

The Public

First Year.

CHICAGO, SATURDAY, JANUARY 21, 1899.

Number 42.

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.

It appears that the war department has established a censorship over political news between the United States and the Philippine islands. For this reason Americans are getting but little information regarding the situation there; and it may be inferred that the Filipinos are not getting much about the debates in the senate. What real occasion is there for an American censorship over political information when the state of war is so purely nominal? Is it another indication of the drift toward imperialism?

The three Filipino representatives who have just arrived in this country to represent the claims to independence of the Aguinaldo republic are savages, of course, and without any present capacity for self-government. One of them is a professor in a medical college, and another—a man in such a low state of barbarism that he cannot even converse with an American without an interpreter—is an artist whose monstrosities are regularly exhibited at the Paris salon, where Parisians mistake them for works of real art. That such people are unfit for independence goes almost without saying.

Gen. Eagan's angry attack upon Gen. Miles, before the war investigating committee, has done much to turn public opinion against him, simply because it was angry. Anger is very generally regarded as evidence of a weak cause. But that is a mistake. It is evidence only of a weak advocate. Charles Lamb was not far from right when he argued that the anger of the advocate is frequently indica-

tive of the justness of his cause. The weak advocate of a just cause may easily be excited to frenzy by an indifferent but self-possessed adversary who cares nothing for causes. It would often be better if we looked with less suspicion upon the cause of the angry advocate and with more upon that of the calm, cold special pleader. Of course, Gen. Eagan does not prove by his anger that his cause is just. In fact, it is very likely far from being so. All the known circumstances tend to support Gen. Miles. But Gen. Eagan's cause should not be condemned merely because he has lost his temper.

Gen. Miles very appropriately calls attention to the fact that the president's investigating committee has examined nearly everybody on the subject of food supplies for the army, except the private soldiers who had to eat what he described as "embalmed beef." There are "hundreds of these men," says Gen. Miles, "who would be willing to be heard," and who, he believes, "would tell the truth and nothing but the truth." Why is it that the president's committee is so chary of inviting private soldiers to be witnesses?

Most sincerely is it to be hoped that Ida Wells Barnett will sue the proprietors of the Palmer house of Chicago and mulct them in exemplary damages. As one of the members of the League of Cook County Woman's Clubs, she attended a meeting at the League last week at the Palmer house, and was compelled to climb the stairs to the meeting room. She had entered an elevator, but was ordered out by a hotel employe whose act was afterwards approved by the hotel manager. Mrs. Barnett is one of the best known and respected women of Chicago. The only reason for excluding

her from the elevator was that she is of the African race.

Senator Ford has introduced in the legislature of New York a good bill bearing on the subject of taxation. It would require the publication annually of the assessed valuations of real estate in the city of New York, with the valuation of lots distinguished from that of improvements. It is public ignorance of comparative assessments that makes real estate tax frauds easy. If everyone interested in taxation could readily compare the assessments of lots with improvements, of vacant lots with improved lots, of property in one locality with property in others, of the property of any owner with that of any other owner, assessorships would soon cease to be peculiarly profitable, and small property owners would before long unload the excessive proportion of real estate taxation which they now bear.

Apparently President McKinley is changing front on the Philippine question. Of his intention to give the Filipinos the blessings of American liberty, even if he had to slaughter half of them to do it, there was but a few days ago no reason to doubt. Colonization was not only the idea; it was the word, too. Nothing could have been plainer than that it had become the settled policy of the republican party, by presidential command, and through that party and the president, of the country at large, to take possession of the Philippine archipelago and govern it as an American dependency. All thought of independence for the Filipinos was jeered at; annexation as an integral part of the American system, under the protection of the American constitution, was not open to consideration. The archipelago was to belong to the American

government, but to be no part of the American Union; the Filipinos were to be subject to American control, but to derive no guarantees of liberty from the American bill of rights. They were to have liberty, to be sure; but according to Speaker Reed's apt description it was to be "canned liberty."

Without wasting ink on the exclamatory editorials of papers like the New York Journal, those semi-official organs of McKinley's kitchen cabinet, which denounced all opposition to the Philippine colonization scheme as high treason against the United States, we may make the imperialistic intentions of the administration sufficiently evident by recalling the history of the past three months.

It was in October that Mr. McKinley went upon his electioneering tour through the middle west, via the Omaha exposition. From place to place he made speeches to cheering audiences; and as the cheering seemed to be most enthusiastic when he hinted at appropriating the Philippines, his speeches became more and more imperialistic, bolder and bolder, until at Chicago he announced that "duty determines destiny." This he did with an undisguised implication that it was the destiny of the United States to own the Philippine islands.

Two months later, as an opening skirmish for the presidential campaign of 1900, Mr. McKinley took a speaking trip through the south. On this occasion, in a public speech at Atlanta, he made his imperialistic purposes more evident than ever. Saying that the American flag had been planted in "two hemispheres," an unmistakable allusion to the Philippines, he concluded:

Who will withdraw from the people over whom it floats, its protecting folds? Who will haul it down?

This was only an interrogative expression, made for rhetorical effect, of a positive purpose. The president meant precisely what Gen. Grosvenor, his reputed representative on the

floor of the house of representatives, meant last summer when at the Ohio republican convention he proclaimed that the American flag must never be hauled down from any place over which it floats. The same expression was repeated again and again, and when the president gave it interrogative form in his Atlanta speech, he was universally understood as having given the sentiment his sanction. Of course, if the flag may not be hauled down from any place over which it floats, it can never be hauled down from the Philippines. The president's question, therefore, was equivalent to a declaration that the Filipinos should never be accorded self-governing rights.

This purpose became active a few days later, when the possible capture of Iloilo from the Spanish by the Filipinos was reported. Our flag had not yet floated over Panay, the island on which Iloilo is located—not even by implication. The peace protocol gave it the right to float only at Manila. But American troops were ordered to Iloilo at once with instructions from the war department to "take immediate possession." The object was to make the flag float over Iloilo, so that later the president might ask "who will haul it down?" and the permanent hold of the United States upon the Philippines be thereby strengthened. Fortunately, however, the Filipinos captured Iloilo before the American troops arrived.

The intention of permanent occupation was made still more manifest by the president in his message of instructions to the secretary of war, under date of December 21. In this message, after requiring that the Filipinos be assured that the mission of the United States is one of "benevolent assimilation," a phrase which certainly hints at permanent American sovereignty, he said that—

for the greatest good of the governed—meaning the Filipinos—

there must be sedulously maintained the strong arm of authority to repress disturbances and to overcome all ob-

stacles to the bestowal of the blessings of good and stable government upon the people of the Philippine islands under the free flag of the United States.

"Under the free flag of the United States"! Is that susceptible of any other interpretation than a purpose to establish American government in the archipelago permanently? How can it admit of a different interpretation when the treaty in pursuance of which the instructions were given—a treaty virtually dictated from the white house—while providing only for the relinquishment of Spanish sovereignty in Cuba, made a direct cession of Spanish sovereignty to the United States in the Philippines? And why are we to pay \$20,000,000 for the Philippines if not to annex or own them in perpetuity?

While the president was thus exposing his imperialistic hand, other men of "light and leading" in the march of imperial progress were diligently furnishing arguments in support of imperial colonization as a constitutional program. Prof. McMaster and some of his confreres dug up bad and forgotten precedents to show that the federal authorities are constitutionally empowered to govern dependencies in perpetuity, outside of the constitution and regardless of its safeguards. Gen. Merritt didn't care whether the exercise of such power would be constitutional or not, for in his imperial enthusiasm he believed that we had "outgrown the constitution." Senator Platt of Connecticut amended that clause of the declaration of independence which asserts that "government derives its just power from the consent of the governed" so as to make it read, "from the consent of some of the governed." And Senator Teller had so completely assimilated the imperialistic idea that he referred prematurely to the Filipinos as American "subjects." There was no room for doubt up to the last days of the year, and no one on either side of the question entertained a doubt, that it was the president's policy to subjugate the Philippine islanders and make them perpetual subjects of the

federal government at Washington. Neither was there any doubt that pursuant to this purpose he intended if necessary to attack the natives at Iloilo and wrest the city and island from them.

But suddenly a change comes. It seems to have been borne in upon the mind of the president that if, under the circumstances, he were to attack the Filipinos at Iloilo he would commit an act of war without authority from congress, our only war-making power. That would be an impeachable offense of the highest grade. So the belligerent campaign against Iloilo, foreshadowed by his message to the secretary of war on December 21, in which he ordered that all persons anywhere in the Philippines who obstructed American occupation be dealt with "with firmness if need be, but without severity so far as may be possible," was allowed to languish. The purpose, however, to permanently subjugate the Filipinos after the ratification of the peace treaty, in which sovereignty over them is ceded, was still clung to, so far as the public could judge.

But that purpose, too, showed marked signs of collapse before the new year had grown half a month old. Senator Foraker was the first to tell of it. In his speech in the senate on the 11th in advocacy of the peace treaty, while specifying the three courses possible of adoption regarding the Philippines—Spanish sovereignty, anarchy, or independence—he said, as reported in the Congressional Record:

We had left on our hands the choice of allowing them their independence and the privilege of establishing a free republic, which I do not understand anybody intends to deny them, except only temporarily at the most.

Requested by Senator Hoar to repeat this remark, Senator Foraker answered:

I do not know of anybody who wants to take possession of the Phillipine islands and govern the people of those islands indefinitely against their will by force of arms.

Still further pressed by Mr. Hoar upon the same point, the Ohio senator exclaimed:

I say I do not know of anybody, from the president of the United States down to his humblest follower in this matter, who is proposing by force and violence to take and hold those islands for all time to come.

Senator Foraker was at the time regarded as speaking for the president with authority. He may have intended only to place the president in the embarrassing position of being obliged either to assert his imperial purpose, or by silence under circumstances requiring speech to acquiesce in Foraker's policy. Be that as it may, the presidential attitude toward the Philippine question has evidently undergone a marked change.

