in trenches in the yard, where they decay in a year or two.

"Bones are taken care of in the same manner, all inflammable stuff is gathered and at the end of the week is burned and the ashes put in the garden for fertilizer. Bricks and stones are used in making sidewalks and for various purposes. Everything is disposed of in the same way."

"What do you think of small parks?" was asked.

"We can't have too many of them, nor of public play grounds. There,

again, the Dutch are ahead of us. In Amsterdam they have these things. They have had them for many years. They are a good thing, as they keep the children off the streets and give them healthful places to exercise. It is almost as good as the country for them."

"Do you really think that Chicago could be made beautiful if your rules were followed?"

"Not my rules," he hastened to correct, "but if the golden rule was followed, yes."

PHILIPPINE INDEPENDENCE.

An editorial in the Hong-Kong Telegraph of March 28.

It is always as well to hear the two sides of a question before passing an opinion, and as the Manila papers have been filled of late with statements to the effect that the trouble in the Philippines was rapidly drawing to a close, we took the opportunity of interviewing Dr. Apacible, a prominent Filipino, who has lately returned here from Europe and America. As will be seen from the interview which we publish elsewhere, Dr. Apacible is still as confident as ever of the ability of the Filipinos to prolong the struggle indefinitely, and he thinks, as we do, that were the whole facts of the matter placed before the American public without bias, that a solution of the Filipino problem would be arrived at very shortly.

The United States authorities have all along attempted to pose as the liberators of the Filipinos, but, according to their own constitution, you cannot govern a people without their own consent, and this is just what the United States are now attempting to do in defiance of all their traditions. At the outset as we have repeatedly pointed out, the Filipinos were treated as the allies of the Americans, and although nobody but the persons concerned can say what promises were or were not made before the Filipinos consented to bear the brunt of the fighting and drive the Spaniards into Manila, facts speak for themselves.

The United States profess to be undesirous of acquiring anything but a foothold in Asia in order to establish a base for their fleet. This could be easily arranged, for their independence the Filipinos would willingly grant one or more coaling stations. American trade would flourish, we presume, just as freely under the Filipino as the American flag, and the United States would save millions of dollars and hundreds of lives in rec-

ognizing the independence of the Philippines as suggested by Dr. Apacible. Why not establish a protectorate? It would be far cheaper and more satisfactory, and who knows but that as the Filipinos come to know the American people better, they might not themselves apply to be included in the union?

AN INTERVIEW WITH DR. APACIBLE.

This interview is the one referred to in the editorial printed above, and appeared in the Telegraph of the same date.

In reply to a question as to the impressions he had received and the conclusions he had arrived at as a result of his travels, Dr. Apacible said: At present I can only give you a rough idea. I cannot enter into detail until such time as I am authorized to do so. In the first place, however, I saw that the government of the United States is either very badly informed as to the true situation in the Philippines, or else is very insincere in its statements. I incline toward the former supposition, though I fancy that there is a little of both mixed up in the doings and sayings of the government. I am by no means convinced that the whole of the citizens of the United States are antagonistic to us—that is to say wish to drown our independence and force upon us their sovereignty—nor are the bulk of the most conspicuous men, nor the people of the different states against us. The political passions that blind a proportion of them and the greed of a few others are, so far as I have been able to judge, the only factors that keep alive the spirit of expansion and war. The information and reports of their own tools and appointees constitute, if not the only fountain at which the administration drinks, at least the only one utilized. To this end men so appointed have sent reports and information of a most partial character in order to serve the interests of their own party. I am sure that when the American people come to know the truth of what is passing and what has passed in the Philippines, they will insist upon the administration according to us our legitimate demands.

Do you believe in the possibility of such a change taking place?

Yes, certainly, though perhaps not for some time to come. How? By our countrymen prolonging their resistance and so causing great expense to America and touching her heart by the loss of life occurring amongst her sons. This is perhaps

a very horrible method, but it is, apparently, that ordained by providence by which it is possible to force those who are strong and who act by reason of their greed to recognize their error; ordained perhaps that they may thus expiate their transgressions.

But will such a resistance be unbreakable? It is now reported that two of your most renowned generals have surrendered.

