who believes in restraining government at all? Is government so sacred a thing that it must neither be opposed nor disbelieved in?

A grim satire upon the thoughtless hate and reckless ignorance with which congressmen are proposing to make laws to suppress anarchy, occurred at Minneapolis shortly after the assassination of President McKinley. One Samuel Hogan, the prototype of our numerous brood of anarchy suppressors in Congress, asked Peter Kolik if he was an anarchist. Kolik replied in the affirmative, and Hogan shot him. This was Hogan's crude conception of what is now a dominant idea in Congress and the White House. But it turned out that Kolik had misunderstood the question. He thought Hogan had asked him if he was an organist, and being one he answered Yes. So Hogan went for three years to the penitentiary for inability to distinguish an anarchist from an organist. But why? There is no more difference between anarchists and organists than there is between some anarchists and other anarchists. Yet our congressmen propose to lump all anarchists together as bad men.

The Hoganistic schemes for putting down anarchy go either too far or not far enough. If anarchists are bad men, simply because they are anarchists, why limit repressive laws to them? They are only one of several kinds of bad men, and we ought to put down all kinds. The greater includes the less, and "bad man" needs to be defined no more than "anarchist" does. If everyone knows what "anarchist" means, surely everyone must know what "bad man" means. Distinctions being unimportant, the job of putting down the whole bad class by law is easy. President Roosevelt and congress could do it. They need only to enact a simple law declaring (1) that all bad persons who are not already in this country shall be kept out; (2) that all bad persons who are already in this country shall be forced to leave; and (3) that absolute jurisdiction over bad persons shall be vested in the Federal courts. Why distinguish minor points? A bad man is a bad man; and with such a law no bad man of any kind could escape. Anarchists would be swept in with the rest. And who could object to it. Only anarchists and other bad men; and bad men have no rights that good men in Congress and the White House or anywhere else are bound to respect. This free country is not for the bad. It is for the good.

We confess, however, that there might be political danger in enacting so sweeping and indefinite a law. Good men might get caught in the net by mistake, even as the good organist was mistaken for a bad anarchist by the good Hogan. And if enough good men did scent danger they might repudiate the "bad man" law and put its authors out of office. The same thing would be true of an anarchist law. Such a catastrophe did happen to the good Federalist politicians 100 years ago when they enacted the alien and sedition laws. It might happen again, even to such particularly good men as those who enact anarchy laws now. The trouble about all legislation of this dangerously sweeping kind is that the good people may at any unexpected time scent danger to themselves. These rampageous anti-anarchism congressmen who are setting snares for people who are not even anarchists, unless Thomas Jefferson and Abraham Lincoln were, would be wise to note Kipling's warning:

Pleasant it is for little tin gods
When great Jove nods;
But little tin gods make their little mistakes
In missing the hour when great Jove wakes.

One member of the House judiciary committee has displayed exceptional courage and more than ordinary statesmanship by submitting a minority report on the so-called anarchist bill, a bill which is in fact the first step in the direction of creating in this country the crime of "lese majesty." It proposes to differentiate the crime of attempts at murdering presidents from attempts at murdering ordinary citizens. To this feature of the bill the congressman in question, Mr. Lanham, of Texas, objects. He denies "the proposition that one honest and law-abiding man's life is any more sacred than that of another."

Senator Spooner has proposed a bill apportioning representation in congress to the number of male adults who are not for any cause except conviction for crime denied the suffrage. An ideal bill would be broader. It would make representation depend upon the number of voters. The disfranchised of any state, no matter what the cause, should not be counted in estimating the basis of representation. But Senator Spooner's bill is a vast improvement upon the bills, obviously aimed only at the South, which withdraw from the basis of representation only disfranchised Negroes. It would accomplish the legitimate purpose of those bills, while treating all the states and all races and conditions of men alike.

The attitude of the administration with reference to the letter of Gen. Pearson, if correctly reflected by the administration press, is not of a kind to inspire confidence in its neutrality in the British-Boer war. Gen. Pearson has written the President, positively asserting that—

the port of New Orleans is being made the basis of military operations, and the port and waters used for the purpose of the renewal and augmentation of military supplies for the British army, for use in South Africa and against the Burghers in South Africa;

that—

at the port of Chalmette, a few miles below the city of New Orleans, a British post has been established, and men and soldiers are there assembled, and are there daily engaged in warlike operations, and are there for the purpose of the renewal and augmentation of military supplies, and for the recruitment of men;

that—

the attention of the courts has been called and an appeal made to them; and the United States circuit court, for the Eastern district of Louisiana, in the case of Pearson against Parson, 108 Federal Reporter, page 461, declared that this matter was not in the cognizance of the court, expressly declaring that the matter was one that "can be

dealt with only by the executive branch of the government;"

and that no concealment has been made of these facts, the war being—

carried on by officers in the army of Edward VII., openly at Port Chalmette, in all respects, except they do not appear in uniform.