The idea of establishing a foreign dominion, like that of England in India, over the Philippines in perpetuity, and the disposition for that purpose to make a military attack upon a peaceable Philippine city, have for the present at least been abandoned. One of the peace commissioners, Senator Gray, is authority for the assurance, made in a public speech on the 14th, and based upon "some knowledge," so he says, that the president "is committed to no policy calculated to discourage, much less strike down, the aspirations of liberty loving people all over the world." Between this idea and the proposition to make the American flag stay forever where it is put, there is a wide gulf; but the circumstances at present indicate that Mr. McKinley has crossed it. His imperial policy appears to have come to grief early in its career.

Among the republicans who have been instrumental in causing President McKinley to reverse, or at least to suppress, his Philippine policy, Senator Hoar, of Massachusetts, is first and foremost. But Senator Mason, of Illinois, is not far behind. Though his speech in the senate did not deal with constitutional questions, as did Senator Hoar's, it did deal, and most ably, with a more sacred American document than the constitution. The

corner stone of Mason's speech was the declaration of independence. Not only was it an able and interesting speech, but it was redolent of democracy. One of the gratifying things about the political issues into which the war has plunged us is that they have revived within the republican party serious discussions of fundamental principles that have long been ignored as academic or sentimental. Both Mason's speech and Hoar's recall the truly democratic origin of their party.

Imperialism is not the only presidential policy to experience a setback. The project for a large standing army would naturally suffer with the political policy that makes an excuse for militarism. But it has received a check also from other directions. Friends of the Hull army bill in the house are reported as panic-stricken over the prospects of a ripping up of army scandals through the court-martial which the president has been forced by Gen. Eagan's indiscreet display of temper to order. Besides the army bill, the banking ring currency bill is also likely to go by the board. H. H. Hanna, president of the National Sound Money League, has made a canvass of the house, so it is reported from Washington, to find not only that no currency legislation this session is probable, but moreover that the plans of his organization have been completely frustrated in the house by the adverse report of Comptroller Dawes. With imperialism suppressed, the establishment of a large standing army prevented, and the currency monopoly scheme frustrated, confidence in the ultimate triumph of right in popular government may revive.

President McKinley is nothing if not smooth. And in no way has he exhibited his smooth qualities with greater smoothness than in his dexterous shelving of Gen. Fitzhugh Lee. Lee was the biggest figure of the war, when the war broke out. As American consul-general in Cuba, he had left Havana under circumstances that

entitled him in public estimation to an opportunity to return with all the power and pomp and circumstance of an American conqueror and Cuban deliverer. But that might have made him formidable as a presidential candidate. So Gen. Shafter was sent to Santiago in command of the first expedition, Gen. Lee being assured that when it came to taking Havana, he should have his innings. But Havana gave up without a blow. However, a governor general of the island was needed during our temporary occupation, and who so fit as Lee? But the president preferred a fluffy martinet, Gen. Brooke, and Lee was given the governorship only of Havana province. That seemed fit enough, as far as it went, since the city of Havana had been the central scene of Lee's Cuban experiences, and as governor of the province he would of course govern the city through his subordinate, Gen. Ludlow, to whose immediate control the city was assigned. But hardly had Lee arrived in Cuba, when the city of Havana was detached from the province and Ludlow withdrawn thereby from Lee's command. In consequence, Lee is now what you might call a suburban military governor. Could shelving be more smoothly done?

It is significant of much that is hopeful that the Patria, the organ of the Cuban revolutionary party, conspicuously publishes single tax articles from the pen of J. de D. Tejada, and that the articles are reproduced in the best papers of Cuba.

It is not all plain sailing for Gov. Pingree, the republican executive of Michigan. Before the people he has his own way, for they trust him. In popular contests, consequently, he wins easily. The party corruptionists and bosses grind their teeth and swear fluently, but they give Pingree right of way when there is a referendum. It is different, though, when the legislature comes to act. There the corruptionists and bosses have an advantage over a bluff, straightforward, honest leader like Pingree. So it has

come about that the United States senator whose reelection Pingree opposed because the senator had proved to be a mere tool of the lumber ring, was forced upon the party and the state by the republican caucus. So too it came about that Pingree's measure for taxing railroad corporations equally with individual property owners was defeated last year. But Pingree is more than bluff, straightforward and honest. He is also determined, resourceful and courageous. And this winter he announces to the corporation tools of his party in the Michigan legislature that unless they pass an equal taxation measure, he will refuse to sign the appropriation bill. That would apparently be a rash remedy; but desperate cases require rash remedies. It may be inferred, besides, that Gov. Pingree knows the people of Michigan well enough to believe that they will endure temporarily the inconveniences of no appropriations for public business, so long as they realize that the legislature can avoid the inconveniences by simply making corporations pay their fair proportion of taxes. It is not probable that Pingree will be unhorsed in this tournament.

The kind of republican management in the matter of senatorships which Pingree had to meet and fight in Michigan, was like that which the republican governor of New York has made no attempt to fight. Pingree did his best to defeat Burrows, the corporation senator from Michigan; but Roosevelt did not resist if indeed he did not favor the election from New York of Depew, the corporation clerk. Aside from his reputation as an after dinner speaker, and as a declaimer of platitudes on anniversary occasions, Depew has no reputation at all except as head servant of the Vanderbilt family. Originally a Vanderbilt lobbyist at Albany when the Albany legislature was most unblushingly corrupt and the lobby consequently most powerful, he has been promoted step by step in the Vanderbilt service, until now that family, through the amiability of the repub-

lican party of New York, advance him to a seat in the United States senate—the second place in importance that they can hope to have within their gift—while he is yet chairman of the board of the Vanderbilt roads. It is as a Vanderbilt servant, not as a statesman—for he is the one and not the other—that Chauncey M. Depew enters the United States senate. His election for that place is the most impudent confession the republican party has yet made of its decadence. It is even more impudent than the selection of Mark Hanna, for he was opposed within his party and had to buy his way through.

Two British workingmen, Messrs. Thorne and Inskip, the former of the Gas Workers' Union and the latter of the Boot and Shoe Operatives, were sent as labor delegates from Great Britain to the convention of the American Federation of Labor recently held at Kansas City. They have just returned to England, and their interviews in London newspapers show their ideas of the condition of American as compared with English workingmen. Mr. Thorne says that he—

as a workingman would not choose the United States as a home.

Mr. Inskip comes to the same conclusion. Speaking with deference of his American brethren, he is nevertheless of opinion that—

the workers in England are better off than the workmen in the United States, for, while the latter may earn more in actual cash, the purchasing capacity of their wages for the necessities of life is less by comparison than the wages paid in England.

And this after years of tariff protection expressly for the benefit of American workmen. England, the one country against which our tariff barriers are especially erected, nevertheless gives her workingmen a better living than workingmen can get in protected America! As a protective measure for workingmen, the tariff would seem, then, to be a dismal failure.

To this opinion also has come the Textile Record, of Philadelphia, organ of the woven fabrics manufacturers of the United States, and a staunch protectionist. Wondering how the friends of protection will sustain their demand for continued protection in the face of the fact that American fabrics are underselling those of foreign make even in the foreign market, this protection organ asks:

If the argument shall be presented that the tariff is necessary for the maintenance of high American wages, will it be surprising if somebody steps to the front with a demonstration that wages, in many protected industries, have fallen under the Dingley tariff?

It is bad enough for protectionists that English workingmen, after visiting this country, report at home that the American workingman cannot make as good a living as the English; but when an American protection organ thus admits that the Dingley tariff, instead of raising wages has reduced them, what is a thorough-going protectionist to do? It would not sound well to advocate protection as the foster mother of trusts and monopolies. Though that is what it is, it could not be popularized by saying so. Yet what other argument will remain to the protectionist when the workingman argument fails him?

Those confiding people who imagine that the rich owners of personal property can be taxed by taxing personal property, should keep their eyes and ears open at taxing time. Many are the tricks by which personal property taxes are dodged. One of the simplest, of the pious sort, is to send as much taxable property as possible out of the jurisdiction. For instance, when personal taxpayers in New York were making their returns, the agent there of a large Chicago house, an agent who has his employers' interests more heavily upon his mind than the interests of the New York city treasury, forwarded a large sum to the home office, with this candid comment: "We send this amount, all we can spare, to avoid paying taxes on cash on hand." That sort of thing is

called "tax dodging." And in fact, it is tax dodging. But why shouldn't a man dodge a kind of tax which everybody else dodges to the fullest possible extent, and which the state has no just right to impose? In the natural order of things personal property represents the owner's own earnings. Why should they be taxed at all, while monopoly values go untaxed or only partly taxed? The personal tax dodger is really defending his property against confiscation. But the essential point just here is that while farmers, who can't dodge personal taxation, insist upon retaining that nearly obsolete method of raising public revenues, the rich owners of personal property easily escape. Personal property taxation is a trap which farmers set for city capitalists, but which catches the farmers and lets the capitalists escape.

A new paper, The Herald, has been started in Seattle, under the editorship of Samuel Archer and the business management of Hon. E. W. Way. Its object is to aid in recovering the ground which was lost politically to reform movements in Washington at the late election through the triumph at the polls of the candidates of beneficiaries of special privilege. The chief subjects which this new Washington paper intends to agitate are direct legislation, justice in taxation, and control of the liquor traffic by a state dispensary system. The political exemplars of the paper are Jefferson, Jackson and Lincoln.

FAVORABLE TRADE.

No apology is required for exposing again and again the prevailing commercial fallacy about favorable balances of trade. This notion that a perpetual excess of exports enriches a nation, while a perpetual excess of imports impoverishes it, is at the bottom of nearly all the economic errors of our time, both in politics and out of it.

Let any thoughtful man once see the truth that nations are enriched not by export balances but by import balances, and not only will he cease from that moment to be a protection-

ist, but the labor question, the money question, the whole tax question, the overproduction question, in a word the entire range of economic and social problems, will be revealed to him in a newer and clearer light. Even such political questions as extra-territorial colonization will be easier of correct solution.

He who habitually thinks of a perennial export balance as favorable trade, is like men standing upon their heads with their feet in the air; he sees everything upside down. Show him that imports, not exports, represent profits, and you have his feet at once upon the ground and his head in the air, so that he sees all things right side up. If any apology were needed for our frequent recurrence to the common fallacy regarding export balances, this would be enough. A fallacy which so disturbs all right thinking in the field of business, economics and politics must be hammered at until it is flattened out.

