

CURRENT TOPICS

IN HIS speech of acceptance, Judge Parker said: "The common law, as developed, affords a complete legal remedy against monopolies." Republican organs have made much of this statement. In his letter of acceptance, Mr. Roosevelt said: "It is now asserted that 'the common law, as developed, affords a complete legal remedy against monopolies.' But there is no common law of the United States. Its rules can be enforced only by the state courts and officers. No federal court or officer could take any action whatever under them. It was this fact, coupled with the inability of the states to control trusts and monopolies, which led to the passage of the federal statutes known as the Sherman anti-trust act and the interstate commerce act, and it is only through the exercise of the powers conferred by these acts and by the statutes of the last congress supplementing them that the national government acquires any jurisdiction over the subject. To say that action against trusts and monopolies should be limited is equivalent to saying that the national government should take no action whatever to regulate them."

A NEW YORK lawyer, commenting upon Mr. Roosevelt's statement and writing to the New York World, says: "The supreme court of the United States, however, takes a different view, and says in a recent opinion, through Mr. Justice Brewer, that there is a common law of the United States. (Western Union Telegraph Company vs. Call Publishing Company, 181 U. S. '92, decided in 1901.) The court said that while there was no federal common law in the sense of a national customary law distinct from the common law of England, as adopted by the several states each for itself, applied to its local law subject to such alterations as may be provided by its own statutes, there was a common law in force generally throughout the United States, and the countless multitude of interstate commercial transactions are subject, said the court, to the rules of the common law, except so far as they are modified by congressional enactment. This language was used by the court with reference to a case of alleged discrimination by a public-service corporation, and is equally applicable to the protection of commerce against oppressive monopolies."

THE origin of the stripes used in the convict's garb is explained by a writer in the New Orleans Times-Democrat. He says the custom comes from the old dispensation. This writer adds: "For instance, in the laws and ordinances of Deuteronomy, we find the following, which will give us the clue to the origin of stripes as a badge of infamy: 'If there be a controversy between men, and they come unto judgment, that the judges may judge them; then they shall justify the righteous, and condemn the wicked. And it shall be, if the wicked man be worthy to be beaten, that the judge shall cause him to lie down, and to be beaten before his face, according to his fault, by a certain number. Forty stripes he may give him, and not exceed; lest if he should exceed, and beat him above these with many stripes, then thy brother should seem vile unto thee.' Now instead of inflicting stripes we put striped clothes on the men who offended the law, or who may come unto the judgment, that the judges may judge them, as it is put in the text. Of course, you could go much further back in history if you cared to trace the marks of infamy, but you would find that physical mutilation of some sort in a majority of instances afforded the means."

IN LARGE black letters in the main reception room of the pension bureau at Washington are the words: "The Lord hates a liar." The Washington correspondent for the Chicago Inter Ocean says that this admonition has been placed in the pension bureau's reception room because of a penchant of the applicants for pensions to magnify the glory of their services. The Inter Ocean correspondent adds: "For many years the department has wrestled with the problem of determining what is just, both to the government, which pays millions each year to civil war veterans, and to those who present themselves as entitled to special recognition. Records of individual performances are very vague, and it has proven a difficult matter to adjust claims. Often it has been found that

those who gave the most definite personal assurances had the least credit in the reports of officers in the service. Weary at last, Commissioner Ware ordered posted the legend which appears above, in the forlorn hope that it might prove a warning to those who are inclined to exaggerate their own importance. The work was done some time between closing hours Saturday afternoon and the time for the arrival of visitors Monday morning. The clerks smiled significantly when they read the inscription upon the wall. Mr. Ware declined to discuss the matter."

IN HIS letter of acceptance, Mr. Roosevelt said: "Since the close of the war with Spain there has been no substantial change in the rate of annual expenditures." The editor of the Dubuque, Iowa, Telegraph, commenting upon this statement, asks: "Is this a condition to commend or to condemn? Is it to the credit of the administration that, compared with 1898—the year of the Spanish-American war—the cost of government per capita has increased from \$6.07 to \$7.14, the cost in 1903? In 1860 the cost of government per capita was \$2.01 or \$10.05 for a family of five; today it is \$35.70 for the same family."

IN THE light of Mr. Roosevelt's proud claim this table showing the cost of government for the last twenty years may be interesting:

Year.	Population.	Net Expenses.	Per Capita Expenses.
1880	50,155,783	\$267,642,958.00	\$5.34
1881	51,316,000	260,712,888.00	5.08
1882	52,495,000	257,981,440.00	4.91
1883	53,693,000	265,408,238.00	4.94
1884	54,911,000	244,126,244.00	4.44
1885	56,148,000	260,226,335.00	4.63
1886	57,404,000	242,483,138.00	4.22
1887	58,680,000	267,932,179.00	4.56
1888	59,974,000	267,924,901.00	4.46
1889	61,289,000	289,288,978.00	4.88
1890	62,222,250	318,040,710.00	5.07
1891	63,947,000	365,773,905.35	5.72
1892	65,191,000	345,023,330.58	5.29
1893	66,456,000	383,477,954.49	5.77
1894	67,740,000	367,525,279.83	5.43
1895	69,043,000	356,195,298.29	5.16
1896	70,365,000	352,170,446.08	5.01
1897	71,704,000	365,774,159.57	5.10
1898	73,060,000	443,368,582.80	6.07
1899	74,433,000	605,072,179.85	6.14
1900	76,295,220	487,713,791.71	6.39
1901	77,754,000	509,967,353.15	6.56
1902	79,117,000	471,190,857.84	5.96
1903	80,847,000	506,099,007.04	6.26
1904	81,867,000	582,569,086.06	7.14

