

general inclination to neglect that day. But if Mr. Cleveland will take the trouble to investigate, he will discover that during all the time when his voice and pen have been exerted in behalf of the republican effort to defeat the democracy, Jackson's Day has been celebrated in all parts of the country. This day has been very generally celebrated by democrats who have read Jackson's history and who adhere to Jackson's principles as closely on election day as they do at the banquet boards where men gather to pay tribute to his memory.

The "old-time, honest, consistent and aggressive democratic faith" did not inspire its adherents to give encouragement to a political party whose principles are essentially hostile to democratic principles.

Mr. Cleveland may not know it, but the fact remains that in nearly every city in the United States there are even more than "thirty young democrats" who, during all the time Mr. Cleveland has absented himself from the party councils, have been "unwilling to allow Jackson's Day to pass without recognition."

Time For Protest.

The attention of a republican congress is called to the fact that land in the western hemisphere is being used as a prison for the incarceration of men whose only offense is that they have fought for liberty and independence. Not only are men imprisoned at Bermuda, but even little children, carried from their far away South African homes, are also detained there.

The Outlook, an outspoken advocate of imperialism, published in a recent issue an article written by Mr. Frank Schell Ballentine giving a description of the prison camps as he found them when he visited the Bermudas. The following is an extract from his article:

In our visit to the Boer laager on Darrell's island, which at the time was the largest of them all, the first thing to attract our attention and to keep it was the great proportion of boys on all sides. The English officer accompanying us informed us, in an apologetic way, even before we asked him, that these boys were taken with their fathers in the trenches and had been substantially taking the places of men in the battles. They would carry shot and shell, he said. They would act as water-carriers. They would creep to the tops of kopjes and bring back information of the whereabouts of the foe, etc. But from the Boers we afterwards heard that out of a certain gathering of twenty-four boys, such boys on the islands who were specifically questioned on this point, only six or seven had their fathers with them, and not all of those six or seven had even taken any part at all in the war.

Little Peter Cronje, for instance, the youngest of them all (he was only eight when captured), says his father was away from home when he was taken. His mother had just gone to another farm. Then the British came along, and took him away with an older brother of sixteen. Mother and children were thus ruthlessly snatched from each other's arms and the most sacred of home ties completely ignored.

John Viljoen is only nine years old. The occasion of his capture he tells as follows: The Kaffir servants had left the farm. His father was away to the war. He was out on the veldt tending the sheep. The khakis (British) came along and took him as well as the sheep.

Another boy tells of his capture in the following way: He was on his way with his father to the store to buy provisions for the Sabbath. The khakis came along, took their horse and wagon, himself and his father, and now they are transported and held as prisoners of war in Bermuda.

An old Irishman says a Kaffir came out to his store one day with a message from the British commander requesting him to report at once to headquarters. He went and reported. He was detained for two or three days. He then began to inquire as to the cause of the detention. "It is because you did not report in the time-limit heretofore pub-

lished," he was informed. And so he is now a prisoner of war in Bermuda.

The next thing to attract our attention in the laager after the boys was the number of old men in it. One of these, a Mr. Senekel, is seventy-eight years old. Quite a number range between sixty-five and seventy-five.

There are altogether about three thousand Boer prisoners at Bermuda, of whom three are Americans. Is not England presuming too much upon the friendliness of the United States when she uses American territory as a prison-house for the confinement of those who love self-government well enough to fight for it?

In its platform of 1896 the republican party said: "We hopefully look forward to the eventual withdrawal of the European powers on this hemisphere and to the ultimate union of all the English-speaking part of the continent by the free consent of its inhabitants."

This declaration followed immediately after the reassertion of the Monroe doctrine and was in turn followed by an expression of sympathy with the Cubans. Here is the way it was stated:

From the hour of achieving their independence, the people of the United States have regarded with sympathy the struggle of other American peoples to free themselves from European domination."

Is it consistent with this doctrine to look with unconcern upon the use of American soil for the imprisonment of those who are seeking independence and are struggling "to free themselves from European domination?"