National exports and imports are the aggregate of the goods which the individuals of a nation send abroad, on the one hand, and receive back on the other. All the goods sent out of a country by its individual citizens constitute its exports; all the goods brought into a country by its individual citizens constitute its imports. The nation itself, as a nation, neither exports nor imports. These commercial terms relate exclusively to aggregates of private transactions.

In considering, therefore, the relative advantages of a perpetual import balance and a perpetual export balance, the real subject in hand is not a question of national profits. It is a question of the aggregate of individual profits. Would the individuals of a country grow richer if the aggregate of goods going out exceeded perpetually or on the whole the aggregate of those coming in, than they would if the aggregate coming in exceeded on the whole the aggregate going out? That is the question.

This question may be more simply considered, and a more accurate result be assured, by dealing at the outset with the comparatively familiar transactions of a single individual. If he prospers by making his sales as an individual exceed his purchases as an individual, perpetually or on the

whole, then all the people of the country taken together would prosper if in the aggregate their exports exceeded their imports perpetually or on the whole. What his sales to and his purchases from all other persons everywhere are to him as an individual, such are the aggregate exports of a country and its aggregate imports, to its people in the aggregate. In other words, as the commercial exports and imports of a country are to its people, as a people, so are the sales and purchases of an individual to himself. Let us ascertain, then, whether an individual profits by selling or by buying.

Here is a merchant doing what is called a "profitable cash business." All will agree that such a merchant is prosperous. But is his prosperity attributable to an excess of sales over purchases—that is, of his "exports" over his "imports"—or to the reverse? Let us see.

On the 31st of January, 1897, he takes an account of stock, balances his books, and finds himself with goods on hand to the value, at cost price, of \$20,000. As he owes nobody and nobody owes him, he starts the new year, 1898—if, for simplicity of calculation, we assume that exactly all his capital is invested in his stock—with just \$20,000 to the good. In the course of that year, from time to time, he buys more stock from city wholesalers to the value, at purchase price, of \$50,000, selling from the aggregate of his stock to local consumers—at an average profit of 50 per cent.—to the value, at selling price, of \$65,000. His business expenses, let us say, are \$10,000.

For convenience of reference we now tabulate these items:

Goods on hand Jan 1, '98.....	\$20,000	
Goods purchased Jan. 1 to Dec. 31.	50,000	
Total stock at cost price.....	\$70,000	
Sales to Cover Expenses.		
Goods at cost price.....	\$20,000	
Profit at 50 per cent....	10,000	\$30,000
Remainder of Sales.		
Goods at cost price.....	\$23,334	
Profit at 50 per cent....	11,666	\$35,000
Total sales at selling price....	\$65,000	

A glance at this table will show that the merchant has made a profit

during the year, over and above his business expenses, of \$11,666. Now, was this profit derived from his purchases or from his sales—from his "imports," so to speak, or from his "exports?" The answer requires as a first step that the table be analyzed.

He had \$20,000 worth of goods at cost price on hand at the beginning of the year, as stated in the first line of the foregoing table. Further examination of the table will show that he sold during the year, measuring again by cost price, \$20,000 to cover expenses, and \$23,334 besides, making a total of sales, on the basis of cost price, of \$43,334. Deduct this total from the total of goods—those on hand at the beginning of the year, and those subsequently purchased, taken together—which, as shown in the table, amounts to \$70,000, and you find that at the end of the year he has on hand, at cost price, \$26,666—an increase in his stock of \$6,666. Deduct that from his net profit of \$11,666, and you find a balance of \$5,000.

As the merchant does a cash business, the latter sum must be accounted for either in cash, in purchases for personal use, in investments outside of his regular business, or in some two or all three of these ways. But let that matter rest for the present while we, to avoid possible confusion, take our bearings again by means of another table:

Goods on hand Jan. 1, '98.....	\$20,000
Goods purchased Jan. 1 to Dec. 31.	50,000
Total stock at cost price.....	\$70,000
Total sales (measured by cost).	43,334
Goods on hand Dec. 1 '98.....	\$26,666
Goods on hand Jan. 1, '98.....	20,000
Increase of stock at cost.....	\$6,666
Cash on hand, expended for personal use, or invested.....	5,000
Net profit.....	\$11,666

Upon these facts, what would be this merchant's showing upon taking account of stock and balancing his books at the end of the year—the 31st of December, 1898?

Let the \$20,000 worth of goods on hand at the beginning of the year be offset by \$20,000 of the \$26,666 on hand at the end of the year, and by that much simplify the calculation. It will appear then that during the year the merchant has bought, that

is to say "imported," \$50,000 of goods, the total amount of the purchases as tabulated at cost price; and that he has sold, that is to say "exported," \$65,000, the total amount of the sales as tabulated at the selling price. There would thus seem, if no thought be given to the matter, to be an excess of "exports" in this profitable year's business. That view of it would probably be put in this form:

Exports	\$65,000
Imports	50,000
Excess of "exports," or profits..	\$15,000

But \$15,000 is not 50 per cent. profit upon either "exports" or "imports." There is no relation, therefore, between the rate of profit and the excess of "exports." Moreover, the table is contradictory upon its face. By no possibility can any merchant make \$15,000 by giving out (exporting) values to the amount of \$65,000, and taking in (importing) values to the amount of \$50,000. Even his errand boy would know that an outgo of \$65,000 against an income of \$50,000 would mean not a profit of \$15,000, but a loss of that amount.

If the merchant wished to calculate his profit or loss he would tabulate his accounts in substance as follows:

Goods purchased, measured by cost price	\$50,000
Goods sold, measured by cost price	43,334
Purchased goods left in stock..	\$6,666
Use of store, assistance of clerks, etc., purchased with profit on \$20,000 of goods sold.	10,000
Remaining profit used to purchase personal goods, or to purchase property for outside investment, or on hand in cash	5,000
Excess of purchases over sales.	\$21,666

That this calculation is correct is proved by the fact that the "excess of purchases over sales," \$21,666, is exactly 50 per cent., the assumed average profit on sales; the sales, measured by cost price, being \$43,334. That is to say, the excess of purchases coincides to a penny with what the profits are. Thus we see that profits, and excess of purchases over sales, are one and the same.

But, as stated at the beginning, and as no one can intelligently deny, a

merchant's sales are his "exports" and his purchases are his "imports." It follows that his profits coincide not with his "exports," but with his "imports," and that his "favorable balance of trade," so far from being an export balance, is an import balance.

To reverse the calculation, let us suppose the merchant to have sold \$50,000 of goods, measured by cost price, for only enough let us say to purchase \$43,334 worth—a loss of 13 1-3 per cent. Then he would tabulate his accounts briefly and sorrowfully as follows:

Goods sold.....	\$50,000
Goods purchased.....	43,334
<hr/>	
Excess of sales over purchases...	\$6,666

Here we find the excess of sales coinciding exactly with the loss, just as in the previous table we found the excess of purchases coinciding exactly with the profit. And as sales are synonymous with "exports," the merchant's excess of exports is proved to tally with his losses, just as in the previous table his excess of "imports" is proved to tally with his profits. To him, a perpetual export balance, so far from being favorable, would clearly be an unfavorable balance.

We may now dispose of the item of \$5,000, which appears above in the table of profits.

We have said that it might be used by the merchant to purchase, that is, to "import," personal goods; that it might be used to purchase, that is, to "import," property for investment outside of his business; or that it might be found in his cash drawer. In fact, it would probably be distributed in all three directions.

Part of it would be used to purchase personal satisfactions. They would be "imports." As to that part, therefore, the sum is properly treated in the table as an import.

Part of this sum would be cash in the drawer, which is not usually regarded as an import. But it is, nevertheless, an import potentially. Merchants sell their goods for money, not because they want the money, but because they want what the money will buy—because they want imports. In time, therefore, the money would be exchanged

for goods, and thus become actually what it already is potentially, an import item.

But part of this cash profit might be devoted to outside investments of a character that could not be personally appropriated — investments in property like real estate. If so, however, it would not be for the sake of the real estate, it would be for the sake of what the real estate would yield in profits, that the investment would be made. Should it never yield to the investor as much as he pays for it, then it is a losing investment. And in that case only would the "exports" with which it was bought be a perpetual "export" item uncanceled. In order that his "exports" for investment may perpetually exceed his "imports," his investments must never return him as much as they cost—they must be losing investments! Here again we may see that a man's "export" balances must in the long run coincide not with his profit, but with his loss.

In this connection the creation of credits as a mode of accounting for export balances, consistently with profits, may be considered. The example of the merchant will again serve for illustration. Let us suppose that our merchant does a credit instead of a cash business, and that of his \$43,334 of sales, \$25,000 are unpaid for, though well secured. While that would leave his profits the same as shown in the table above, \$21,666, it would cut down his purchases from \$50,000 to \$25,000. This would make his sales exceed his purchases, his "exports" exceed his "imports," by \$3,334 (for which he would have to resort to his accumulated stock of the previous year), thus giving him an "export" balance to that amount, along with a profit of \$21,666. This seems on the surface to indicate that exporting balances may be profitable.

But what are these credits? If they are never to be liquidated of what profit can they be to the merchant? Are they aught but evidence of imports deferred? Some time they must be paid, either in goods, or in money, which will be expended for goods, or cause the merchant loss. Should they never be paid, the transactions would be profitable only on paper. As an

actual business fact, they would in that case result in a loss equal to the face value of the credits.

Any man in profitable business may, it is true, during a particular interval, appear to have sold or "exported" more than in the same interval he has purchased or "imported." But in all such instances, if the business be really profitable, the purchases or "imports" are merely deferred. Within a reasonable time they must come in to him, and on the whole they must exceed his "exports." No individual can prosper whose sales or "exports" perpetually or on the whole exceed his purchases or "imports."

