

amendment with which republicans in congress are trying to pacify their constituents on the trust question, Mr. Bryan may see what his anti-trust proposition would lead to. This amendment would give congress control of all private corporations, co-partnerships and joint stock companies, and confer upon it the power "to define, regulate, control, prohibit, repress and dissolve all trusts and monopolies and combinations or conspiracies to monopolize any part of trade or commerce, and all contracts and combinations in the form of trusts or otherwise, or conspiracy in restraint of trade or commerce." Were that amendment adopted, centralization of power in the federal government would be complete. In so far as remedies for the trust evil along this line are sincerely proposed, they get the cart before the horse. They assume that the monopoly of trusts is due to combinations of competitive businesses, and therefore aim to prohibit combinations. But the truth is that evil trusts are combinations not of competitive businesses but of conflicting monopolies—monopolies already created by law. All other so-called trusts soon fall to pieces. The true remedy for the trust, therefore, is not legislation restraining combinations, but legislation abolishing legalized monopolies.

"Fake" interviewing is one of the worst vices of modern journalism, and unfortunately one of the most common. It is, therefore, a good thing when some man of national reputation whose opinions excite general interest falls a victim to it and makes the fact known. The latest of these victims is ex-President Cleveland. He was reported as expressing himself in the most enthusiastic way over Dewey's self-nomination for the presidency, and he denies that he uttered a word of the interview. For misinformation of this kind the reporters who "fake" the interviews are not to blame, except as men may be blamable for doing any other wrong act under duress. Neither is the ed-

itor to blame for favoring reporters who bring back interviews for which they are sent, though the interviews have to be "faked" to be got, and frowning upon reporters who fail. The blame rests upon the journalism which makes good faith with readers a matter of secondary concern or none at all. In such journalism success depends not upon industry in gathering and skill in presenting the truth, but upon aimless hustle and meretricious ingenuity in serving up sensations.

Senator Lodge made no concealment, in his speech this week at the Hamilton club of Chicago, of the fact that the administration's Asiatic policy rests on the ability of the United States to keep the Philippine islands outside of the American governmental system. He conceded the point, which we have frequently insisted upon, that the Philippines are to be made subject territory, and their people a subject people with no legal rights whatever except such as may be given and withdrawn at will by a congress in which they are to have no representation and in the choice of which they are to have no voice. If the Filipino people were begging us to assume this tyrannical relationship toward them, we ought not to comply. Its reactionary effect upon our own liberties could not fail to be prejudicial. But when we raise the strength of our army from 25,000 to 100,000 men in order to compel the Filipinos with great slaughter to accept the relationship against their will, we brand our nation as infamous beyond modern comparison.

After exciting a week's mirth, the Dewey sensation has subsided. Before it had wholly disappeared, Admiral Dewey made a choice between the two political parties, selecting the democratic for the favor of his leadership. But this seems to have been prompted less by political principle than by a conviction that McKinley has a cinch upon the republican party. For upon being asked if he

would accept the democratic nomination, Dewey replied:

I certainly would. The other is fixed, I take it. President McKinley is sure of renomination; his friends have the machinery all in motion.

And yet the admiral, who has discovered that there is one step higher in the line of promotion and wants to take it, does announce himself as a democrat, and the constitution as his platform. This, however, is hardly definite enough. In these days, when a man calls himself a democrat it is necessary to know his brand. And as to the constitution, why McKinley stands upon that. He has even sworn to support it. And it will soon be unrecognizable if somebody doesn't pull him off. There is nothing reassuring any longer about a promise to stand on the constitution.

COLONIES, CONGRESS AND "BOSSSES."

We have no reason to be surprised that congress makes sad work of trying to take hold of the duty placed upon it by reason of our new colonial policy. It is probable that no such task was ever before imposed upon such a body. No wonder that its wisdom is most apparent when it gives up the idea of proceeding in accordance with the methods of civilized governments, and in sheer desperation, following mediaeval methods, turns everything over to the president's discretion. For the part assigned to congress in our scheme of national government, and the way its members are chosen, make it impossible that it should successfully legislate for territories which are not there represented. It is a body of delegates. There is no pretense that it is a selection of the wisest and best, nor from the wisest and best. Each member of the lower house is a representative of a part of the sovereign people, and was selected to represent his own constituents and for nothing else. Naturally he feels specially charged with a duty to his constituents, but when we expect him to be animated with equal zeal on behalf of our new subjects, we are demanding too much of human nature. It is no more the duty of one member than it is of another, and no more the

duty of the house than of the senate, to provide needed legislation for the colonies; and a one-four-hundred-and-forty-seventh part of a responsibility has never been known to cause anyone very much uneasiness.

