

be agreed to by the senate, and gives his reason in this fashion:

Spain has little sovereignty in the Philippines to sell just now, and I do not think the people of the United States are in the market to buy sovereignty just now, or that the constitution has conferred upon anybody the right to buy any such commodity. The constitution was framed upon the theory that sovereignty is not salable. The people of the United States have conferred upon nobody the power to make such purchases in their behalf. We have acquired territory, either vacant or so sparsely settled that there were no people capable of governing it and no germ of a national life. We have, also, in one recent case, acquired a territory where the original germ of national life had perished. But neither of these precedents applies to the Philippine archipelago, with its millions of inhabitants.

Some one having said, apropos of the imperial and colonial policy of the administration, that "God never intended one nation to govern another," some one else wants to know how the other some one happens be so familiar with God's intentions. This is a common inquiry when moral problems come up for solution. It is invariably propounded by advocates of the immoral side, and is usually regarded as a conclusive reply to appeals to the public conscience. But God's moral intentions are not so very difficult to understand. Nothing is easier. Even children understand them. Indeed, there is respectable Christian authority for the statement that God reveals his intentions unto babes. Whoever indulges a lively sense of justice, pushing selfishness behind him, knows the moral intentions of God. It is only men that put selfishness first, who find God's intentions in moral affairs complex and obscure.

That pet scheme of the national banking ring for killing the greenbacks and placing the control of the volume of the currency with the ring, the scheme which is embodied in the McCleary bill, has met a deadly foe in an unexpected quarter. Its new foe is no other than the comptroller of the currency, Charles G. Dawes. Mr.

Dawes, in his annual report, shows by the experience of his bureau that the McCleary bill, besides stimulating the flow of money to the great centers, would cause the greatest losses, when banks failed, to the depositors in small banks. This report, which saw the light prematurely, has temporarily demoralized the McCleary bill ring.

The cotton-mill operatives of Augusta, Ga., are enjoying a large slice of Mr. McKinley's peculiar species of prosperity. This species of prosperity, as we have already been advised by good McKinley authority, is especially notable for the fact that while it makes more work it provides less pay. And that is the peculiarity about it which the Augusta cotton operatives are now beginning to experience. Some 6,000 of them are striking against a reduced scale of wages which the mill owners are trying to enforce. Mills are open and work is to be had, but upon condition that operatives accept reduced pay.

When Mr. McKinley went upon the road as "an advance agent of prosperity," he neglected to enlarge upon this peculiarity of the prosperity he was about to introduce. But too much must not be expected of Mr. McKinley. It is impossible, even for so good and great a man as he, to increase the incomes of workers and also those of monopolists. Whenever one of these classes is benefited the other must correspondingly suffer. Now, Mr. McKinley has unquestionably increased the incomes of monopolists. Workers, therefore, must be content if they get more work; it were extravagant, in these circumstances, to expect more work and more pay too.

Commissary General Eagan gives but little aid and comfort, in his annual report, to those apologists for the mismanagement of the war, who attribute the suffering of the soldiers to general unpreparedness for war. He reports that rations sufficient for 16,000 men for 1,472 days were loaded upon the trans-

ports that carried Shafter's army from Tampa to Santiago. These rations consisted of bacon, beef, flour, hard-tack, beans, rice, potatoes, onions, tomatoes, coffee, sugar, salt and other provisions. Gen. Eagan also reports that additional supplies were soon afterward shipped to Santiago, consisting of such delicacies as canned fruit, canned soups, lime juice and jellies; and that when the transports left for Montauk there was an abundance of subsistence stores at and near to Santiago, with which the transports might have been provisioned. All this being true, the country appears to have been admirably prepared for war, so far as subsistence goes. No soldier should have suffered for want either of substantial food or of delicacies. Yet all the soldiers did suffer for both, not only on the way to Santiago, on the way back, and at Montauk, but also in front of Santiago. Col. Roosevelt has testified of the need of the soldiers for vegetables, and how he stretched his conscience to get only 500 pounds of beans for his men, being refused any vegetables unless he would certify that they were for officers. Why was not the whole army supplied with beans, rice, potatoes, onions and tomatoes, if, as Commissary Eagan now reports, such vegetables were available in sufficient quantity for 16,000 men for 1,472 days? Must we assume that Gen. Eagan's detailed report is false? There is no apparent reason for doing so. Then we are driven to the conclusion that although there was at all times an abundance of appropriate food within reach of the army, the officers who had it in charge withheld it from the soldiers.

