

The Public

First Year.

CHICAGO, SATURDAY, SEPTEMBER 24, 1898.

Number 25.

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.

Various producing interests of the United States are to have a hearing before the joint high commission now sitting in Canada. What a blessed novelty it would be if such bodies would now and then give a hearing to the consuming interests.

The prompt refusal of representative men to serve upon President McKinley's commission for investigating some of the departments of the war office, is significant of what we should gladly disbelieve. Whatever other motives these men may have had for declining to serve, there is one reason amply sufficient to justify such action on the part of any man fit for the place. It is this: President McKinley has appointed a commission which has no authority to compel the production of testimony.

Since the president, as commander-in-chief of the army, has full power to appoint a commission with authority to compel the production of testimony, why did he appoint one which could have no such authority? What could have been his purpose in instituting an inquiry into the delinquencies of the war department in such manner as to enable all witnesses who chose to do so, or who feared to do otherwise, to refuse to testify? Could he have had any other purpose than to suppress the damning facts? It will be remembered that he stood out sturdily against any investigation at all, until the Vermont election admonished him that there might be a God in Israel, whereupon he hastily appointed the commission which had no investigating power and most of

whose members have since declined to act. Was this done for the purpose of trifling with public opinion? Did Mr. McKinley decide upon an impotent commission, instead of the kind he might have appointed, in order to defy public opinion while seeming to defer to it?

The time has fully come when the responsibility for the ghastly management of the war should be placed where it belongs. President McKinley is no king, whose delinquencies are to be loaded off upon the shoulders of his ministers. As the chief servant of the people, upon his head should rest the blame for his faults. And this mismanagement was his fault. He has done nothing but play politics with war questions since they first arose. What is the sense in trying to excuse him by putting the blame upon Alger? He is responsible for Alger. Upon good authority it has been publicly asserted, and never denied, that just as he appointed Sherman to make a place in the senate for Hanna, so he appointed Alger to strengthen Hanna's senatorial fences. Responsible for Alger, he is responsible for the fact that the war was most deadly where there were no troops but our own and no weapons but theirs. He realizes this fully, even if the people in their generosity have not yet awakened to it; and no injustice is done him by inferring that his futile commission was intended to be futile. It was another "bunco."

From the president's original appointments of sons and nephews to staff positions in the army, where they have been able to contribute more or less to the sickness and death of our massacred soldiers, down to the report of Gen. Shafter, army appointments in this war have been

treated almost wholly as questions of "pull." Shafter literally caps the climax by recommending for promotion nobody but his own staff officers, and he recommends them in a bunch.

The action of the republican convention of California in making a side attack upon James G. Maguire, the democratic candidate for governor, because he is a single tax man, is beginning to have the effect we expected. While Maguire does not admit that the single tax is the issue in the campaign, as indeed it is not, he nevertheless plunges into a full discussion of it, showing the ignorance of the republican platform makers, and taking up and tearing to flinders their assertion that the single tax would burden farmers.

Already the leading republican paper of San Francisco has been compelled to apologize for the single tax plank of the republican platform, which describes the single tax as "socialistic" and "anarchistic," as if it could possibly be both; and we may yet expect the same paper to explain away the assertion that the single tax would exempt city values and fall heavily upon farm values. Maguire has shown that on the contrary, while it would fall with especial weight upon the large land owners of San Francisco, it would actually diminish the taxes of working farmers. It won't take much of that kind of campaigning to make the republicans of California try to forget that they allowed an anti-single tax plank so unnecessarily to slip into their platform. But though they forget, not so the farmers whom they have stirred up. To be aroused by a cry that somebody intends to increase your taxes when you are already overtaxed, and then to find, after all the excitement, that