We go greatly astray if we consider our congress as occupying towards our new possessions the same position that the legislative bodies of other countries which enjoy representative institutions do toward their colonies. Our system of government is peculiar in that it does not admit the officers who are to administer the laws, to take part in the initial steps of legislation. Our executive officers share in legislation only through the exercise of a more or less qualified veto power, after the passage of measures by the legislature, which gives them little or no control over their form. Our laws are framed by those who are to take no part in administering them and are to have no responsibility with respect thereto; who are officially ignorant of the operation of the existing laws; who are in most cases actually ignorant of the evils to be remedied and at best know of them only as they are informed by the administration; who are not at all dominated by a sense of duty or responsibility to the whole people, but are justified in taking the position that they must work into each measure as much as possible for the special interests of a part of the people, their own constituents; and who too often are really dominated by an honest or dishonest interest in the effect a measure is to have upon a very few influential individuals. Then most important legislative measures over which a great difference of opinion exists, are usually so modified and twisted in their course through the legislative bodies that neither the individual legislators who drafted them nor any other individuals can be held responsible for their form. At best we try to fix responsibility upon a party, which, however, can always plead as an excuse the revolt of convenient traitors.

The other great governments of the world practically reverse this procedure. They have their legislation framed by those who are to be responsible for the administration of the laws after their enactment; who

have official and personal knowledge of the evils to be remedied; who can command the services of experts who best understand the practical effect of each provision; whose official duty is to the whole people and not to a small constituency; and upon whom is fixed the responsibility for the practical operation of the law after its passage. In England, France and Italy a member of the administration brings in its proposed measures; defends them; modifies the form of proposed amendments and agrees to such changes to meet objections as he deems wise; and in the end the legislature either consents to their passage in the form agreeable to the administration or rejects them. If a measure deemed to be important is not passed by the legislature or is amended in spite of the administration's opposition, the cabinet either resigns or dissolves the legislature and sends the representatives back to their constituents for a new mandate. In Germany the administration does not, to be sure, usually resign when its proposed measures fail to pass, but no legislation can be effected without its concurrence.

A natural consequence of our peculiar method of framing legislation is that our federal government is hampered by absurd laws limiting the discretion of the executive in the most trifling details of department routine, while in other ways the door is left open to the greatest abuses.

Examples are not far to seek. The salaries of most of the employees of the government are fixed by law. The deputy collector, who practically runs the custom house at the port of New York, receives the same compensation as employes whose single duty it is to sit on a bench and take depositions—something that any clerk in a real estate broker's office does in connection with his other duties upon receiving an appointment as notary public. The collector cannot apportion his appropriation, as justice and efficient administration would suggest. Thousands of bonds are every year executed by importers, which have been officially held to be worthless and upon no one of which in the history of the government has a prosecution ever been based. The

secretary of the treasury continues to spend a large part of his time signing his name to documents which he by no possibility could find the time to read over, and which could just as well be signed by the subordinate upon the faith of whose check the head of the department appends his name. Some time ago a dry dock was found to be endangered by a leak or flow of water, which might be stopped by an expenditure of some \$1,500. The damage, if not checked, would soon amount to several hundred thousand dollars. An opinion was requested by the attorney general as to the legality of spending \$1,500 for such a purpose. The reply was that to do so would constitute a crime. Congress had not foreseen the leak and there was no appropriation available to stop it. The post office at New York collects a large part of the postal revenues. If we had better postal facilities, such as are to be had in every European capital, it would in the opinion of experts pay much better. Yet congress cripples its service by insufficient appropriations. But there is no need of multiplying instances. Many such examples will come to the mind of every one who has ever had to do with the federal service. To complain of such conditions to congress has always been as ineffectual as if the prayers for relief were addressed to the gods of the ancient Greeks. Congressional committees pay not the slightest attention to the repeated requests of the departments for relief, be it ever so much needed.

It is the greatest proof of the ingenuity of our public officials that notwithstanding the crudities and inconsistencies which characterize all congressional legislation, they take hold of each new administrative law and somehow make it work. In the last extremity, the meanings of certain provisions are explained away by an opinion of the attorney general, or deliberately violated; and government property which cannot be legally saved is allowed to perish.

But it must be remembered that the federal government has for us here at home but a limited number of functions and that most of the matters affecting our commercial, social and political life which call for the action of the government belong

to the states. The disadvantages of our system increase as the so-called business ends of government become of greater importance; and it is somewhat appalling to consider the increased range of subjects with which congress will have to deal if it bears to our new colonies the relation which our state legislatures bear to our state and city governments. For even in our state governments we see the same cause producing the same effects. The interference of the legislature with the administrative details of state and city governments furnishes a fresh scandal at each session.