The theory that a business man profits by his sales instead of by his purchases, by his "exports" instead of by his "imports," originates in the generally accepted notion which in thought substitutes for an end the means whereby it is usually attained. Because men seek work in order that they may get wages with which to buy goods, we fall into the habit of thinking of the work instead of the goods as the real object of their desire. Likewise, because men seek money in order to buy goods, we are prone to forget that what they want is after all not the money, but the goods, for the purchase of which the money is but a medium. Again, because men persistently try to sell goods which they do not need, in order to get money with which to buy goods that they do need, we think of their desire to sell instead of their desire to buy as the impulse of their action.

An instance of this is worth noting as illustrating in a simple way the whole subject of this discussion:

An intelligent professional gentleman, holding an official position in Ohio, had been invited to subscribe for a Chicago paper, the subscription price of which was a dollar a year. This paper had taken some pains editorially to point out the fallacy of the balance of trade theory; and the gentleman in question, jocularly as to the special instance, but in all seriousness as to the principle involved, specified, as one of his reasons for declining, that upon the trade balance theory which the paper adopted he feared his subscription might tend to

impoverish the publisher. This was his language:

A sale of a year's subscription to me, might run your sales that much above your purchases, make you sell more than you buy, and if your logic be true make you that much poorer. I must decline to subscribe, for I do not wish to contribute to your poverty.

In these brief words the commercial theory of favorable trade balances was admirably set forth. And as will be observed, the dominant thought was that the publisher's main and ultimate purpose, so far as profit was concerned, was not to sell his paper in order to buy things, not to "export" in order to "import," but just to sell his paper, just to "export" without regard to "importing." Such was not the publisher's idea of business, however, as his reply may show. He said:

You have entirely misunderstood my proposition. I did not offer to send the paper to you for nothing. That would be all export and no import. What I did offer was to export to you a paper which costs me about 50 cents a year, in exchange for imports of Ohio food stuffs (which would have been bought by myself and my employes with the check you sent me) food stuffs which in the Chicago market would be worth \$1. Had you accepted my offer, my accounts would stand like this:

Imports of Ohio food stuffs.....	\$1.00
Exports of one weekly paper for 1 year.....	.50
Excess of imports.....	\$.50

You may think it would impoverish me to import more than I export, but I find, nevertheless, that it is upon my imports, not upon my exports, that I live.

The principle is universal that it is the desire to buy and not the desire to sell, the desire to get and not the desire to give, that sets the economic mechanism of the world in motion and keeps it going. The desire to sell is a means to an end, not the end itself.

But that simple and obvious principle is ignored, and the world of trade looked at as in a camera, where everything is upside down, when questions of international commerce arise. The people are urged to believe, and great problems of public policy are made to turn upon the theory, that international trade balances, to be favorable, must be perpetually or on the whole export balances.

The idea behind this notion is that a people export their surplus, what

they don't require at home, and in return for it get gold and silver from abroad, secure credits abroad against which they may draw at will, and obtain titles to foreign bonds and real estate. The theory is as fallacious in the case of a whole people considered together, as it would be in the case of any one of them considered individually.

If an exporting people were to get their pay in gold and silver, those metals would not be useful to them (especially if theirs were a great gold and silver producing country), except as they could exchange them sooner or later for imports of goods or use them in the arts.

If they were to get credits abroad, the credits would serve them only as they set imports to flowing in their direction through drafts against the credits.

If they were to make investments in foreign real estate, that would be useless to them except as it brought imports from time to time in payment of rents, or, in the case of corporations, of dividends. Even were it possible for the people of one country continually to send "surplus" products abroad as exports for investment in foreign bonds and foreign lands, though their export balances might thus be kept steadily up for a long period, the time would have to come when rents, interest and dividends imported from abroad would more than offset all exports invested in foreign property; and after that the investing people would find their imports perpetually exceeding their exports, which would be significant, according to the export balance theory of trade, of approaching bankruptcy. As soon as the investments began to pay, the investors would begin to suffer!

The plain truth is that a perpetual export balance is utterly inconsistent with commercial prosperity. To be prosperous in their commerce a people's imports must on the whole exceed their exports.

American exports for the past three years are pointed at as evidence of American prosperity, because they enormously exceed our imports during the same period. But why stop with

three years? If our merchandise exports during the past three years have exceeded our imports by more than \$1,000,000,000, they have exceeded our imports during the past 30 years, as shown by the monthly summary of the treasury department, by more than \$2,800,000,000. And our imports of gold and silver, instead of having risen above the exports of those metals during that 30 years sufficiently to pay off some part of the enormous export balance of merchandise, have actually fallen so far below, as to carry our total excess of exports—merchandise, gold and silver—several millions above \$3,000,000,000.

If a perpetual excess of exports means that gold and silver are being imported in payment, why have we for the past 30 years exported more gold and silver than we have imported?

If a perpetual excess of exports means that we are running up a credit balance against which we may draw at will, why were we not able to draw during the past 30 years, when we were piling up an export excess of over \$3,000,000,000, of which two-thirds was piled up three years ago? Instead of being at liberty to draw against a former credit we were during all those years piling up a foreign debt.

If a perpetual excess of exports means that we are investing in European securities or property, where are the evidences of title? Thomas G. Shearman asserts that whereas American securities are daily bought and sold in Europe, European securities are not traded in in the United States.

If a perpetual excess of exports means prosperity, why have we had two long and exhausting periods of industrial depression during those 30 years of enormous excess of exports?

The simple answer to it all is that continuous exports in excess of imports imply not prosperity, but exhaustion. They have the same significance regarding a people that continuous sales in excess of purchases have regarding a man. Representing what goes out, over and above what comes in, they cannot be persistent in the affairs of either a person or a people without culminating in complete commercial prostration.

What our vast excess of exports really means, in largest part, is that foreigners are drawing, in the form of American products shipped abroad, dividends on American securities, interest on American mortgages, and rents for American real estate. For these exports there are no counterbalancing imports. Hence the "favorable balance." But in sober truth could a trade balance be in character more unfavorable?

NEWS

On the day of our going to press last week, January 12, Commissary General Eagan testified before the presidential committee for the investigation of the mismanagement of the war, in such manner with reference to Gen. Miles as to have become the subject of a court-martial which may result in an authoritative and complete investigation into the quality of the food supplied last summer to the troops. This investigation may even probe the whole army scandal.

Replying to Gen. Miles's previous testimony that much of the beef furnished to the army was unfit for use, and especially to Gen. Miles's statement that it had been supplied "under the pretense of an experiment," Gen. Eagan said:

It was not furnished under the pretense of an experiment, nor even as an experiment; and when Gen. Miles charges that it was furnished as a 'pretense of experiment,' he lies in his throat, he lies in his heart, he lies in every hair of his head and pore of his body, he lies wilfully, deliberately, intentionally and maliciously. If his statement is true that this was furnished under 'pretense of an experiment,' then I should be drummed out of the army and incarcerated in state's prison. If his statement is false, as I assert it to be, then he should be drummed out of the service and incarcerated in prison with other libelers. His statement is a scandalous libel, reflecting upon the honor of every officer in the department who has contracted for or purchased this meat, and especially and particularly on the commissary general—myself. In denouncing General Miles as a liar when he makes this statement I wish to make it as emphatic and as coarse as the statement itself. I wish to force the lie back into his throat. I wish to brand it as a falsehood out of whole cloth, without a particle of truth to sustain it, and unless he can prove his statement he should be driven out of

the clubs, barred from the society of decent people, and so ostracized that the street bootblack would not condescend to speak to him, for he has fouled his own nest—he has aspersed the honor of a brother officer without a particle of evidence or fact to sustain in any degree his scandalous, libelous, malicious falsehoods—viz.: that this beef, or anything whatever, was furnished the army under 'pretense of experiment.'

The foregoing attack upon Miles was made with great deliberation. It was not a spontaneous outburst, but was read from a carefully prepared paper, which was left with the investigating committee, but which on the following day the committee returned with a request that Gen. Eagan revise its language before again submitting it as testimony.

Gen. Eagan sent to the commission on the 14th a revised statement, from which the objectionable language had been eliminated. He accompanied this with a letter explaining that such monstrous charges as those which he had long been compelled to endure in silence were calculated

to work upon an honorable man in such a way as to goad him to a species of desperation, and that it was but natural, when the proper opportunity was given him to meet and refute the charges, that he should characterize them in harsh language and in terms that are deemed improper no matter what the provocation.

The statement as Gen. Eagan had originally made it, caused much excitement and gave rise to a belief that it would force the issue which Gen. Miles had raised with the war department. The president and the secretary of war were in consultation upon the subject, and at a cabinet meeting on the 17th the president announced that he had ordered a court-martial for the trial of Gen. Eagan. The order was made public on the 18th. It summons a general court-martial to meet at Washington on the 25th at 10 a. m., "or as soon thereafter as practicable, for the trial of Brig. Gen. Eagan, commissary general of subsistence, United States army, and such other persons as may be brought before it." The members of the court named in the order are Gen. Merritt, and Cols. Hains, Gillespie, Suter and Guenther, of the regulars, and Gens. Wade, Butler, Young, Frank, Pennington, Randall, Kline and Comba, of the volunteers. All the volunteers except Gen. Butler are attached to the regular army with inferior rank. Deputy Judge Advocate General Geo. B.

Davis is appointed judge advocate of the court-martial. Maj. Gen. Wesley Merritt will preside.

In Cuba the process of reorganizing civil government subject to American military authority is well under way. Gen. Ludlow, as military governor of the department of the city of Havana, appointed on the 12th a mayor, five assistant mayors, 27 councillors, a secretary of the council, a secretary to the mayor, a civil governor, a chief of police, a city attorney, an auditor, and a treasurer—all Cubans. The mayor is Perfecto La Coste, late president of the Havana revolutionary junta; the chief of police is Mario G. Menocal, late commander of the insurgent troops in Havana and Matanzas provinces; and the civil governor is Federico Mora, a member of the late revolutionary junta in Havana. These appointments took effect on the 14th.

Gen. Brooke, military governor of Cuba, has appointed a cabinet of four advisers for the administration of the island. Their portfolios respectively are department of government, department of finance, department of justice and public instruction, and department of agriculture. The minister of government is Domingo Mendez Capote.