In other words, the suffering of the soldiers was due not to lack of time for preparation for war, nor to lack of preparation, but to the indifference or incapacity or both of officers upon whom rested the responsibility for distributing the stores. And for these officers—Gen. Shafter and the sons and nephews of administration favorites—the responsibility is upon

President McKinley. It was he who put the worse than incompetent Shaftner at the head of the invading army, and appointed sons and nephews over the heads of experienced and competent men.

The importance of a real investigation into the mismanagement of the war is more evident than ever. That whitewashing committee which has been going around the country, making the scope of its inquiries as narrow as possible, throwing a veil over the favoritism that is so manifest to every observer, making favorable testimony prominent and discouraging the unfavorable, and withal having no legal standing—that committee will throw no light upon the truth. A rigid congressional investigation is needed. And such an investigation Senator Foraker, himself a republican, is determined to have if possible. So at least he is reported as saying. There should be an investigation, he says, rigid and impartial, by a congressional commission having power to administer oaths and to send for persons and papers; a commission that would also afford protection to witnesses who hesitate to tell what they know because they fear the wrath of the president and his secretary of war.

The Rev. Reverdy C. Ransom, a colored clergyman of Chicago, confirms our view that the negro question at the south is at bottom not a race but an industrial question, and part of the very labor question which agitates the rest of the country irrespective of race. Referring to our articles, Mr. Ransom says:

The belief which I have steadily maintained amid much discouragement, that there is a remnant who will forever oppose abridgement or usurpation of political equality as well as unfettered freedom of opportunity, has received fresh confirmation. You go to the very foundation of all this "race problem," when you say that the trouble is industrial rather than from any cause of race antipathy. It is, as you say, a question of the industrial servitude of one class to another. White

men the country over will one day discover a menace to their own industrial independence and prosperity, as well as their political liberty, through the degradation, by industrial and political serfdom, of the millions of black toilers of this land.

Gov. Tanner's testimony before the grand jury in the Virden labor riot cases goes far to show that his action in the matter was not so indefensible, even from a legal point of view, as it seemed at first. He makes it perfectly clear that what he did in preventing the unloading of negro miners from Alabama, was not directed against them as negroes; for he asserts that American citizens, white and black, have the right to seek employment wherever they can find it. He also makes it clear that his action was not against their coming in large bodies; for he says that American citizens, white and black, have the right not only to seek employment wherever they can find it, but to do so either singly or by thousands. But what he insists that no non-residents of Illinois, white or black, have the right to do, is to come into the state as those citizens of Alabama came to Virden, under the guard of a private military force—a force which under the statutes of Illinois is unlawful. Gov. Tanner denounces that, as an armed invasion of the state, which it was his duty as governor to repel. Upon this aspect of the case it may be that quite as much may be said in support of Gov. Tanner's action as against it, and probably more.

Conan Doyle, in an open letter to Michael Davitt apropos of the development of friendly relations between England and the United States, which Davitt as an Irish leader resents, argues that no liberty that has been granted England and Scotland has been denied Ireland. This is both true and false; true upon the surface, but false interiorly. While Irishmen as individuals are granted and denied the same liberties that are granted and denied to Englishmen and Scotchmen, the Irish people as a community are not granted that first of all lib-

erties, the liberty of self-government, in anything like the degree in which it is granted to the English and the Scotch people. Whereas the English and the Scotch rule themselves, the Irish are ruled by the English and the Scotch. Dr. Doyle should learn that the liberties of a people, to be truly liberties, must comprise something more than a set of privileges graciously granted as to inferiors by a superior.

Vermont is considering the advisability of making an experiment in personal property taxation. The old, old schemes for robbing men under the forms of law and in the name of personal property taxation have proved as abortive in the Green Mountain state as they always have everywhere else; and the Vermonters now propose to allow all newcomers to assess their own personal taxes for 30 years. According to this plan, any non-resident coming into the state to live may make a contract to pay a specified sum per annum for 30 years, in lieu of all other taxes on personal property. As the specified sum must not be less than \$500 in any case, the rather transparent object of this device is to enable rich tax dodgers of other states to do their dodging, for a consideration, under the sanction of Vermont law. It is not, therefore, a substitute for personal property taxation. Yet it suggests the best possible substitute. If personal property taxation were totally abolished, no one who ought to pay personal taxes would or could escape. For then the whole burden would fall upon real estate; and as the most valuable personal property—stocks and the like—consists in mere titles to real estate, such personal property would pay its share of taxes at the source. This method would be unfair, it is true, to owners of real estate improvements, which would then be overtaxed; but the soundness of that objection would be due, not to any wrongfulness involved in abolishing personal taxes, but to the wrongfulness of not also abolishing taxes on improvements. If