The great power of our legislative bodies, independent of and uncontrolled by the executive, is balanced by the equally independent position of the executive in administering the laws after their passage. This feature of our system serves as an additional obstacle to efficiency. Especially is this the case in the state governments where the laws are for the most part administered by locally elected officials. So, not unfrequently, the spirit in which certain laws shall be enforced becomes a principal political issue at elections. Thus state laws regulating or prohibiting liquor selling are administered in one part of the state rigorously and in the other parts with the greatest laxity. The law may require property to be assessed at its full value for purposes of taxation, but the local officials cheerfully make oath to the correctness of assessments which are notoriously undervalued; and the civil service laws are often openly violated with the tacit approval of the executive. But without stopping to weigh the advantages and disadvantages of this system of checks and balances, it is obvious that the price paid for the advantages is a very inefficient and wasteful administrative system, in which the correction of abuses, even when seriously attempted, is a long and difficult process. For instance, many efforts have been made to control large corporations and monopolies, but with little or no results. The legislatures pass laws for the purpose, but they have always proved impossible of enforcement for one reason or another. Even if an ade-

quate and effective statute were finally passed, it must be applied by an attorney general who may not be in sympathy with it.

Now, so far as this system of ours involves evils and embarrassments in the management of our domestic affairs, where the legislators that frame laws and the president and governors who execute them are all directly responsible to the people who experience the results of their works, such evils and embarrassments must become infinitely increased when the laws so framed and passed are applied among a people unrepresented in congress, of whose habits, customs and needs its members are ignorant, and whose approval or disapproval will have no effect upon elections. Governmental stupidity or carelessness or ignorance may be of comparatively small importance when the result is felt at home and the power of correction lies with the persons who suffer from it; but it becomes intolerable when its victims are a subject race. How many things we pass over lightly, feeling that we are ourselves to blame, which it would be scandalous for any people to submit to from a foreign power. Foreign paramount powers have their own faults, but our peculiar fault would be tyranny.

Where the business ends of government are of such great importance as in our largest cities and states, the increased difficulties encountered in carrying on the administration with the executive and legislative branches of the government, independently of each other, has resulted in some curious developments which have a certain bearing on the subject we are considering. In our states we may observe the tendency to increase the governor's practical influence over the legislature; by giving him, for example, the power to veto particular items in appropriation bills without vetoing the whole measure. In our city governments, which have but insignificant political but the most important business functions, the legislative branch has been made comparatively harmless by being deprived of all practical power, while the authority of the mayor has been correspondingly increased. But even the

increased importance of the governor and mayor has not been enough to meet the demand for greater efficiency, and in response to the demand for still greater harmony between the two branches there has developed a position to which is attached greater practical powers than those of either the governor or the legislature, although the incumbent of the position has no legal responsibility nor are his powers defined by law.

Let those who object to the "boss" as such, consider whether our legislatures would be improved if freed from his restraining influence. He is a natural product of our system. By furnishing the missing link needed to unite the executive and the legislature in harmonious and mutually helpful action, he supplies a long felt want. How quickly the natural antagonism between the mayor and the municipal assembly manifests itself when the incumbent of that important position in the actual government of the city of New York betakes himself away to England to enjoy a few weeks of much needed rest. How quickly all friction ceases under the sobering influence of his expected presence when it becomes known that he is on his way home. Even so vigorous and strenuous a character as New York's present governor finds it necessary to make frequent trips from Albany to New York to visit the leaders of his party and to arrange over the breakfast table what he, the governor, and the legislature are to do. We owe the greater efficiency of our state and city administrations to the increased powers of the governors and mayors and above all to the influence of the "boss." Thus has been overcome the extreme jealousy of the executive on the part of the legislature, which still characterizes congress, but which had to yield in our largest cities and states when their growing requirements made it necessary for them to have a more efficient and skillful administration.

We have not yet developed the "boss" as an adjunct to the federal government, but during the past few weeks we have seen both president and congress bend to an outside influence which is not unlike what we are accustomed to in our state and local governments, and if ever congress actually attempts to provide an admin-

istration, and to pass appropriation bills, and to set up local governments, and to grant franchises for the eight millions in the Philippines we may reasonably expect to evolve out of the scandals and embarrassments to result from its mistakes, either a "boss" or some other institution which shall be effective to carry through colonial bills. We can scarcely expect congress by itself, when it comes to legislate for colored men on the other side of the world, to show greater wisdom, solicitude and knowledge than it does when it legislates for its own constituents, or than it did when it once before tried to set up a government in a conquered territory, and reconstruct the southern states, or than has been shown by our state legislatures when dealing with matters affecting their own states. If we undertake to govern dependencies from Washington, either congress must become submissive to the executive, or absorb the executive by admitting cabinet officers to the floors of congress who will direct its deliberations and administer its laws in accordance with the will of the majority, or both branches must become the tools of a great party "boss."

