

When the resolution came up on the 6th, an attempt was made to refer it to a committee; but Mr. Hoar expressed his fear that this was meant for delay and he succeeded in securing its prompt adoption by the senate.

Mr. Hoar had already given notice of his intention to discuss the Vest resolution, and on the 9th he did so at length. Following is the Vest resolution:

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That under the constitution of the United States no power is given to the federal government to acquire territory to be held and governed permanently as colonies. The colonial system of European nations cannot be established under our present constitution, but all territory acquired by the government, except such small amount as may be necessary for coaling stations, correction of boundaries, and similar governmental purposes, must be acquired and governed with the purpose of ultimately organizing such territory into states suitable for admission into the union.

The burden of Mr. Hoar's speech, which was a reply to Senator Platt, of Connecticut, who had opposed the resolution, may be inferred from this quotation: "When you raise the flag over the Philippine Islands as an emblem of dominion and acquisition, you take it down from Independence Hall."

Senator Hoar's speech of the 9th was followed on the 10th by one from Senator Mason on the same side. Mr. Mason, however, spoke to a resolution of his own, which he had offered on the 7th. It is as follows:

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.

In favor of the treaty, the more important speech of the two so far made in the senate was delivered on the 11th by Senator Foraker. Its importance lay in the fact that Mr. Foraker intimated, with an assumption of authority, that the administration has no intention of interfering with local self-government in the Philippines, or of making the United States occupancy more than temporary.

When he said that it had been "decided to take possession ourselves—for the present at least—until the people of those islands are ready and capable of self-government," there was a stir of astonishment in the senate at the suggestion of temporary occupancy, and Mr. Foraker reiterated his assertion, adding:

I do not understand that anyone desires anything but the ultimate independence of the people of the Philippines, neither the president nor anyone in this chamber.

Mr. Foraker also said, answering a question asked by Mr. Hoar as to the right of the Philippines to self-government:

With the determination of the ultimate policy respecting the Philippines, their feelings will have much to do. No one, so far as I am able to learn, is prepared by force and violence to take and hold them. I am willing to trust the administration. I have no sympathy with those who talk of making war on Aguinaldo any more than I had with those who talked of making war on Gomez.

President McKinley's proclamation to the Filipinos, referred to in these columns last week as having been cabled but not made public, was promulgated on the 5th at Manila by Gen. Otis. According to the version of the Associated Press, Gen. Otis, after reciting briefly President McKinley's instructions, expressed the opinion that it is the intention of the American government while directing affairs generally to appoint representative Filipinos forming the controlling element, to civil positions. He also expressed himself as convinced that the United States government intends to seek the establishment in the islands of a most liberal government, in which the people will be as fully represented as the maintenance of law and order will permit, and susceptible of development, on lines of increased representation and the bestowal of increased powers, into a government as free and independent as is enjoyed by the most favored provinces in the world. To this end he invited the full confidence and cooperation of the Filipinos. Nothing was said in the proclamation regarding the disarmament of the Filipinos.

Gen. Otis's proclamation was followed by a manifesto from President Aguinaldo accusing the American government of bad faith and calling upon the people to work together for Philippine independence. The re-

publican papers of Manila do not yield in their demands for independence.

The news reports from Washington have all along indicated a war-like disposition toward the Filipinos; but the more recent reports go to show that the instructions to the American troops off the island of Panay have gone no further than to order them to land, and, getting into communication with the Filipinos at Iloilo, to make public the purposes of the United States. "The policy to be adopted now," says the Associated Press report from Washington, "is a gentle one. Persuasion will be used before power." At last accounts the Americans had not landed at Iloilo, and the city was still held by Filipino troops. Filipino committees in Paris, Madrid and London telegraphed on the 9th to President McKinley a protest against the disembarkation of American troops at Iloilo, as premature before the ratification of the treaty of peace.

Gen. Wood arrived at New York on the 10th en route from Santiago, Cuba, to Washington. His departure from Santiago was noted last week, its object being to confer with the Washington authorities regarding Gen. Brooke's order requiring Santiago customs receipts to be sent to Havana. This had aroused great indignation in Santiago, and, as already reported, a mass meeting of citizens had requested Gen. Wood to intercede. Gen. Brooke revoked his objectionable order before Col. Wood reached New York; and Santiago will retain its customs receipts.

Politics in the United States are assuming shape in the democratic party for the presidential campaign of 1900. The indications now are that the party will be split both by the money question and the question of colonial expansion. At the Jackson day banquet on the 6th in Cincinnati, Wm. J. Bryan struck the keynote for the wing of the party which he represents. He emphasized the doctrine of free and unlimited coinage at the ratio of 16 to 1, as set forth in the Chicago platform, and then took up the colonial question. His speech upon that issue was largely in answer to this searching interrogatory:

Whether we can govern colonies as well as other countries can is not material; the real question is whether we

can, in one hemisphere, develop the theory that governments derive their just power from the consent of the governed, and at the same time inaugurate, support and defend in the other hemisphere a government which derives its authority entirely from superior force. And, if these two ideas of government cannot live together, which one shall we choose?