Such occurrences as this do not make any appreciable impression upon us. More than three of our generals fell last August. Some were victims of evil fortune, some of treachery and almost all of them were of the highest prestige, yet the war did not come to an end; on the contrary, on many occasions it has been carried on with greater vigor than ever. As for the rest, we all know that not all who start to ascend a mountain reach its summit. We have still many other generals in whose worth, courageousness, energies, intelligence, tact and firmness we have absolute faith. There remains to us still the most renowned of all, our heroic leader, who will not lay down his arms except with his life or on the attainment of our independence. It remains for us, the Filipino people, who though sometimes obliged by force majeure to appear to favor the American cause, though in our hearts we do not, to contribute supplies for the national defense, of which men, money and other assistance are the mother and support.

In that case the formation of the federal party, as it is called, and the many apparent adhesions to it, cannot but be derogatory to your cause.

I believe I may assure you that the formation of this party and the many reported adhesions to it can injure, and undoubtedly does injure, the cause of Filipino independence abroad; in the Philippines it really does not detract from our force. I could show you letters and testimonies in which we are assured that the cause of such adhesions is but the fear of reprisals on the part of the Americans, for he who refuses to join the party is pointed out as a revolutionary or as supporting those who are still in arms. You already know what Gen. MacArthur stated in his proclamation with respect to those who may be considered as such. The Americans now hold about 6,000 political prisoners, and here in Hong-Kong is a family composed of women, children and old men and only one young

man amongst them, who have been expelled from Cebu because there is a member of the family in the Filipino ranks and because they sympathize with our struggle for liberty. This is apart from the deportations to Guam and the houses and towns fired upon, of which even the Manila papers speak. I think that there are not half a dozen persons who are truly affiliated to the federal party at heart. The reason is obvious. The platform of that party does not fulfill the aspirations of the country. I have studied the party since my return from Europe and America, and I see its early downfall, as also that of other parties formed in Manila, despite the active support it receives from the American authorities. A fuller measure of autonomy was promised to us by the Spaniards in the last days of their domination than that demanded by the Parti do Federal, and was not accepted by the Filipino people. With what more reason can the promise of the federals be accepted, now that not even a promise exists, except the vague, the very vague one held out by Mr. Taft, which is even less definite than those held out to us by Admiral Dewey and Consul Pratt? Neither congress nor President McKinley have said anything definite on this subject that I am aware of, and I wonder at the manner in which the Manila papers prate of the liberal offers put forward by the United States.

Then you do not think that peace will be long delayed?

I truly believe that so soon as the true state of affairs becomes known throughout America, a solution of the difficulty will be arrived at, either by a mutual agreement or by one or both making concessions. I have already said what the American administration aims at with regard to the Philippines. On the other hand, the party at present in power is not really the representative of the great majority of the American people. . . . I can assure you that nobody now in the Philippines except Aguinaldo and Mabini have intervened in the creation of the Filipino committees in foreign countries. I can also state that Agoncillo, with whom I spent nearly the whole of January in Paris, has not quarreled with us, as stated by the American press, and had no intention of returning. If he does some day return it will not be because he renounces our ideals and much less because he desires to place himself under the protection of American bayonets in Manila. As for myself, much as I long to return to my country, I can-

not, for I should be obliged to take an oath repugnant alike to my convictions and my honor. I prefer a voluntary exile, long though it be, in any English or European country, where, under the protection of equalitarian and democratic laws, one is at least sure of being respected in his personal liberty and is free to profess and express his political convictions. Of my other companions here, who are not a third of the number stated by the American press, you may take the same assurance.

In conclusion, if you publish this interview, you can declare before the world that we who are abroad work for the independence of our country on the same lines as our countrymen who struggle on the battlefield and lay down their lives. We earnestly hope for peace, we wish for peace at once, for the vapors emanating from the lakes of blood shed in our country reach us here, asphyxiating our souls, and we cannot remain insensible to the desolation wrought throughout the country by war. But the bringing about of peace is not in our hands. America the strong, who has gone to our land and has already satisfied her military honor, is the one who could, who ought to yield. We have no other course to follow than that of attempting to defend our inalienable rights, the independence of our nationality. Until independence is gained, only temporary solutions of the difficulties will be found. The faint spark of tranquillity which may now and again be kindled will be repeatedly quenched long before it can burst into a steady flame. America will lose much if she persists in her dream of sovereignty. On the contrary, she will gain much if she prefers to take upon herself the title of liberator. With it she will obtain for all time our love and the blessing of our young country.