The Bank of Spain in Cuba has been reestablished by the war department, with temporary authority to collect the general property tax in the island for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1899. Its compensation is to be a commission of 5 per cent., and it is required to give a bond of \$1,000,000. This bank is in bad odor in Cuba on account of its aggressive methods of collecting taxes under the authority of Spain.

Friction with the military authorities has brought about the resignation of the subordinate civil authorities—the mayor and the entire city council—of San Juan, in Porto Rico. As the cause of their resignation, which took place on the 13th, they assigned inability to raise sufficient funds under the present tariff, and dissatisfaction with what they describe as the abrupt commands of the supervisory military government.

The Chinese question in connection with our newly acquired Hawaiian territory has been simplified, —or complicated, according to the

point of view—by a decision rendered on the 7th by the supreme court of Hawaii. It is held by this decision that permits issued to Chinamen by the late Hawaiian government, prior to annexation, authorizing them to leave the islands and return, are now invalid. The order of the United States treasury department prohibiting the return to Hawaii of any Chinaman who has not the qualifications to return to the United States is sustained. Intention is announced to carry the question to the United States supreme court.

Passing farther westward for news regarding American interests we find that affairs in the Philippine islands, so far at least as authentic reports shed any light upon them, are unchanged. The Filipinos are still in possession of Iloilo, governing it well, while an American force is still stationed in transports off the island near the city. Though friendly to the Americans, the Filipinos will not allow them to land. At Manila a commission selected jointly by Gen. Otis for the Americans and President Aguinaldo for the Filipinos, is or has been in conference with a view to adjustment; but no reports of its deliberations have been published. It was rumored on the 14th that Aguinaldo's troops were massing to the number of 40,000 in the vicinity of Manila. On the 16th, however, it was given out at Washington that a cablegram from Gen. Otis showed that the critical stage had passed and that he had control of the whole Philippine situation. The cablegram itself was withheld from publication. The paucity of news from the Philippines is due to an American censorship established on the 16th over all telegrams containing political information.

The 4th regiment of regulars left Chicago on the 15th for the Philippines, by way of New York and the Suez canal. They are to sail from New York upon the transport Grant. While they were en route from Chicago, three representatives of the Philippine republic arrived at San Francisco and set out across the continent to Washington. These Filipinos are Jose Lasada, a professor in the College of Medicine at Manila; Marti Burges, a captain in the Filipino army; and John Luna, the Filipino artist whose paintings are familiar at the Paris salon. At about the time of their arrival in this country, Agoncillo, the Filipino agent who

has been in Washington for two months, filed with the state department an official memorandum giving precedents and arguments in support of the demand for Philippine independence.

In respect to the domestic concerns of the American people, the week has been devoted chiefly to the election of new United States senators. In Minnesota, Senator Cushman K. Davis, republican, was re-elected, his adversary being ex-Congressman Towne. In New York, Chauncey M. Depew, republican, was elected over Senator Murphy, democrat. Other senators elected or re-elected were Albert J. Beveridge, republican, of Indiana; Senator Francis M. Cockrell, democrat, of Missouri; Senator Henry Cabot Lodge, republican, of Massachusetts; Senator Eugene Hale, republican, of Maine; Senator Julius Caesar Burrows, republican, of Michigan, and Senator Joseph R. Hawley, republican, of Connecticut. All these elections were made in joint session of the respective legislatures on the 18th.

Senatorial elections in several other states have thus far failed, and in California there is a deadlock. Balloting for senator in the legislature of that state began on the 10th and has continued ever since without result. The leading candidate is Ulysses S. Grant, one of the sons of the late Gen. Grant, who is closely followed by D. M. Burns. Both are republicans. Charges of bribery have been made against Grant's agents, and referred to an investigating committee.

Benton McMillan was inaugurated governor of Tennessee on the 16th; and on the same day the legislature of Nevada convened. The anti-Pingree majority in the Michigan senate increased the membership of all important committees on the 13th, so as to take their control out of the hands of Gov. Pingree's supporters and thereby prevent legislation for the equitable taxation of corporations; on the 14th Gov. Pingree replied with an announcement that he would not approve appropriation bills until the Atkinson equal taxation bill had been passed; and on the 16th a resolution to delay the Atkinson bill was defeated. No organization of the West Virginia legislature has yet been effected. Each political party, one in the house and the other in the senate, is trying to unseat members of

the other, so as to control the legislature on joint ballot. The house claims to have organized, but the senate and the governor refuse to recognize it. Arkansas came under the control of a new administration on the 18th, with the inauguration of Gov. Dan W. Jones.

Among the new industrial trusts are the thread trust, the chewing gum trust, and the carbon trust, all organized under the laws of New Jersey. The thread trust comprises the J. & P. Coats company, the English Sewing Cotton Co., and the American Thread Co., and the market value of the combined stock is about \$300,000,000. Into the chewing gum trust have entered the White Gum Co., the Yucatan Gum Co., and the Dr. Beaman Pepsin Gum Co., of Cleveland; the Adams Sons Co., of Brooklyn; the Kis-Me-Gum Co., of Louisville; the Tutti Frutti company, and others. This trust is to have a capital of from \$15,000,000 to \$20,000,000. Of the carbon trust the corporate name is the National Carbon Co. Its capital stock is \$10,000,000, distributed in \$4,500,000 7 per cent. preferred, and \$5,500,000 common. This stock is selling at about 25 for the common and 85 for the preferred.

There are indications of a great coal strike. Unless the mine workers and the mine employers, now in joint session at Allegheny, Pa., agree upon a scale of wages, it is believed that the former will strike. The annual convention of mine workers assembled in Pittsburgh on the 9th, and is still in session. Officers for the ensuing year were elected. The president chosen to succeed M. D. Ratchford, was John Mitchell, of Illinois. Anti-Philippine resolutions, and resolutions endorsing socialism were defeated; but Gov. Tanner was commended for his stand in connection with the strike at Virden, Ill. Meanwhile the wages scale committee was in daily session adjusting the terms to be demanded of the employers at the joint convention. This convention formally organized on the 17th. The joint meeting was called to order by President Ratchford, of the miners. Alexander Demsten, an employe, was chosen to preside, and W. C. Pearce, of the miners, was elected secretary. The principle rule adopted by the committee on rules for the deliberations of the convention, requires the vote of every state, both of employers and miners, for the adoption of any

resolution. It is understood that the miners will make several demands, including an eight-hour day, but that they will stand out for an advance of 10 cents a ton in wages. At a secret meeting of the employers, held on the 18th, it was agreed to demand a 10 per cent. reduction.

Great Britain also is threatened with another great strike. The Amalgamated Society of Engineers, which recently passed through a disastrous strike, has repaired its funds, which now amount to \$1,000,000, and along with other trade unions gives signs of a purpose to press for better pay. In this emergency it transpires that Lord Weymyss's committee to watch labor legislation in the interest of employers has organized a colossal federation of employers, representing some 300 firms and possessed of an immense fund. The object is to force business men to do their employing through a central committee of the employers' federation. No firm is to make a separate bargain with workmen, and every firm is to be guided by the advice of the central committee. One year's net profits is guaranteed to any firm which engages in a lockout or resists a strike lasting that long. This federation expects to cope successfully with any trade union combination that may be formed, and the situation is regarded in London as significant of another industrial war.

Across the western channel the Irish municipal elections under the new system of local government for Ireland came off on the 17th. The labor vote developed unexpected strength. Fourteen labor candidates were returned to the Dublin council, and 9 to that of Cork, while in the Limerick council there will be a working majority of labor members. In the Armagh council the nationalists will exceed the unionists two to one. John Daly, the political prisoner whose election heretofore to other positions has been invalidated, is elected mayor of Limerick. In several Ulster towns the local government has been changed from Orange to Catholic. Women voted at these elections for the first time in Ireland.

Dispatches of the 18th from New Zealand tell of an insurrection in the Samoan islands. The news is brought down to the 12th. The insurrection sprang out of the election of a successor to the late King Malietoa. On the 31st Chief Justice Chambers, of

the supreme court, an American, decided that Malietoa Tanus had been elected king and Tamasese vice-king, on the ground that Chief Mataafa was disqualified by the treaty of Berlin, under which the Samoan government is organized. A large body of Samoans thereupon assembled with arms around the municipality of Malinu, where they were met by Malietoa Tanus with about 2,000 men. Then a general conference of the representatives of the three protecting powers—England, Germany and the United States—was held; but the German consul refused to recognize Malietoa Tanus or to cooperate in the dispersal of the Samoans at Malinu, and though the British and American consuls tried to avert hostilities, a battle between the natives occurred, in which Tanus and Tamasese were utterly routed. Personally, they took refuge upon a British warship. An agreement was afterward made between the three consuls, pending instructions from their respective governments, to recognize Mataafa provisionally, with Dr. Rafael, the president of the municipal council at Apia, as executive head. Rafael thereupon, with the concurrence of the German consul, took possession of the supreme court, declaring its power to be vested in him; but upon an appeal from the British and American consuls, the captain of the British warship Porpoise placed Chief Justice Chambers upon his seat under a guard of marines. Such is the story as it comes through the Associated Press. In official quarters at Washington, it is regarded as doubtful in so far as it goes to show a rupture between the German, and the American and the British consuls.

NEWS NOTES.

—Knut Alemlof, the distinguished Swedish actor, reported as one of the two greatest in Europe, died on the 13th at Stockholm.

—U. S. District Judge Peter S. Grosscup, of Chicago, has been nominated by the president to succeed the late Judge Showalter as circuit judge of the Seventh circuit.

—The new U. S. cruiser Albany was launched on the 14th, at Newcastle, England, by the Armstrongs, in the official presence of Lieutenant Colwell, of the American navy.

—The largest steamer ever built was launched on the 14th at Belfast, Ireland. It belongs to the White Star line and is named the Oceanic. This steamer is 704 feet long, and registers 17,000 tons.

—Newell Dwight Hillis, Prof. Swing's pulpit successor at Chicago, has been called to Beecher's old church, the Plymouth, of Brooklyn, to succeed Lyman Abbott, who has resigned on account of failing health.

—John Russell Young, librarian of the Congressional library, died on the 17th at Washington. He was at one time managing editor of the New York Tribune, under Horace Greeley, and later was American minister to China.