His answer was sufficiently explicit in the peroration, when he said:

We cannot afford to destroy the declaration of independence; we cannot afford to erase from our constitutions, state and national, the bill of rights; we have not time to examine the libraries of the nation and purge them of the essays, the speeches and the books that defend the doctrine that law is the crystallization of public opinion, rather than an emanation from physical power. But even if we could destroy every vestige of the laws which are the outgrowth of the immortal law penned by Jefferson; if we could obliterate every written word that has been inspired by the idea that this is "a government of the people, by the people and for the people," we could not tear from the heart of the human race the hope which the American republic has planted there. The impassioned appeal, "Give me liberty or give me death," still echoes around the world. In the future, as in the past, the desire to be free will be stronger than the desire to enjoy a mere physical existence. The conflict between right and might will continue here and everywhere until a day is reached when the love of money will no longer sear the national conscience, and hypocrisy no longer hide the hideous features of avarice behind the mask of philanthropy.

Mr. Bryan took the same ground regarding the democratic policy at the Jackson day banquet on the 7th at Chicago that he had taken in Cincinnati; and ex-Gov. Altgeld, in an eloquent speech at the Jackson day banquet on the same day at Omaha, a speech pitched in a high moral key, endorsed the same policy. Another speaker at the Omaha banquet was Congressman Sulzer, a Tammany democrat of New York city, who is mentioned as Tammany's choice for democratic leader in the next house. Mr. Sulzer placed himself in his speech squarely upon the Chicago platform.

But Richard Croker, the "boss" of Tammany hall, has taken pains to outline a democratic policy diametrically opposed to that advocated by Bryan and Altgeld. He wrote a letter on the 6th to the New York papers in which he opposed the free coinage of

silver at 16 to 1 as a dead issue, and advocated expansion. On the latter question he said: "I believe in holding whatever possessions we have gained by annexation, purchase or war."

Wm. A. Poynter, as governor of Nebraska; Roger Wolcott, as governor of Massachusetts; Chas. S. Thomas, as governor of Colorado; Lewellyn T. Powers, as governor of Maine; Frank Rollins, as governor of New Hampshire; and W. E. Stanley, as governor of Kansas, have been inaugurated since our last issue. Among the governors' messages read to legislatures were those of Stephens, of Missouri; Thomas, of Colorado; Stanley, of Kansas; Ellerbee, of South Carolina; Mount, of Indiana; Wolcott, of Massachusetts, and Pingree, of Michigan. Pingree's message was largely devoted to the subject of equal taxation, though he took occasion to attack the colonial policy proposed by the Spanish treaty. He also severely scored the improvident granting of street franchises. His remedies for this were twofold; first, reference of street franchises to popular vote; and, second, municipal ownership of street car systems. As to the latter he said:

The arguments in favor of municipal ownership are too many to be stated here in detail, but a few may be briefly stated: (1) The taking out of the control of the council of a matter which has always, in large cities, been the most fruitful source of municipal corruption. (2) The tendency of a public plan to give the greatest consideration to the lives and comfort of passengers. (3) The tendency of such a system to confine the tracks to as few streets possible, instead of, as in the franchise system to cover as many as possible. (4) The reduction of fare to as low a point as is consistent with the cost of maintenance.

The governor of Vermont, on the 11th, appointed Chief Justice Jonathan Ross, of the state supreme court, to the vacancy in the United States senate made by the death of Senator Morrill; and the following candidates for United States senator have been agreed upon by caucuses of the dominant party in their respective states: Senator Henry Cabot Lodge, republican, Massachusetts; A. J. Beveridge, republican, Indiana; Senator J. C. Burrows, republican, Michigan; John Kean, republican, New Jersey; Senator Joseph R. Hawley, republican, Connecticut; Senator Hall, republican,

an, Maine; and Senator C. D. Clark, republican, Wyoming.

The legislature of Delaware, which had not been able to organize last week after 54 ballots for speaker, succeeded in organizing this week on the 91st ballot. The democrats with 12 members finally united with the regular republicans who had 11, and thus defeated the so-called "union" republicans who had 12. Other legislatures to organize since our last issue are those of Indiana, Nebraska, Missouri, Massachusetts, Texas, Kansas, Oregon, Utah, Washington, Wisconsin and West Virginia.

The extraordinary session of the Kansas legislature, the proceedings of which were noted in these columns last week, came to a close on the 9th without further legislation than that already reported.

Proceedings were instituted on the 5th in the supreme court of Ohio, by the attorney general of the state, for the forfeiture of the charters and the dissolution of the Standard Oil company. Eight instances of violation of charter are specified as grounds for the forfeiture proceedings. The attorney general has for several weeks been engaged in procuring evidence upon which to base these proceedings, and the company has thrown a great variety of obstacles in his way. He asserts among other things that he has positive proof that the company, in the midst of the investigation, burned several boxes of books containing incriminating entries. Two weeks have been given the company in which to answer the petition for forfeiture of its charters.

Across the water, the Dreyfuss trouble in France has broken out in a new place. The sensational resignation of the president of the civil section of the court of cassation has thrown Paris into an uproar again, and fears are expressed that in this judge a revolutionary leader will be found. On the 8th it was first reported that M. Quesnay de Beaurepaire, the presiding judge referred to above, had resigned his office but refused to assign a motive. On the 9th, however, he published a statement in which he charged a conspiracy on the part of the criminal section of the court of cassation, which has the Dreyfus case under consideration, to exonerate Dreyfus. He declared, also, that his resignation was intended to