A NOVEL SCHOOL.

The "elementary school of the Chicago university," the "Dewey school," as it is more generally known, because Dr. John H. Dewey, head of the department of psychology and pedagogy in the Chicago university, is at its head also, is a working exposition of ideas and theories and methods directly and diametrically opposed to all the ideas and theories and methods against which the (ordinary accusations against schools) are made. The child's interest in and use for a subject or study is made the test for his need of work in this direction. Children are only trained to read and write as they

themselves feel the necessity and usefulness of these accomplishments. No child is set down to writing, spelling, reading, arithmetic or any of the time-honored subjects of study until he or she realizes the need for just this work. Then, according to the exponents of this system of education, he or she is in just the best possible condition for the acquiring of this particular branch of knowledge, and will naturally make far more rapid progress than if forced into it before his interest has prepared him to cope with it properly. The interest, if necessary, is carefully created and fostered, but it must come first.

Dr. Dewey believes, according to one of his teachers and disciples, that the time spent in an elementary school on reading, writing and arithmetic could be more profitably spent and that the average child can learn all these in the doing of other things.

The same idea is applied to every other branch of study treated in the school, and the children certainly do seem to work wonders, or, rather, the system works wonders with them. Eleven and 12-year-old children converse easily in Latin, know quite a little of French and German, together with something of the history, progress, governmental policy, stage of development and general condition of most of the countries and nations of the world, can discuss national, state and civic politics intelligently, understand many of the basic laws underlying all knowledge and have a good working acquaintance with chemistry, science and even cookery. They can set up electric bells, design and make all manner of useful articles, handle tools and instruments in the manner of an expert and tell you more about "primitive life" and the manner in which baby nations grope and feel after expression and development than you ever dreamed of knowing—unless you have made a special study of these subjects. They all know something of cookery and needlework—the boys can sew on buttons and use a needle and cooking spoon and saucepan as easily and skillfully as the girls can work with hammers, saws, chisels and so on—and they carry on a discussion courteously, intelligently and keep to the point. Not one of them knows what it is, however, to dread the failure to "pass" in a coming examination, and the competitive system has been completely eliminated, save where it would naturally crop up in the same conditions anywhere in the world.

The best work survives, of course, and the best worker in a "group" or class has the work given him when there is not enough to go around. There is no shirking or idleness in this school. Every child is alert, eager and anxious to work. It is not difficult to get them into the school at all, but it is rather difficult, occasionally, to induce them to leave. And many of the children are so deeply interested in some phases of the work that they ask permission to take it home with them. The school sessions last from nine o'clock in the morning until noon and from one p. m. until 2:30. A few of the children are allowed to remain at the school as late as three p. m. and the little ones under eight years have a morning session only. The oldest child in the school is about 14 and the kindergarten babies are surpassingly youthful—some of them. Boys and girls work and study together, precisely as men and women are thrown together in real and maturer life, and the conditions of this real and maturer life are duplicated as completely as possible all the way through.

"Education," says Dr. Dewey, "is a process of living, not a preparation for future living."

On this idea the work and methods of the school are planned entirely. The time is spent in doing things rather than in learning how to do them. This is the reason why the government and conditions of the school differ so essentially from those more usually followed.

No more than ten children are allowed with any teacher at any time. Ten is the largest number allowed to a single one of the "groups" into which the school is divided. The social idea is preserved and the social organization ideal sought after at all times and places. For this reason the public school student suddenly transplanted into a group at the Dewey school occupies some time in readjusting himself and his relations with his fellow students and his teachers. The understanding that if one member of a group fails in his or her duty the best possibilities of the entire group are thereby endangered, if not lost, sinks into the consciousness of the children before they know it. "Bad" or incorrigible children, the Dewey teachers believe, cannot possibly exist or persist long if the right conditions are arranged for them. If, as occasionally happens, a child is inclined to sink below the level of his best opportunities and powers, the rest of the group can usually be

trusted to stimulate him, by better work and potent example, to do his best. The entire atmosphere of the school contributes to this end. Of "school government," as ordinarily understood, there is very little. The children never stay away voluntarily, so the truancy problem never crops up. And the "captain," or "leader," of each group is usually more than equal to his responsibilities in the way of looking after the rest of the class.