To ignore a statement so specific, of a breach of neutrality so flagrant, as it is reported from Washington that the President has done and intends to continue doing, constitutes a disregard of American ideals in the interest of British imperialism which cannot be excused by jocular references to Gen. Pearson's request to the President—

to either put an end to this state of affairs, or permit me to strike one blow.

The question raised by Gen. Pearson is not one that may be laughed out of the White House. It is the serious one of whether the British army shall any longer be permitted to use an American city and port, in violation of American neutrality, as a base for warlike operations against a friendly people.

The British ministry must have made a sad blunder when it entered into the arrangement to intimate to the American people from the floor of parliament that in the American war with Spain the British government was so friendly, and so solitary in its friendliness, that it alone prevented a coalition of European powers to interfere in the interest of Spain. This pretense was made for the purpose, evidently, of checking the pro-Boer sentiment in the United States which has recently been growing with great rapidity. Not only did it fail in that, but it has put the British ministry in a plight; for now the German government lays claim to having been our one and only friend, and offers to prove that the British government was quite otherwise. In these extraordinary assertions of tory and monarchical friendship there is an element of danger. It should be the constant aim of the American people to be on terms of cordial friendship with the British people, the German people, the French people, and every other people. But friendship between peoples and friendship between royal governments may be quite different.

On the 10th, Mayor Johnson's 3-cent fare plans for Cleveland (p. 644) were advanced another step. The bids theretofore authorized by the council were then opened, and although only one had been made, the established companies having stood out in hostile opposition, that one came from a responsible source—John B. Hoefgen, formerly with Johnson and one of the best street railway men in the country; it was backed by the required guarantee deposit of $50,000; its acceptance has been recommended by the city board of control; and the council has by a vote of 21 to 1 directed the corporation counsel to draft the necessary ordinances. Unless the 5-cent monopoly systems of Cleveland are able, through influencing abutting real estate owners to refuse consents, Cleveland will soon have 100 miles of street car track over which the fare will be only three cents, and the ownership of which may at no distant day be assumed by the city.

While Johnson is thus redeeming his election pledges as to local street car service, he is losing no points on the issue of taxation, in which his interest is as keen and deeper. What he lacked in this connection, Gov. Nash has supplied. In order to "steal Johnson's thunder," the governor proposed a state tax on corporations. But as he neglected to distinguish between corporations without special privileges and those with very valuable special privileges — a distinction which Johnson scrupulously makes—he has actually given Johnson more tax thunder than he had before. The situation is very clearly described by a Columbus staff correspondent of the Cleveland Plain Dealer (February 9), who writes:

When he started out to "separate state from county taxes" Gov. Nash thought he would have an easy time of it; that the corporations would fall over themselves to accept his ideas as a means of escaping the Johnson bills. Gov. Nash forgot that the Johnson bills were aimed at the corporations fattening on public privileges, while he was going after those who owed their success to the workings of men's brains only. Railroads without the right of eminent domain would be of little public service and consequently of little value, it is argued. The greater part of their value is in the right of way, a continuous strip of land running across the state or the continent. The value of telephone and telegraph companies is mainly in the privilege which they have to set poles and string wires across a city, county or state. The greater part of the value of a street railroad is in the right given it to use the streets of a municipality. These are the propositions which the advocates of the Johnsonian scheme of taxation advance. They say they do not want to tax brains. Gov. Nash may not want to do that, either, but that he is doing it in his capital stock bill there can be no dispute.

A constitutional amendment of great importance, but so framed as to be of no importance at all, has been adopted by the senate. It changes the date for the inauguration of President and the beginning of Congress from the 4th of March to the last Thursday in April. The only reason urged for this change is the fact that in March the weather is often so blustery as to interfere with inaugural displays. This reason is too petty to set all the machinery of amendment making at work. Yet the inaugural day and the day for the beginning of congressional sessions ought to be altered. The time elapsing between elections and official responsibilities is too long. As does the Canadian parliament, so Congress ought to assemble immediately after the congressional elections and presidents ought to be inaugurated immediately after presidential elections. It is important to the interests of popular government that they enter upon their duties with the instructions of their constituents fresh in their minds. This is a valid reason for an appropriate change. But instead of considering and being governed by this reason, the proposed amendment actually lengthens the time between election and induction into office. And for what? Merely to hit upon a more agreeable season