—Nelson Dingley, chairman of the ways and means committee of the lower house of congress, and sponsor for the Dingley tariff law, died on the 13th, at Washington. The cause of his death was heart failure due to pneumonia.

—The official vote on the woman suffrage amendment at the fall elections in Washington state, was as follows: For the amendment, 20,171; against the amendment, 30,497; ignoring the amendment, 24,986. Adverse majority, 10,326.

—At a meeting of single taxers in Chicago on the 14th, Henry George campaign committees were organized to support the mayoralty candidacy of ex-Gov. Altgeld. Walter F. Cooling, Esq., Unity Building, is general chairman.

—During the calendar year 1898 the exports and imports of the United States were as follows:

	Imports.	Exports.
Merchandise.....	\$633,664,634	\$1,254,925,169
Gold.....	158,036,252	16,194,954
Silver.....	29,029,724	53,797,104
Total.....	\$820,730,610	\$1,324,917,227
Excess of exports.....		\$504,186,617

IN CONGRESS.

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

Week ending January 16, 1899.

Senate.

On Thursday the 12th the joint resolution thanking Clara Barton and the other officers and agents of the Red Cross society for their aid in relieving the distress of the Armenians and others in Turkey, and of the Spanish and American troops in the West Indies during the war, was passed. Nearly three hours were spent in executive session.

The bill to authorize the construction of a railroad through the Choctaw and Chickasaw nations in the Indian territory was considered on Friday, the 13th, and passed. Senator McLaurin spoke in support of the Vest resolution against acquiring territory as colonies; and the Nicaragua canal bill was discussed. The Indian appropriation bill also was discussed, after which the senate went into executive session.

Mr. Hoar submitted on Saturday, the 14th, a resolution providing that the people of the Philippine islands of right ought to be free and independent;

that they are absolved from all allegiance to the Spanish crown, and that any political connection between them and Spain is and ought to be totally dissolved, and that they have, therefore, full power to do all acts and things which independent states may of right do; that it is their right to institute a new government for themselves, laying its foundations on such principles and organizing its powers in such form as to them shall seem most likely to effect their safety and happiness; and that with these rights the people of the United States do not propose to interfere.

Upon the objection of Senator Davis, the resolution went over for the day. Discussion was begun upon Senator Allen's resolution calling for an inquiry into the conduct of the war, which was interrupted by an adjournment out of respect to the memory of the late Representative Dingley.

After returning from the funeral obsequies of the late Mr. Dingley in the house of representatives, on Monday the 16th, the senate briefly transacted routine business and adjourned.

House.

On Thursday, the 12th, the diplomatic and consular appropriation bill for the year ending June 30, 1900, was taken up and passed.

The bill to reorganize and increase the efficiency of the personnel of the navy and marine corps was taken up on Friday the 13th and partly considered.

No business was done on Saturday the 14th, owing to the death of Representative Dingley.

Funeral ceremonies over the body of the late Mr. Dingley were held on Monday, the 16th, the senate and the president and his cabinet being present.

MISCELLANY

LUX E TENEBRIS.

For The Public.

O world of strife and anguish! O sin! O want! O care!
 O hearts that droop and languish with the crushing load ye bear!
 O conscious lack of duty! O crimson blush of shame,
 That stains the purest beauty, and damns the fairest fame!
 O life! O love of heaven! O hopes that in us burn!
 O blessed peace of sins forgiven, for which our tired hearts yearn!
 O pure unselfish striving toward heights we cannot gain!
 O truth, all scorn surviving! O grief for others' pain!
 O gull! O ceaseless molling! The last redeems the first.
 Love's peace shall bless, in tolling, the hearts that sin has curst;
 And love, the God-Man's essence, shall save all human life;
 And toll, the God-Man's presence, redeem the world from strife.
 And thou, O earth, must bear the cross with heaven's crucified.

Strong passion-throes must purge thy dross, and anguish crush thy pride;
 And the grapes thy vintage yieldeth must suffer being bruised;
 And the pearls thy cold sea shieldeth be brought to light and used.

T. G. ATKINSON.

BENEVOLENT ASSIMILATION.

A charitable boa-constrictor moved to compassion by the plaintive outcries of a succulent goat, interfered to rescue him from the clutches of a bloody tiger. The tiger, being of haughty and ancient lineage, resisted fiercely, although, by reason of the infirmities of extreme old age, his teeth and claws could inflict little damage. During the struggle the goat was filled with gratitude. Afterwards, the boa-constrictor was filled with goat.—N. Y. Evening Post.

MUFFLE THE LIBERTY BELL.

If we enter upon a colonial policy we must expect to hear the command "Silence!" issuing with increased emphasis from the imperialists. When the discussion of fundamental principles is attempted in the United States, if a member of congress attempts to criticize any injustice perpetrated by a government official against a helpless people, he will be warned to keep silent lest his criticism encourages resistance to American authority in the orient. If an author on the Fourth of July dare to speak of inalienable rights or refers with commendation to the manner in which our forefathers resisted taxation without representation, he will be warned to keep silent lest his utterances incite rebellion among distant subjects. If we adopt a colonial policy and pursue the course which incited the revolution of 1776 we must muffle the tones of the old liberty bell and commune in whispers when we praise the patriotism of our forefathers.—William Jennings Bryan.

THE CHILD IS FATHER OF THE MAN.

For The Public.

The imperialists represent Uncle Sam as once a boy in short jacket, but now grown to be a man, wearing a dress-coat, and so big that

He could stand like some tall steeple high, And while his feet were on the ground his hands could touch the sky.

This is the merest nonsense. A child understands the Uncle Sam myth. He knows that what Uncle Sam in short jackets stood for was the principle of eternal right as opposed to eternal wrong. To make him grow older is not to alter what he stands for. What was eternally right when he wore short jackets is eternally right now that he wears a claw-hammer coat. The child's

sense of justice will not permit that his Uncle Sam should domineer over young boys or young nations, simply because he has grown to be a big man, and carries revolvers, and swears, and chews tobacco, like other men and nations.

OLD SOLDIER.

"REMEMBER THE MAINE."

We have heard much of the motto, "Remember the Maine." If we are satisfied that the Maine was blown up from the outside we have a right to remember her with indignation; but without more conclusive evidence than we now have, we are not right if we charge criminality to persons. Therefore I conceive that the motto "Remember the Maine," used as a war cry, would not have been justifiable. I should like to make the point here, as I have made it elsewhere, that this great and free country, with its education, good intention, and universal moral influence, may go to war to punish, but not to revenge. Improperly applied, the motto "Remember the Maine" savors too much of revenge, too much of evil for evil, but it may be used in an entirely worthy sense.

During the recent war with Spain about 75 men were killed and wounded in the United States navy. Only 15 were killed. On board the Maine 254 men were killed outright and others died later—more than 17 times as many as were killed in the United States navy by the Spanish land and naval forces during the entire war. In the way that the men of the Maine died and suffered there was enough of the heroic to provide a sound foundation for the motto "Remember the Maine." Let us dismiss the prevailing impression that this motto was used in the United States navy in the recent war, as a battle signal. No United States naval vessel has entered into action flying the signal "Remember the Maine." I am glad that it can be stated; yet one may excuse many mistaken expressions in the heat of action.—Charles Dwight Sigsbee, U. S. N., Captain of the Maine, in The Century for January.

NOTE BY THE EDITOR OF THE CENTURY.

It may be said on the authority of Capt. John R. Bartlett, during the war chief intelligence officer of the navy: "The signal, 'Remember the Maine,' has never been displayed on a United States man-of-war, or by the army or navy, with one exception. A signal quartermaster (an enlisted man) of the coast signal service hoisted the signal from the station at

Port Eads, at the mouth of the Mississippi, when a transport loaded with troops was passing out to sea. In reporting the passing out of the transport, as was his duty, the quartermaster added to his message to headquarters the fact of display of signal, which was received with great enthusiasm by the troops. He was severely reprimanded by return message over the wires."

A CHICAGO ALDERMAN GOING TO A COUNCIL MEETING. Set to Descriptive Music.

Alderman Mahoney leaves his saloon. This is charmingly expressed by the muted trumpet. As he gets nearer the city hall the "franchise" motive takes a stronger hold. The harmonic leadings of the second and fourth measures suggest that the gang will stand firm. Mahoney arrives at the council chamber and the precipitous harp glissando expresses his joy at arriving without being held up by one of his own constituents.

The council gathers. A mixture of the "reform" and "franchise" motives.

Mahoney has an ordinance in his pocket. He arises (heavy beats of the kettle drum and trilling strings). The "street and alley committee" motive dominates here and the cadenza for the harp shows his agitation, for he knows that a brass band (expressed by the tuba and muted brass) waits for him in the corridor. He gets the mayor's eye (tremolo and an ascending run in woodwinds). He moves that his ordinance be referred to the joint committee on streets and alleys. Fortissima attack of tuba and trombone expresses the agitation of the reform aldermen.

Aldermen Lienbenbrock proposes a substitute and again the franchise theme appears in the trumpets and trombones. A sharp word duel expresses by the most incoherent dissonances. Harp glissando, loud beating of the kettle drums and wind machine. Referred to city hall committee (religious passage). Alderman Mahoney goes homeward sadly (long held note on the bassoon). He feels that agree chills are about to shake him (violins). Thinks he's getting the grip. First introduction of "the grip" motive (represented by tuba and flute). He takes three grains of quinine (oboe and bass clarinet in solo passage). Goes to bed and sinks to his mellow sleep with the "franchise" motive still running through his mind, accompanied by trombone and harp glissando. Sleeps. Finale!—Raymond Maxwell, in Chicago Chronicle.

OUR DUTIES TO THE FILIPINOS.

Extracts from a speech made in the United States Senate on Jan. 10, by the Hon. Wm. E. Mason, of Illinois, speaking to the following resolution:

Whereas all just powers of government are derived from the consent of the governed: Therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate of the United States, That the Government of the United States of America will not attempt to govern the people of any other country in the world without the consent of the people themselves, or subject them by force to our dominion against their will.

