

In the Palace of the King.

Under the headline "Things a King Cannot Do" the Chicago Tribune prints an interesting reference to the powers and privileges of monarchs, as follows:

The rulers of the peoples of the earth, of whom there are now seventy-six of recognized importance, have on the average much less power than is usually imagined. The new King of England, for instance, will find when he ascends the throne in many ways he is not as free as his subjects.

King and Subject.

An ordinary Englishman may travel where he pleases and may select his own traveling companions. The King of England may not leave the confines of the empire without being accompanied by a Minister of state. The British constitution provides that the King shall hold himself at all times in readiness to sign acts of Parliament after they have passed both Houses of the national Legislature. Until they have been so signed they do not become law. It might happen that in some crisis the King's signature would be needed without a moment's delay. The existence of the state itself might well depend on instant action; for instance, an army of invasion might suddenly appear off the coast of England, in which case it would be necessary to call out the militia. This could not be done legally without the signature of the King. Therefore it is provided that a responsible Minister of state shall accompany the King wherever he may go to present emergency acts of Parliament to him for his signature. Even if Parliament is not in session this act is enforced, because it might be necessary at any time to call Parliament to meet in extraordinary session.

ooo

No matter how tired the King of England might grow of his responsibilities the lawyers say that he could not abdicate. There is no precedent for such

Cannot Abdicate.

an action, and, as is well known, precedent is an important factor in the British government. If the King should absent himself from the kingdom without formally notifying his Ministers of state, so that one of them might accompany him, Parliament would be obliged to meet and declare the throne vacant. According to the authorities the crown would then be placed in commission; that is, the King's place would be taken by a kind of Board of Directors, composed of the highest statesmen and noblemen in the land. What such a commission would do with a royal truant on his return does not seem clear. No ruler of England has ever done such a thing, and therefore there is no historic precedent to serve as a guide for future action.

No King of England can force a subject to accept a peerage or other title of nobility. There are few Englishmen, indeed, who would refuse to be made Barons, if the honor were offered them, but the King can do no more than offer the honor. He may order and compel a subject to sit in the House of Lords and legislate for his country, but he may not compel the acceptance of a title.

ooo

In time of peace no King of England may maintain a standing army without the consent of Parliament. Every year of the world it is necessary to

Armies and Taxes

introduce what is called the annual army bill and procure its passage by both Houses of Parliament. If the members of parliament were to be stricken down by some pestilence or plague and so kept from attending the sessions of the national Legislature in legal numbers, the British army would absolutely pass out of existence. At no time does the army of England have more than a twelve month's lease of life. That lease must be renewed yearly. The idea behind this somewhat curious procedure is that if the King were allowed to maintain a standing army without the sanction of the Parliament that army might at some time be used against the people.

Neither can the King of Great Britain and Ireland avoid paying taxes on whatever property he may

own in his own name. The allowance or salary of the new King—again following historic precedent—is likely to be \$1,920,000. If from this amount he should save a portion and buy an estate he would be obliged to pay taxes on it like any commoner. On the other hand, crown property is free from taxes of all kinds.

ooo

All the land in the kingdom is according to law held by its present tenants "from the crown." Landowners regard it as their own, but in reality it belongs to the King, and if the letter of the law were strictly followed, he might recall and recover it in a perfectly legal manner. To the King also belongs absolutely all the shore around the whole coast of the islands from low to high water marks. Some day when an ingenious inventor discovers a method of taking advantage of the motion of the tides this ownership may add greatly to the present income of the crown. The King is also vested with the ownership of the beds of all tidal rivers such as the Thames.

A curious limitation of the powers of a King is the fact that his wife, though a Queen, is in the eyes of the law a mere subject. It would, it is true, be high treason to attempt to kill her, but if she should commit any offense against the laws of the country she might be brought into court like any ordinary person, and, if convicted of an offense, fined or even imprisoned.

By a legal fiction the King of England is supposed to be present in every court in the land. An ordinary citizen who is involved in a case at law must be present either in person or by attorney, but the King needs no representative, and a case may go on in his absence exactly as if he were present in his royal robes.

ooo

Among the rulers of the world there are twenty-two presidents of republics, and in many ways they have greater powers than a majority of the fifteen Kings and six Emperors who occupy corresponding places of power.

The Power of Veto.