This "captain," or "leader," is selected, as the seats in the various classrooms are arranged according to the alphabetical place and position of the first letter of the last name. Upon the leader of a group devolves the duty of seeing that each member of the group gets properly to his classes throughout the day, following out the programme given teachers and leaders every morning, and also hung up in the main halls, of insuring order and quietness in the passing back and forth along the corridors—in order that no other class need be disturbed—and taking care that books, materials and so on are kept neat and in good order. The younger children are usually enchanted with the responsibility entailed, the older ones dislike it extremely. So, in the older groups, pains are taken to divide this responsibility somewhat in order that no child need feel overburdened by it.

The manner in which children study is as unusual as are the methods of school government. The children work over a thing or subject, be it texture manufacture, numbers, history or cooking, until, with the aid of judicious assistance or suggestion from the teacher, they have worked it out and mastered it for themselves. Then the entire class joins in producing a report—sometimes dictated to the teacher, because none of the children in the class are as yet able to read or write—and this report is typewritten and brought back to them. Clause by clause, line by line, paragraph by paragraph, it is gone over in type-written form. These reports are of themselves powerful incentives to the study of reading and writing. Nearly all the children desire to have a hand in the making of these reports, aside from the cooperative authorship, and reading and writing are mastered to this end. The "group songs," for which the children first compose the words and music, which they afterward render in their chorus singing and vocal culture work, are produced by means of similar methods. A number of songs

really creditable to much older composers have been evolved from the various groups, a favorite number being the "Football Song," which has the Chicago university yell for a refrain. Other strong and general favorites of the children are the "Lincoln" song and the "Spinning Song," of which the words are herewith given. The "Spinning Song" has a sort of characteristic burden, the recurring "Br," which is a really good bit of descriptive musical composing. The words of the "Lincoln" song are as follows:

'Twas in a small log cabin,
One February day,
A little Lincoln baby
In a small, rude cradle lay;
When at the age of twelve
By night he studied law,
And when the morning dawned anew
Again took up his saw.

He rose to be a statesman
Of very great renown.
His wisdom saved the union,
And slav'ry he put down;
'Twas in the spring of sixty-five
That messengers rode fast
To bring the news of Lincoln's death;
The noble life had passed.

The "Spinning Song" is equally good in its way and both of them were composed by children under the age of 12. The older children, who have studied music more thoroughly, do not feel the composer's impulse nearly so strongly as their juniors, it has been found.

The spinning wheel goes round so fast
It makes a sound like this:
Br.....

The threads they twist and never miss.
We'll weave the threads as tight as we can
To make the canvas strong,
And then we'll shape it into tents,
With poles just twelve feet long.

The spinning wheel it hurries on
And makes so many things—
Br.....

It goes as with a hundred wings,
From cotton, wool and silk worm's cocoons
It makes thread, yarn and silk,
And then we'll dye them brilliant tints
Or bleach them white as milk.

Refrain—
Oh, spinning wheel; oh, spinning wheel,
How prettily you go!
Oh, I could spin on you all day
Because I like you so!

It may be said, in passing, that the writing, reading and number work of the children of this school is certainly quite as good as if not better than the same work done by the average public school student several years older, and many other subjects are dealt with in shorter time daily than the public school student spends in school. The children will be ready for college much earlier as well as far better fitted to earn their own living at an early age should this be necessary. And their

grasp upon the subjects studied is by no means a slight or superficial one, notwithstanding the wide diversity of these subjects and the unusual manner of getting at them.

"How on earth did you manage to interest such young children in Latin?" was asked of the principal of the school, Miss Georgia A. Bacon, after learning that 10 and 11-year-old children actually talked in Latin. Miss Bacon smiled.

