

United States the island of Puerto Rico, together with the Philippine Islands and the Island of Guam in the Ladrone, the United States paying to Spain \$20,000,000. Under the constitution treaties are made a part of the supreme law of the land and they have a legal status similar to that of contracts. Numerous treaties have been made with the Indians."

AFTER four hours' deliberation, February 11, the proceedings marked by caustic criticism of Mr. Roosevelt's course, the senate ratified with amendments ten international arbitration treaties. The word "agreement" as used in Article II was changed to the word "treaty." The vote on this amendment was 50 to 9. Those voting in opposition to the substitution of the word, but in line with the wishes of the president, were: Dolliver (Rep. Ia.), Fairbanks (Rep. Ind.), Hopkins (Rep. Ill.), McCumber (Rep. N. D.), Nelson (Rep. Minn.), Platt (Rep. Conn.), Stewart (Rep. Nev.), Warren (Rep. Wyo.), Wetmore (Rep. R. I.). Those voting for the amendment in opposition to the president's wishes as specifically set forth in a letter which Mr. Roosevelt sent to Mr. Cullom, chairman of the foreign relations committee, were: Messrs. Alger, Allison, Ankeny, Bacon, Bailey, Bard, Bate, Berry, Beveridge, Blackburn, Burnham, Burrows, Carmack, Clark (Mont.), Clay, Culberson, Cullom, Daniel, Dick, Dillingham, Dryden, Foraker, Foster (La.), Foster (Wash.), Fulton, Gallinger, Gamble, Gorman, Hale, Hansbrough, Heyburn, Kean, Kittredge, Lodge, Long, McComas, McCreary, McLaurin, Money, Morgan, Newlands, Overman, Patterson, Scott, Smoot, Spooner, Stone, Taliaferro and Teller.

NEWSPAPER correspondents devoted extraordinary attention to the differences between the president and the senate. The Washington correspondent for the New York World, under date of February 12, says: "Other presidents have had pet projects squelched by the senate, but no president in this generation, the wise men of the upper house say, has ever been rebuked as President Roosevelt was yesterday. That rebuke was drastic, historic, caloric. Its effect was more noticeable today than last night. There are many features manifest now that serve to emphasize the firm determination of the senate to teach the president a lesson. The executive sessions preceding the final vote are described as the most dramatic in the memory of those who have been senators for twenty years. The intensity of feeling, the earnestness of speech, the unanimity of sentiment have not prevailed on any similar proposition since the war."

THE senators criticize the president because he addressed his communication to an individual senator rather than to the senate itself, also because the president made the letter public before it was delivered to the senate. There seems to be a disposition among the senators to find fault with the present president on many subjects. It is claimed that while the Swayne impeachment case was in progress, the president summoned to the white house a number of senators and lectured them on the problems of their duty. The Washington correspondent for the New York World says: "This has grown to be a favorite practice of the president, and the rank and file of the senators do not like it. They feel that such a course implies that the majority of the senators are like sheep and will follow leaders, without reference to what their honest convictions may be on any pending public question."

"COLONEL BILL" HACKNEY presided over the committee of the whole in the Kansas house of representatives, February 9, and the interesting proceedings are related by the Topeka correspondent for the Kansas City Journal in this way: "It has been twenty-eight years since I sat in this chair," said he. "It doesn't swell me up a bit. I have long since discovered that most anybody can preside over the house in committee of the whole." Just then some bill came up which Hackney didn't see much merit in. "What will you do with this fool bill?" he asked. The fool bill was recommended for passage. "You fellows make less racket and do more business, he shouted to some members who were talking. The colonel spied a couple of lobbyists working on the floor of the house. "We will suspend business," said he, "until those lobbyists get their members fixed." Someone made a motion that was rather hazy. "I don't understand the motion and I guess nobody else does either," said Hackney, "so I will put it

now." He did so and it carried. When the committee arose and Hackney stepped from the chair he said: "Mr. Speaker as chairman of this outfit (waving his hand over the house) I make the following report." The members rather enjoyed the colonel's way of running things."

RECENTLY Senator-elect Hemmenway of Indiana appeared on the platform as a speaker, in company with the governor of his state. A writer in the Philadelphia Enquirer, referring to this incident, said: "When Hemmenway was working in a livery stable across the street from the place of meeting, the governor was digging a ditch in front of it for a gas company. Minnesota has just elected a governor by an unprecedented majority whose father was sent to the poor house as a common drunkard when the potential governor was 10 years old. The latter went to work at \$1 a week and increased his wages until it was possible for him to get his mother to retire from the washtub, since which he has supported her. Massachusetts has just installed a governor who learned the trade of cobbler as a small boy and rose to high place in the manufacturing world by industry and integrity. There are at present in congress at least 100 men who began life under apparently the most untoward circumstances and have made their way in the world without the benefit of higher education (unless secured by their own efforts) and against what most persons would consider normal chances of achieving distinction. If it were necessary we could point out many cases, in fact the majority of those who have achieved distinction, from Washington to the present, have worked out their financial, moral and intellectual and political salvation by industry, energy and economy."