The English government certainly knows the feelings of American citizens on this subject, and knowing the irritation that such a condition is likely to produce would, in all probability, remove the prisoners to the eastern hemisphere if attention was called to the matter. It is time for a friendly protest. If the administration is unwilling to express sympathy for the Boers, it surely ought to be willing to carry out the spirit of so late a republican platform as the one written in 1896 and protest against the erection of an English bastille upon American soil.

Following English Precedent.

The Outlook of December 7 seems to find cause for congratulation in the fact that the Philippine tariff bill provides that the money collected on goods imported from the Philippines to the United States "shall be held as a separate fund and paid into the treasury of the Philippine islands to be used and expended for the government and benefit of said islands." The editor of the Outlook reminds his readers that his paper insisted upon this provision in a previous issue, and he rejoices that the demand was complied with.

Before our esteemed contemporary jubilates too much over this provision it would be well for him to read the protest against English rule written by John Jay and approved by the colonial congress, October 21, 1774. As this protest is reproduced in the World's Best Orations as well as in many other publications, the editor of the Outlook will have no difficulty in finding it. His attention is called especially to the following words, which appeared in that protest:

These, and many other impositions, were laid upon us, most unjustly and unconstitutionally, for the express purpose of raising a revenue. In order to silence complaint, it was indeed provided that this revenue should be expended in America for its protection and defense. These exactions, however, can receive no justification from a pretended necessity of protecting and defending us. They are lavishly squandered on court favorites and ministerial dependants, generally avowed enemies to America, and employing themselves by partial representations to traduce and embroil the colonies.

Here is an English precedent for the provision inserted by a republican congress and gleefully indorsed by a great religious periodical. It is not strange that a colonial policy such as Eng-

land enforced against the American colonies, should, when adopted here, bring with it all the hypocrisy and false pretense that characterized its administration against our forefathers, but nevertheless it is humiliating that our nation should be doing today exactly the same things against which earnest and effective protest was made a century and a quarter ago.

"To silence complaint" now, as then, the revenues are to be turned over to the colonies, but what of the principle of taxation without representation? What of the theory of government without the consent of the governed? The revolutionary patriots were not willing to surrender the right of self-government merely because the English turned over to them the proceeds of unconstitutional taxation.

There is another parallel between Jay's protest and present conditions in the Philippines. It was complained that the revenues collected without authority and then turned back to the colonists, "to silence complaint" were "lavishly squandered on court favorites and ministerial dependants." While we have no court favorites as yet, we have ministerial dependants, men appointed by the president, who have fixed for themselves larger salaries than are paid for the same kind of work in this country. Complaint was made that the salaried officials appointed by England were "avowed enemies to America" and employed themselves in "trading and embroiling the colonies." If any one will read the official reports that come from the Philippine islands he will be convinced that the Filipinos are being governed by "avowed enemies" of their principles, however they may profess friendship for the Filipinos themselves.

Step by step the doctrine of imperialism is advancing, and unless the American people are prepared to adopt the European idea of government there must be a protest that will rescue the republican party from its present tendencies or drive it from power.

The Initiative and Referendum.

Mr. James C. Hogan, of New Jersey, in a very interesting speech delivered before the People's club of New York, discusses the referendum and quotes at length from the debates on the adoption of our federal constitution. Rodger Sherman is quoted as saying: "I oppose the election of members of the national legislatures by the people. The people, immediately, should have as little to do as may be about the government."

Mr. Dickinson, of Delaware, is quoted as saying: "I consider a limited monarchy as one of the best governments in the world," while Mr. Garrey "admitted that it was necessary that the people should appoint one branch of the government in order to inspire them with the necessary confidence." Alexander Hamilton is quoted as favoring a strong centralized government in which life tenure was prominent and appointment rather than election suggested.

There is no doubt that the constitution was a compromise between those who had faith in the capacity of the people for self-government and those who favored an independent government, but doubted and distrusted the people. The followers of Jefferson represented the popular idea of government and the followers of Hamilton represented the aristocratic idea of government. Experience has demonstrated that the people can be trusted. The abuses which have arisen and which have given cause for complaint are due not to the participation of the people in government, but to their partial elimination from the control of the government. The government is good just in proportion as it is responsive to the will of the people; it is bad in proportion as the virtue of the people is strained through agents and diluted by misrepresentation.

The last national platform of the democratic party indorsed the principles of the referendum. That principle is now recognized in the submis-