"The children were interested when quite small in old Roman stories," she explained, "and the names of various things and places were given them in Latin. Thus they acquired, being eager to know more, quite a Latin vocabulary before they knew it. French and German were made interesting in the same manner. Naturally again they soon noticed that sometimes a Latin word ended in one way and sometimes in another and wanted to know the reason why. Then their teacher from time to time points out to them that a given word is so-and-so in Latin, something else in French, something else still in German. The reason for and grammatical conditions governing these meanings and terminations are then given. Thus the children without being discouraged at the prospect of mastering two or three different grammars, dealing with as many different languages, come to understand the basic laws underlying all grammatical construction.

"They were talking of the laws which govern the wars of nations and the rights of other nations to help or interfere one morning not long since, and the varying opinions, all quietly, clearly and grammatically expressed, would have done credit to a gathering of men. They were very clear, also, upon the duties of the president and congress in regard to the declaring of war and peace.

"It is sometimes asked us: 'What becomes of character development if the element of drudgery is entirely omitted, and do you think the children will acquire as fine a degree of self-mastery if everything is made easy for them as if they worked harder?'" says Miss Bacon, the principal of the school, "and this is a question most easily answered, according to our way of thinking. For the work done here is only not drudgery because the interest felt in it redeems it from drudgery to pleasure, and this is the way in which the problems of later work in life are settled. The thing we do not like, and consequently feel no interest in, is drudgery, drudgery of the dreariest and most unpleasant kind, but it is

not, therefore, the most valuable to us or the thing we can do best for ourselves and fellows. Give us an interest in this work, transform it, consequently, into something which we really like doing, and it is no longer drudgery, although we work twice as hard at it as we did before. And it is the work which is performed with pleasure and a keen sense of interest which is worth most to us and to humanity at large."

This is the underlying principle and the philosophy of the elementary school of the Chicago university, in a word, as it appears to the interested observer. And it is certainly a principle and a philosophy which child trainers and educators everywhere might do well to study.—Condensed from Chicago Chronicle of April 15, 1900.

CUBA LIBRE.

When we sailed from Tampa Bay,
(Cuba Libre!)

And our ships got under weigh,
(Cuba Libre!)

As we floated down the tide,
Crowding to the steamer's side,
You remember how we cried:
"Cuba Libre!"

When we spied the island shore,
(Cuba Libre!)

Then we shouted loud once more:
"Cuba Libre!"

As we sank Cervera's ships
Where the southern sea-wall dips,
What again was on our lips?
"Cuba Libre!"

These are foreign words, you know—
"Cuba Libre!"—

That we used so long ago;
(Cuba Libre!)

And in all the time between
Such a lot of things we've seen,
We've forgotten what they mean,
"Cuba Libre!"

Let us ask the president,
(Cuba Libre!)

What that bit of Spanish meant,
(Cuba Libre!)

Ask McKinley, Root and Hay
What on earth we meant to say
When we shouted night and day:
"Cuba Libre!"

But alas! they will not speak,
(Cuba Libre!)

For their memories are weak,
(Cuba Libre!)

If you have a lexicon,
Borrowed from a Spanish don,
Send it down to Washington,
(Cuba Libre!)

—Ernest Crosby, in Life.

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 687, Chicago.

With practical simultaneity the sword whizzed through the air, struck into the block, and the head of the Chinaman dropped and bounded lightly from the pavement.

A great sigh burst from the breast of the Caucasian witness.

Whereupon the celestials that were present—and living—prostrated themselves, and in a manner designed to harmonize with the apparent regret of the white man, they cried: "O worthy Christian, grieve not! Surely the wicked offender deserved to be executed as your virtuous judges demanded!"

The higher man condescended to make no reply, but to himself he groaned: "In a lawful sense, I suppose the punishment fully fitted the crime, but how much more satisfactory it would be if the rascal had been made with more than one head!"

G. T. E.

"Did you have a good time in Boston, Rivers?"

"Good time? I never had so much fun in my life!"

"Fun? In Boston?"

"Yes. I went into one bookstore after another, asking the salesmen if they had any expurgated editions of Ralph Waldo Emerson's works."—Chicago Tribune.