HENRY DE FOREST BALDWIN.
New York City.

NEWS

Our report of the South African war closed last week with the announcement that Lord Roberts was making active preparations to withstand an investment at Bloemfontein. The Boers had a few days before won a victory at Koornspruit, not many miles east of Bloemfontein; had captured and were still in possession of the Bloemfontein water works; and were otherwise pressing upon the town from the south and east. This pressure has continued during the week now closing, causing the British to concentrate so as to be ready to face an attack from any direction; and some fighting has occurred.

One of the fights was a small affair at Boshof, a place in the Orange Free State a short distance to the northeast from Kimberley. A British force of nearly 700 surrounded a Boer force of 65, and after four hours' fighting killed 7, wounded 8, and captured the rest. Only three of the

prisoners were Boers; the others were uitlanders — Frenchmen, Germans and Russians. Among the killed was Gen. Villebois Mareuil, known as "the Lafayette of South Africa," a French officer who was the Boer chief of staff.

This British victory would have offset in some degree the stinging defeat of Koornspruit, reported last week; but it was itself more than offset by the capture, reported by Lord Roberts on the 5th, of three companies of the Royal Irish fusiliers and two companies of the 9th regiment of mounted infantry, at Reddersburg, by a supposedly superior but unknown Boer force. Reddersburg lies a little east of the railroad and as far south as Edenburg. Gen. Gatacre at once went to Reddersburg; but although he arrived within two hours after the fight, he could get no news either of the captured detachment or their captors.

On the 11th hard fighting was reported at Wepener, an Orange Free State point 45 miles directly south of Thaba N'chu, and on the border of Basutoland. Gen. Brabant commands a British force of from 2,000 to 3,000 at Wepener. As early as the 6th the Boers were observed to be gathering in force, and owing to the bad condition of Brabant's horses it was believed that he would have to act strictly upon the defensive. Surrender of the place was demanded on the 7th, and on the 8th the garrison was reported as isolated. The Boers had invested it on the three Orange Free State sides. On the same day the attack began and the battle was still under way on the 11th, when the last report from Wepener was received.

From Boer sources on the 11th there came reports of hard fighting and a Boer victory at a place called Meerkatsfontein, in which the British lost 600 in killed and 900 in prisoners. The British war office neither confirms nor denies this report. That, however, is not significant, as the censorship has again become very strict. But there are reasons for suspecting that the report is the Boer version of the Reddersburg affair, in which the Irish fusiliers were captured.

By reference to a map of the Orange Free State, it will be readily seen that these Boer movements are

of a highly threatening character to the British position at Bloemfontein. The Boers appear to have extended a broken line of mobile troops in a semi-circle eastward around Bloemfontein from Brandfort in the north to the neighborhood of Reddersburg in the south, where they threaten Roberts' communications; and the reports show that virtually all the Free State east of the railroad, where the British were but recently in control, is now dominated by Boers. Meanwhile Roberts is unable to move. He ruined his horses in the chase after Cronje, and has not yet received fresh ones. He is also suffering for want of warm clothing for his men. The winter is coming upon him, and his men have only the thin khaki uniforms that have served them during the summer. In London the predictions that Pretoria would be taken by May have been withdrawn, and gloom has succeeded enthusiasm.

Mafeking is still unrelieved, and fighting in that region continues. Lord Methuen has moved from Kimberley to the relief of Mafeking with the main body under his command. But nothing has been heard of his progress. The capture of a Boer detachment at Boshof, described above, may have been made in this connection. Belated British reports say that Col. Plumer, with a relief expedition from the north, came within six miles of Mafeking on the 31st, but in a battle between Ramathlabama and Mafeking was driven back with considerable loss. Col. Plumer himself was wounded in the right arm. These reports confirm earlier ones to the same effect from Boer sources.

Buller's force in Natal is being attacked by the Boers. They began their aggressive movement here on the 10th, in the neighborhood of Elandslaagte, where the earliest fighting of the war occurred. Elandslaagte is on the railroad only a few miles north of Ladysmith. Buller, like Roberts, is badly hampered for want of fresh horses and winter clothing.

The latest official report of British casualties was issued on the 11th and brings the figures down to the 7th. They are as follows:

Killed	2,171
Died	2,082
Missing and prisoners.....	3,890
Invalided home.....	5,222
Total	13,365