PRINCE HERBERT VON BISMARCK, who died recently, was the only remaining son of the great "iron chancellor," who had the most to do with the building of the German empire. A writer in the Cincinnati Enquirer says: "Prince Bismarck's father trained him for his successor as chancellor of the German empire, and advanced him rapidly in the diplomatic service until, at the age of 40, he was minister of foreign affairs, in which position he took part in nearly every important international transaction. Since the retirement of his father in 1890, Prince Herbert Bismarck ceased to be foreign minister, he has taken no part in public affairs, save only as a member of the reichstag. His attitude has ever been that of a man who was not appreciated by his sovereign and who was waiting in the background for an opportunity to resume his career."

IT IS said that Prince Herbert steadfastly declined to join any political group and insisted on calling himself an independent. He had a haughty and imperious manner in early life when he was conscious of the fact that he was the son of the most powerful statesman Europe, but the Enquirer's correspondent says that this manner softened in later life. According to this correspondent, an instance which nearly wrecked Prince Herbert's career and which caused the chancellor great annoyance, was Herbert's elopement with Princess Carolath Beuthen, the wife of Prince Karl, the head of that distinguished Silesian house. The princess was of the Hatzfeldt family, and

young Bismarck, at the time, was his father's private secretary. Prince, then count, Herbert lived with the princess in southern Italy for a few weeks, but, at the command of his father, returned to Germany. The princess afterward was divorced from Prince Karl and has since died.

THE title of Prince Bismarck and the large fortune of the deceased, will, according to the Enquirer's correspondent, go to his seven-year-old son, Otto. This correspondent says: "The late Emperor Frederick gave to Chancellor Bismarck extensive forests at Friederichsruhe, which have since increased in value, and the chancellor gave to Prince Herbert \$2,400,000 in securities and cash. The estate is now estimated to be worth \$4,000,000 exclusive of the lands."

CONSIDERABLE interest now attaches to the question as to how Mr. Roosevelt will obtain money for his ambitious schemes of territorial expansion and to increase the size of the army and navy. A writer in the New York World says that this question is not answered by the government's figures of August imports. The World writer points out: "These show an increase from 1902 of some nine millions in value. But the revenues gain nothing, as will be seen in this classification: August imports, 1902. 1903. 1904.

Free of duty...	\$28,673,894	\$35,130,329	\$41,163,477
Dutiable	50,249,387	46,918,933	46,348,169

"The dutiable goods that got past the Dingley tariff wall were actually worth less last month than in either 1902 or 1903. And the same decline has been noted for some months. But expenditures mount daily. August and July showed a deficit of \$24,000,000—\$13,000,000 of which was for increased army and navy cost, although these two items alone had in seven years risen from \$82,000,000 to \$217,000,000. Mr. Roosevelt promises if elected to go on as he has done, still piling up vaster and vaster war budgets. But where will he get the money? Will he ask congress to reimpose the Spanish war taxes—and to seek other new revenue sources, since these alone would probably not suffice? Or will he run the nation in debt for 'current' expenses?"

AFTER a separation of 54 years, Hugh Murphy of Minneapolis met his sister, Mrs. Mary Cassidy, whom he lost track of in Ireland. The New York American tells the story in this way: "Back in 1850 the brother and sister decided to come to America, and in accordance with this plan the sister started first, expecting her brother Hugh to meet her shortly after in New York. She went to New York as they had planned, but upon Hugh's arrival he was unable to find her. During the first year of his stay in this country Hugh Murphy wandered about for many months in search of his sister whom he had lost in New York. His long search seemed to be in vain, however, and after over a year of weary tramping he finally settled in Minneapolis. He worked in this city for many years, and finally by dint of energy and perseverance amassed a considerable fortune. As he felt that old age was creeping upon him the longing to hear from some of his kinsmen came upon him and he wrote to one of his relatives in Ireland. A correspondence between them developed the fact that the relatives in the old country knew the whereabouts of the sister from whom he had so long been separated. From them he learned that she lived in La Porte, Ind., and without waiting further he went down to Indiana to see her."

THE democratic campaign textbook for 1904 is said to be one of the most interesting publications ever issued by a political committee. In this work the arraignment of imperialism is particularly strong. For instance, it is said: "The United States has no issue involving greater responsibility than the retention of the Philippine Archipelago with its liberty-seeking people. In the ever-increasing casuistry the opinions expressed by fearless statesmen, great educators and soldiers can well be taken into account. They are better entitled to credence than the partisan statements of persons forced by official employment to support an administration of which they are part."