There is no vicarious atonement for a nation's crime. I care not what your religious faith may be, no nation has ever committed a crime against a weaker nation or against her own citizens that the law of compensation has not demanded settlement. For a hundred years in this country we have piled up the wealth of unrequited toil of the slaves. We said, "This is the land of the free and the home of the brave," and sold women and children to the highest and best bidder for cash. No picture could be painted of the genius of our country in which the slave pen and whipping post did not rear their heads. We tore down the slave pen; the auction block came down with it; but there was not material enough to make headboards for the graves.

We are told that they cannot govern themselves. Where is the student of evolution who talks like this? Where is the man who has read who does not know that all government is made to fit the people, and does not rise either above or below the people themselves? Who does not know the difference between "canned liberty," as the distinguished Speaker of the House calls it, and the genuine liberty which we enjoy?

We are to go to those people and say to them, notwithstanding Dewey said they were competent to govern themselves—he had handled them without guns; he had had no trouble with them; he had an understanding—we are to say to the people of the Philippine Islands, "You poor, God-forsaken creatures, this thing of sovereignty is a great thing; we bought yours somewhere across the water."

Not one expansionist, not one who advocates the taking of these islands against the consent of the people, but what will tell you in the same breath, "Yes, it is going to be a great tax upon the people of the United States, but we will let the Filipinos pay that tax." They are to pay for our standing army. They are to pay the price of their own chains.

The Filipino is begging to treat with us. He knocks at our door to be heard. He loves his home as you love yours, sir, and as I love mine. He has breathed the inspiration of our history; he asks only what our fathers fought for—the right to govern himself. There is no treaty of commercial value to the United States which could be suggested that he is not ready and willing to give us. Then it is not the expansion of commerce you want, but it is the expansion of the gewgaws and the tinsels of royalty.

Let me give notice to you gentlemen who expect to be in politics that if this war goes on, and if we open the guns, as we threaten to do within ten days, upon the women and children in the island of Oloilo, the father in New England will begin to plead for the father in Manila, the mother in Illinois will begin to pray for the mother in the islands of the sea, and the fathers will vote as the mothers pray. God Almighty help the party that seeks to give civilization and Christian liberty hypodermically with 13-inch guns.

But they say Aguinaldo is a self-appointed chief. That is a way of their politics there. Look about the senate, Mr. President, and who of us is here except originally upon his own invitation?

Why, Mr. President, cannot we now make those people our friends, as Fox plead to make America England's friend a hundred years ago? Why not give them what they ask? Why should we stingily withhold the jewel of independence? Why should we not finish this war as we began it—for humanity's sake? Why not with a free and open hand give them what we have promised to give to Cuba, and say: "Go, and obey the divine injunction, work out your own salvation with fear and trembling; go and learn by experience, as we did. Profit by your mistakes, as we have done. Yes, we have saved your life, Filipino, and in the future we will protect it against all comers from within or without while our flag floats." Then we shall have kept our promise, and only then.

We cannot teach them to govern themselves. There is only one road to self-government. That is through the gate of responsibility, along the rough and rugged road of experience. You cannot teach liberty and self-government with a Mauser gun. Spain has tried it for centuries; at least, with guns similar if not of the same pattern. For centuries she has been for expan-

sion, more land, more property, more poor people she could ride over with some cheap politician with a crown on his head. Are we going to keep the crown room there that Spain occupied? Is the throne room to be kept intact for Tammany Hall or the republican party, when we send our envoys there?

Spain is an expansionist and has been for centuries. And say, my friends, have you forgotten the first rule proved by all history, without exception, that every square inch of territory taken by force has to be held by force? Go to your children who are in the first year of the high school, and they will tell you the rule, that in all history every square foot of ground taken by force from an alien nation has to be kept by force. There is Alsace-Lorraine, between Germany and France. A standing army is kept there on both sides, and there is a continuing threat of war. Are we to continue to imitate Spain? She has believed in the expansion of territory, expansion of commerce by force, without the consent of the governed, and her ships are lying at the bottom of the sea. Her men are rotting in the ocean and upon the land all over the world. Her flag has been dishonored, disgraced, defeated and sent back to her peninsula, and the golden crown of imperialism that she sought against the will of the people has turned to ashes in her palsied hands.

But distinguished gentlemen who claim a monopoly of patriotism, who do not seem to observe the difference between expansion and explosion, say that we who believe in getting the consent of the governed before we govern them want to give back the Philippines to Spain. Everyone who makes the statement knows that is not what we want. May I repeat the old story of Lincoln? Driving in his carriage one day, he alighted to turn a tumblebug to his legs. Replying to the Cabinet minister within the carriage, he said: "I merely wanted to give him a show with all the other bugs of his class." He did not want to annex the bug or to tell him how to run his business. He did not seek to tax him or to tell him that he did not know how to govern his bugship. He set him along the highroad, along the line of the survival of the fittest.

Do you remember when Mexico was invaded by the French and Uncle Sam said, "Go; there is the Monroe doctrine; Mexico is covered by the shadow of its wing," and the French soldiers left, and the brave little Republic of Mexico is slowly but surely climbing

the ladder to a better education, a better civilization. Ah, Mr. President, that is the expansion I believe in. That is the imperialism the fathers taught.

THE RETURN OF HAMILTONISM.

Look about you! Nearly all of the wealth of the land is passing into a few hands, and not one of these hands favorable to the freedom of the citizen. Every great industrial, commercial, mining or transportation enterprise is passing into the hands, first of corporations, and then by further consolidation into the hands of trusts, which thus have an absolute monopoly, a monopoly which can, arbitrarily, fix prices, fix wages and regulate output—a monopoly which has no soul, and whose chief purpose is to plunder the public. The monopolist and the speculator prosper, but the masses wither. Men of moderate fortunes and of fair incomes, who were the bulwark of the republic, are slowly but surely being wiped out. We are being reduced to two classes; in the first stage these will be known as the very rich and the moderately poor, and in the second stage as the masters and the slaves. We have established a monied aristocracy and are now fastening a yoke on posterity. A standing army is to be enthroned and bayonet argument is to govern.

Republican institutions cannot live amid these conditions. Wealth has never been the friend of liberty. Concurrently with the progress of these changes we hear the snarling voices of men who deride the doctrines of Jefferson and Lincoln that made our country great and mighty. Already we see magazine articles urging the establishment by law of a permanent aristocracy in our system of government, and from high quarters we hear a demand for Hamiltonism. Hamilton believed in monarchy and aristocracy bottomed on corruption. He was in love with the English system as it existed in the last century, thoroughly rotten from top to bottom, and he labored to transplant whatever he could of that system. He once said to John Adams: "Purge the British constitution of its corruption and give to its popular branch equality of representation and it would become an impracticable government. But as it stands at present, it is the most perfect government that ever existed." He did not advance a single new thought, did not promulgate a single new principle; and he sneered at the idea that the people were capable of self-government.

England herself has since that time repudiated corruption and established equality of representation. Hamilton

avored the adoption of the new constitution, but was not satisfied with it, and openly expressed the hope that some future war would centralize the powers of the government. When he was made secretary of the treasury, the new constitution had been adopted, congress had been given power to raise money, everybody could see that the republic could now easily pay its debts, and that it was not necessary to introduce corruption of any sort. But, true to his theory, he at once secured the establishment of a national bank and introduced the British funding and bond-issuing system, coupled with its limitless opportunities for plunder. A short period of unparalleled speculation and speculation followed. The sharks and financial birds of prey made fortunes and Hamilton became the hero of the hour. The whole system collapsed in a few years and scattered ruin and misery over the country. Yet for a whole century the men who used the government to plunder the country have shouted for Hamilton. Whether Hamilton himself shared in the plunder is immaterial. He expressed his belief in the system, and deliberately furnished the opportunity to others. During the administration of Mr. Adams Hamiltonism ran wild. Almost every principle of the Declaration of Independence was trampled under foot, and those provisions of the new constitution that were intended to protect the individual were ruthlessly brushed aside. No man dared to criticize the administration. Scores of good men were denied trial by jury and languished in prison for exercising the right of free speech. A tyranny was established that surpassed anything existing in England. Four years of this regime was all the American people could then stand; they declared that they had not cast off a foreign yoke to take up a more galling home yoke, and in 1800 they arose and overthrew it so completely that it has taken it nearly a century for a resurrection.

Had Hamiltonism prevailed at that time the whole history of the republic would have been different; the brains, the industry, the skill and the enterprise of the earth would not have flocked to our shores. The genius of man being cowed would have withered here as it had in Europe, and the American republic would to-day be simply an oligarchy, stretching in small settlements from the Mississippi to the Atlantic. Hamilton was a member of the constitutional convention, and succeeded in establishing that aristocratic branch of our government known as the federal judiciary, un-republican and un-

democratic; it is not chosen by the people and is not accountable to them. In fact, for practical purposes is not accountable to anybody. Jefferson opposed this manner of creating a judiciary with all his might, and he pointed out that here would ultimately be found the tomb of American liberty. How prophetic was that vision? During its whole career this branch of the government has never been on the side of the weak, but always on the side of power. First it stood for federalism and usurpation.

When Gen. Jackson tried to protect the American people from the clutches of the great rotten bank the federal judiciary used all its power to help that institution. After the bank went down this same judiciary did the bidding of the mighty slave power, and after this went down these courts took the corporations under their wings and many of them seemed to become mere side-door conveniences for concentrated and even corrupt capital. For the last 30 years the corporations have fled to the federal courts as the ancient murderers fled to cities of refuge—there they felt safe. Recognizing that the construction of the laws is more important than making laws, these powerful influences have allowed no man to be appointed judge whom they did not believe friendly to them. They do not buy federal judges because it is not necessary. In their eagerness to serve the corporations, these judges have in recent years established government by injunctions in this country, under which a judge becomes legislator, court and executioner. They brush free speech—the liberty of the citizen—and trial by jury away with a contemptuous sneer.