The King of England technically possesses the right of vetoing an act of Parliament. As a matter of fact, this right has not been exercised for so long that it is practically obsolete. The President of the United States, on the other hand, exercises his veto power frequently, and it takes a two-thirds vote of both Houses of Congress to pass a bill over his veto. Even the lordly German Emperor has no right of veto on laws passed by the Bundesrath and the Reichstag. Neither can he prorogue nor dissolve the Reichstag except after a favorable vote by the Bundesrath. In no case can he prorogue the Reichstag for more than thirty days unless its members so agree. The Emperor may conclude peace, but may not declare war unless it be necessary for the defense of the empire.

Labor.

The labor program for the Twentieth century is as follows: To organize the yet unorganized workers; to build up national and international unions; to make our unions more effective; to protect the interests of the toilers; to promote their welfare by all possible methods; to safeguard every step we have already gained. It may be true that others by their sympathetic action may aid the workers' movement but we resent the promises and claims of any and all that the betterment of labor or the abolition of any form of injustice to the wage-earners depends upon any other power than the federal labor unions of the country. Associated capital must be met by organized labor. Workers as individuals are today as much at the mercy of the employing class as a rudderless ship in a tempestuous sea is at the mercy of the waves.—Gompers, in New York World.

With all the railroads of the country merged into five and the five harmoniously skinning shippers and passengers to pay dividends on watered stock we should fully realize what combination against competition means.—St. Louis Post-Dispatch.

The German government not only sells life insurance to its subjects but it requires those who earn less than a certain amount to be insured against illness and old age.—Buffalo Times.

The Boers.

For some months any attempt to question or criticize these and the like expressions of imperialist chivalry was described, in the courteous terms applied by the "Times" to Mr. Leonard Courtney, as "anti-English whining." But now our officers and men are coming back in some numbers from the seat of war, and the burden of all they have to say about the men they have been fighting is that of the speech made the other day by General Porter:

The Boers were a brave nation who fought gallantly and well. They treated British prisoners with every consideration, and wounded with the same care as they would their own. On a few occasions the white flag was abused, but in what large community would they not find one or two miscreants?

Equally typical of what seems to be the prevalent feeling of our soldiers is the article contributed to the current "Monthly Review" by Mr. Basil Williams, a gunner in the City Imperial Volunteers. His account of the experience of a Canadian sergeant who was taken prisoner by the Boers is worth quoting:

He belonged to a small force which, in the unaccountable way so common in this war, suddenly found itself surrounded by Boers. This particular Canadian was riding along when he saw an armed Boer blocking his path; he pulled out his revolver to have a shot at him, but just as he was pointing it his horse stumbled, and he fell head over heels on to the ground. For the moment he was stunned, and the next thing of which he was aware was that the Boer was helping him on to his feet, saying in a good-humored way to him, "Don't try and kill me, I don't want to kill you, but to give you a hand up." After this the first question the Boer asked him was, "Have you had any breakfast?" "No." "Well, here is something to eat," and he pulled a dough cake out of his pocket.

Which, then, is the correct opinion? To hold General Porter's, or even to suggest that it might be tenable, was described six months ago as "unpatriotic," "pro-Boer," "exalting the enemies of England," and "twisting the facts against our countrymen." Do our imperialists really contend that the British army is anti-British, that General Porter holds a brief from Mr. Kruger, or that Dr. Leyds was potent even among the C. I. V.? Or will they own frankly that they lost their own heads in a trying time and so split a great many foul words which did their own country very foul wrong in the ears of the world, and that now they are as sick and sorry for it as they ought to be?—Manchester, (Eng.,) Guardian.

Kitchener, as the representative of Anglo-Saxon civilization in South Africa, is pursuing the methods that were so violently denounced when employed by Weyler in Cuba. The Boer families, we are told, "are being systematically brought into convenient centres from all over the country"—the reconcentrado policy. They are not to be left to shift for themselves and starve, as in Cuba; that is, not all of them. They are to be fed, but "those whose husbands are still in the field are provided for on a reduced scale, which is raised to a full allowance when the husbands surrender."

This is the very refinement of cruelty. The women and children are taken from their homes, herded in camps, and kept on insufficient food, in order that their sufferings may force the husbands and fathers to surrender. Weyler himself never imagined anything more despicable than this.—Philadelphia Times.

An Election Echo.

It appears that the Filipinos are not easily influenced by the ballot. During the Presidential campaign of last year it was solemnly promised that the re-election of William McKinley would have the effect of immediately bringing the war in the Philippine Islands to a close; that the "rebels" were only holding out in the hope that the election of a new administration would result in the immediate withdrawal of the United States troops from the islands. Possibly not as many people were foolish enough to believe this theory as the administration managers supposed. What the country needs is not fewer presidential campaigns, but more dignified ones. Campaign lying ought to be made as reprehensible as cheating in business transactions.—Cincinnati Enquirer.