A BILL is pending in congress to extend succession to the presidency to the new cabinet officers—the secretary of agriculture and the secretary of commerce and labor. A writer in the Kansas City Journal, referring to this measure, says: "In 1885 an act which sent the line of succession down through the cabinet was adopted. It provides that upon the death or disability of the president and vice president the succession shall be to the cabinet officers in the order in which their departments were created, commencing, of course, with the secretary of state. At the beginning of things congress fixed the succession first in the president pro tem of the senate, then in the speaker of the house. This law stood for many years. It never solved any problem because it never happened that both the president and vice president were dead or incapacitated. But it left the chance that the presidency might pass to a party which had not carried the election, as, for instance, to the speaker of a democratic house to succeed a republican president. There was the same objection to this law that had been found in 1804 to the manner of choosing the vice president. As the constitution originally stood each member of the electoral college voted for two persons for president. The one having the highest vote was made president, and the one having the next highest was made vice president. Obviously there was an opportunity for the creation of a vice president of a different political party than that of the president."

IT IS POINTED OUT by this same writer that a number of serious questions are still left open. The Journal writer says: "The present law provides that in case of removal, death, resignation or inability of both the president and vice president, the secretary of state shall act as president until the disability of the president or vice president is removed or a president is elected." Who, asks the Outlook, is to determine the question of inability, and when such inability ceases? If the president-elect should die before his inauguration would the vice president-elect be president for the term? If both the president and vice president-elect should die before their inauguration, on whom would the succession fall—on the cabinet officers of the outgoing president? If a cabinet officer should succeed to the presidency, would he continue in office during the remainder of the presidential term or would an election be held to fill the office at once? If an election were held, would it be before the unexpired portion of the term, or for a full term of four years? The answer to these questions is not found in any constitutional provision or in any act upon the statute book. While all of them presume an exceedingly remote contingency, any one of them could become a live question in the ordinary course of affairs—that is, upon the death of a president and

vice president. Why these questions have been left open it is hard to say. Probably, however, it is not for any real reason, but simply because of the more or less happy-go-lucky manner in which we often treat important matters. And now, that a bill is pending on the question, it would be the part of good statesmanship to remove all doubt."

IT IS CLAIMED that there is marked growth of the sentiment in New York city in favor of the use of the rod in schools. The Newark, N. J., News says: "For several years past the discussion over corporal punishment in the New York board of education has grown more and more heated, and the rod party has become more and more aggressive. At the board's last meeting the committee on elementary schools presented a majority and a minority report, the latter recommending the restoration of corporal punishment. Four of the committee favored it, and five were opposed to it. After a lively discussion in the board the vote taken on the minority report showed fifteen in favor to twenty-two against. This is a comparatively close vote. The conversion of only four more members to the corporal punishment rule would restore it to every school in New York city, and this would unquestionably exert a powerful influence in many cities and states in which moral suasion does not meet all requirements. Ninety per cent, it is formally stated, of all the principals of the New York schools for boys favor the rod. They argue that only four boys out of every 100 are bad enough to deserve corporal punishment, but that the 96 others are entitled to protection from the example set and the disorder caused by those who are incorrigible without the use of the rod. The strongest argument against the use of the rod in schools is the one least considered; its effect upon the good children who are never in danger of it. They think it may be their turn next. They are in constant dread, and in their mental unrest and distress they sometimes incur the very penalties they strive to avoid."

A PHILADELPHIA GROCER has adopted a novel method of advertising his coffee. This grocer has displayed a sign reading as follows: "If one grain of our coffee was placed on the first square of a checker board, two on the second, four on the third and so on, doubling throughout the whole 64 squares, the total number arrived at would be 18,446,744,073,551,615 coffee beans, or 7,960,915,394,584,601 pounds of coffee. This would represent 331,704,808,107 car loads, and a freight train to carry it would be 3,957,841,460 miles in length. It would reach around the earth 158,313 times and would extend 42 times the distance between the earth and the sun. The quantity would make 13,374,337,682,902,130 gallons of coffee and would cost at 28 cents a pound \$872,407,300,806,397.20. If each person in the country drank three cups daily it would take the entire population of the United States 2,442,801 years to consume it."

DR. BROWN of the New York board of health has brought upon himself considerable criticism by declaring "idiot children should be put in the dog pound and drowned." To a New York World reporter, Dr. Brown said: "Every child with the slightest deficiency receives a special examination. If he is blind or deaf he is sent to an institution where that deficiency is given special treatment and possibly cured. In like manner an imbecile is often made into a useful citizen. But for the idiot there is absolutely no hope. When it is found that he is too far gone for a surgeon's knife to help, his life had better be extinguished. Idiot children should be drowned. We would then have more time and energy to spend on the children in whom there are possibilities of success. For the imbeciles who have less mental depravity and the weak-minded pupils we have the training classes. In these a great deal of manual work is taught. The boys are trained to be expert carpenters and the girls learn to cook and sew. In another class we teach the 'slow.' This is called the coaching class. Boys and girls in these classes often make the best students and the biggest successes in later years, but they are for some reason slow in comprehending. By separating them from their classmates, the normal children are allowed to go ahead and learn as fast as they please. Then there is the unruly, lazy pupil who is put in the disciplinary class. There are great hopes for him when he wakes up and sees the useless trouble he has caused. Nevertheless, his place is not with the real student whose ambition is to lead his class. Already we have these various classes in seventeen schools. Every month the pupils are examined and a new report made of each."