The Anglo-Saxon race has shed its blood to maintain these bulwarks of liberty, and our constitution guarantees them to every citizen. But they have already been stabbed to the vitals. For several years we have beheld the spectacle of some supreme court and other federal judges dragging their ermine around over the land to act the part of advocates for those interests which are destroying republicanism in this country. What are the liberties of America worth when committed to the guardianship of such men? During the recent campaign Mr. Depew came to Chicago under the auspices of the Hamilton club to deliver a partisan address at the Auditorium. Federal Judge Peter S. Groscup mounted the rostrum for the purpose of introducing the orator, and told the audience, among other things, that the light of Jefferson was waning—that on the dial plate of our

nation's history this hour was Hamilton's, that Hamilton's great name exactly fitted these times, etc.

My friends, must we admit that Judge Groscup was right? Let us look around again. The senate of the great state of Ohio has just indicted a Hamiltonian senator for bribery and debauchery in securing a high office. A grand jury in Pennsylvania has just indicted another Hamiltonian senator for robbing the treasury of the state. Almost every great trust appears to have one or more Hamiltonian senators as standing conveniences. In the house of representatives, where the voice of the people was supposed to be heard, we find a pensioned ring-master of monopoly stifling the voice of the people's representatives and reducing republican congressmen to a condition of pity and contempt. Two years ago a horde of Hamiltonian statesmen went to the capital of Illinois and not only sold out the people but robbed the state of everything in sight. Wherever you find dirty finger marks in the temple of justice or a foul odor in the halls of legislation, there you will find Hamiltonism. Verily the spirit of Hamilton fits these times, but what shall we say of a judiciary that openly rejoices over the fact that an era of corruption has enveloped the land, that the betrayal of the people has become a science, and that the robbing of the people has become a fine art? And now we are to widen the sphere of this class of statesmen by giving them a chance to rob the Filipinos! Heaven pity those poor people. The Spaniard took what was in sight, but the Hamiltonite, with his bond jobbery, enters the womb of the future and plasters his mortgage on remote generations.—Hon. Jno. P. Altgeld before the Jacksonian Club of Omaha.

JAIL BOYS.

Statements made to a reporter of the Chicago Evening Post, by Miss Nellie J. Flood, the teacher of the school in the jail of Cook county, Ill., for the boys who are confined there awaiting trial.

I think my boys are easier to manage than the average boy in the public schools. This does not mean that the boys in the jail are better than those outside. Probably their tractability is partly to be accounted for by the fact that their teacher is the only woman with whom they come in contact, and the novelty of this association makes an impression on them, for they are just as impressionable as any other boys, and perhaps a little more so. Then most of these poor little fellows are strangers to anything like womanly affection and a sincere and active

interest in their welfare. This is not true of all of them, but I am afraid it applies to the majority of my pupils. My work has gone far toward disproving the doctrine of "natural and inherited depravity." On the other hand, it has forced me to the conviction that depraved surroundings and associations are mainly responsible for the acts which bring the boys behind the bars.

Only a few months ago I visited the home of one of my boys and talked with his mother. She insisted he was a bad boy and nothing short of the reform school would better him. In the course of the conversation I learned that he had been allowed no liberty at home and that he was strapped for the slightest offense. After a long argument she was prevailed upon to give him another chance under the condition that in the place of the strap she should show a little motherly affection and allow him to enjoy some of the privileges that are the natural right of a boy. On my recommendation the court gave the lad his liberty. Shortly after this, on entering the Sunday school I attend, my hand was grasped and I heard a childish voice exclaim: "How do you do, Miss Flood? Everything's all right now."

As I glanced down I looked into the happy eyes of the boy who had been returned to his home. He has been "made over" by the new treatment he has received at home, and now gives excellent promise of becoming a useful and honest man.

SIR ROBERT GIFFEN ON LAND-LORDISM.

From an essay on "Taxes on Land," written in 1871 by Robert, now Sir Robert Giffen.

At the past rate of increase, the real property of England, which is now worth about £150,000,000 a year, will be worth £250,000,000 in another 30 years. And a large part of this additional £100,000,000, perhaps the half of it or more, will not be owing to any investment of capital in improvements, but to increasing monopoly value. At the past rate of increase, however, our rates will be under £30,000,000, so that, at the outside, there will not be an additional burden of £15,000,000 to set against an additional value of £100,000,000, while much of that additional burden will also have fallen, not on the property generally, but on the profits of the improvements. There is little hope of touching this immense augmentation. But this is hardly a result to be rejoiced over by the defenders of private property in land. If they were wise in their generation it should be

their aim to show that the present system, besides any indirect advantages to the community it may have, is also directly beneficial to the state, because it provides a large fund for the support of national charges. Looking forward to the great increase of value which is inevitable, they should rather, of all others, be anxious to secure a large appropriation to the state, as some compensation to the masses for the privilege of exclusive possession which they enjoy. The divorce of the people of England from the soil would be more, and not less, defensible than it is if it could be shown that private property in it was so regulated as to relieve the general taxpayer of his burdens.

There is not one who reads the history of our own struggle for independence who does not realize that the inhabitants of these conquered islands have as great a grievance against the conquering republic as we had against the conquering monarchy. I have confidence that the democratic party will pursue a single policy, offering to these various countries independent government. If when they become independent, they desire to be annexed, we may consider their applications upon their merits. We will very likely be defeated in such a policy, but time will justify it.—Hon. Geo. Fred Williams, in Boston Post.

"I don't put much stock in this here imperialism; but, I tell ye, I'm right in fer the annexation of Cuba. We need it ter perfect Porto Rico!"

"Oh! yes; but I can't see any use in us havin' Porto Rico!"

"Ye can't? Yer a suppyicial reasoner, Hank. We need it ter perfect Cuba, an' we need Cuba ter perfect Porto Rico. This thing of gov'ment an' ferrin policy is a complex an' a interrelated thing!" —Puck.

If, by order of President McKinley, American guns are fired upon the Filipino patriots at Holo, President McKinley deserves to be impeached. Why? Because, under the constitution congress alone can declare war, and congress never has declared war against the Filipinos. Are we to have a dose of usurpation along with the forced draught of imperialism?—Boston Post.

In a recent lecture Mr. Zangwill told the following story: "At one of our seaside resorts—Ramsgate or some other similar place—I was lying on my back on the sands, when I overheard some Jews discussing me and my work. 'Oh,' said one, 'I don't think he's so very clever. He's a Jew and knows all about Jews. No wonder he can write

novels about Jews. There's Besant now. He's written a book about Jews. He doesn't know anything about them. That's what I call clever!'"—Public Opinion.

I heard Dr. Hale say a year ago that one of the greatest Abolitionists who had fought and almost died to help the slaves to freedom, one who kept a station of the "Underground Railway," was approached recently by his little boy, 12 years of age, and the boy said: "Papa, what is a slave?" His father had almost died to free the slave, and the boy had never heard of one until he was 12 years old, and then had to ask this question. And the day is coming when the boys will look into the faces of their parents and say not only "What is a slave?" but they will say: "What is poverty?" "What is injustice?" "What is war?" and the parent shall scarcely find language for adequate description to the child.—Benj. Fay Mills, in the Social Gospel.

The Indianapolis Sentinel, of October 19, publishes a list of evictions made in Indianapolis during the previous six days.

The number was 121.

This was not in Ireland, but in Indianapolis, a city of home owners!—Justice, of Wilmington, Del.

Reformer—But don't you think that public office should be a public trust?

Statesman—Why, certainly! I don't believe in investigation committees, or anything like that!—Puck.

It is said that a little German clerk in the government office at Johannesburg once got the better of Cecil Rhodes. The latter had to stand in line and didn't like it. He had not been used to standing in line in South Africa or anywhere else. "Please attend to me at once," he said, "I can't wait." "When your turn comes, mister," mumbled the clerk. "Confound you, sir! don't you know who I am? I'm Rhodes." "Oh,

God Winning Us.

BY

REV. CLARENCE LATHBUR.

Price, 40 cents.

Some of its chapters are:
 GOD ACCOMMODATING HIMSELF TO US.....(Incarnation)
 GOD WINNING US BY DEATH.....(Atonement)
 GOD OPENING OUR EYES.....(Faith)
 GOD GROWING IN US.....(Regeneration)
 GOD ACTING THROUGH US.....(Religion)
 GOD CARING FOR US.....(Providence)

SWEDENBORG PUBLISHING ASSOCIATION,
 GERMANTOWN, PA

yes, I knew that, but that doesn't worry me," was the unruffled reply. "If you were in Cape Town I'd have you discharged in a minute," roared Mr. Rhodes. "Yes, I've heard that they discharge people in Cape Town for doing their duty," answered the clerk, "but we ain't in Capt Town; this is a republic!" — Northwestern Christian Advocate.

They terribly carpet the earth with dead, and before their cannon cool, They walk unarmed by twos and threes to call the living to school.

—From Rudyard Kipling's ballad of "Kitchener's School."

HARRIS F. WILLIAMS

ATTORNEY AT LAW

1101 Chamber of Commerce Building . CHICAGO

FRIENDS

of this paper are requested to send us the names and addresses of persons of their acquaintance who would be interested in reading it regularly.

The Public Leaflets.

From time to time THE PUBLIC will reproduce, in pamphlet form suitable for mailing in open envelopes at the one-cent rate of postage, the editorial articles of permanent interest that appear in its columns. These pamphlets will be supplied upon the following terms:

Single copies, delivered at office, \$0.02
 Quantities delivered at office, per 100, 1.00
 Single copies mailed to any address, postage paid, .03
 Single copies mailed to any address, postage paid, upon orders for 100 or more, per 100, 2.00
 In quantities, mailed in bulk to one address, postage paid, per 100, 1.25

The following pamphlets are now ready:

1. A Business Tendency (from THE PUBLIC of September 10, 1898).
2. That Favorable Balance of Trade (from THE PUBLIC of October 22, 1898).
3. Nero-Thes, by E. J. Salisbury (from THE PUBLIC of November 12, 1898).
4. Department Stores (from THE PUBLIC of November 12, 1898).

The Public

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

Subscription, One Dollar a Year.

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

Single copies, five cents each.

Published weekly by

THE PUBLIC PUBLISHING COMPANY, Room 522,
 Schiller Building, Chicago, Ill.

Post-office address:

THE PUBLIC, Box 687, Chicago, Ill.