"Last night," said Johnny Imperialist, "I dreamed that every one of the Philippines was a barren waste, and not worth a cent!"

"Were we in the dream?" asked his brother Sammy.

"Yes; we were working with all our might and main trying to polish the tarnished side of the Duty-Destiny shield."

G. T. E.

MAY MAGAZINES.

—The Manuscript, edited by Marlon Mills Miller, and published by the Manuscript Press, 1123 New York, is a neatly printed, readably edited and useful little magazine (50 cents a year), which is published especially for the pleasure and guidance of manuscript makers.

—The Arena for May contains a personal sketch of George D. Herron, by Rev. W. T. Brown, of Rochester, which it follows with a conversation with Dr. Herron on the subject of "The New Apostolate" in which he is engaged. Another important paper relates to the progress of fiscal reform, treating especially of local option in taxation. It is by Marion Mills Miller. To a new department, "On the Stoa of the Twentieth Century," in which "great social, economic and political measures that intimately affect the welfare, prosperity and happiness of the nation and the advancement of civilization," are to be discussed, and of which the initial subject is "An Army of Wealth-Creators vs. an Army of Destruction," the contributors are the editor—B. O. Flower, Prof. Frank Parsons, Rev. Hiram Vrooman, Prof. Thomas E. Will, Dr. C. T. Taylor, Rev. Robert E. Bisbee and Mayor Jones of Toledo.

—The Pilgrim for May, the monthly periodical published at Battle Creek, Mich.,

of which Willis J. Abbot has become the editor, is no disappointment to Mr. Abbot's admirers. It is an illustrated family paper, calculated to satisfy the want that has brought so much success to the Ladies' Home Journal, but which substitutes for the mawkishness of that species of publication an invigorating moral strenuousness. It aims primarily at entertaining and pleasing its readers. In this it succeeds, if the initial number under the new editorship is to be taken as indicative. But unlike other periodicals of that class, it refuses either to ignore or to approve the spectacle of "pagan luxury existing side by side with the most squalid pauperism." The principal contributions to this number are from Mayor Jones, on "Aristocracy or Democracy;" Henry George Jr., on "Tom L. Johnson, a Character Sketch;" Trumbull White, on Russia and China—"Where Bear and Dragon Meet;" Isabel McDougal, on the Artist Abbey, and ex-Secretary of the Treasury Foster, on Benjamin Harrison. There are departments on dress, on domestic science, on beautification, on motherhood, on gardening and on health in the home, the latter under the direction of Dr. Julia Holmes Smith; and these are to be augmented by departments and special contributions on other homelike subjects. With all the rest the Pilgrim puts forth brisk and brave editorials from the editor's own pen.

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,
1025-1080 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,
COUNSELLOR AT LAW,
BENNETT BLDG.
99 Nassau St., Borough of Manhattan.
Tel. Call, 1353 Cortlandt. Rooms 1011-1015.
NEW YORK.

For any Book on Earth

Old or New
Write to
H. H. TIMBY,
Book Hunter,
Conneaut, Ohio.
CATALOGUES FREE.

BINDERS FOR THE PUBLIC:

Emerson Binding Covers in which THE PUBLIC may be filed away week by week, making at the end of the year a reasonably well-bound volume, may be ordered through this office. Price, 80 cents, postpaid. tf

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 fling.

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.

WRITERS, CORRESPONDENTS or REPORTERS

Wanted everywhere. Stories, news, ideas, poems, illustrated articles, advance news, drawings, photographs, unique articles, etc., purchased. Articles revised and prepared for publication. Books published. Send for particulars and full information before sending articles.

The Bulletin Press Association, New York.

Volume III of The Public

Complete Volumes, including index, sent postpaid at Regular Subscription price, \$1.00.

Bound Volumes Now Ready.
Price, \$2.00. Express charges to be paid by consignee. Address,
PUBLIC PUBLISHING CO., Box 687, Chicago.

JOIN THOSE
WHO KNOW.

CALL FOR

Moos' Cigars

AND BE HAPPY.

J. & B. MOOS,

95 Randolph Street, 58-64 Dearborn
Street, - - - CHICAGO, ILL.