

ment roads as against roads owned privately.

The great danger that Egypt has to fear is the disinheritation of the fellaheen, and the alien ownership of the land. Unless great care is taken Egypt will drift into the condition of Ireland and India and be drained of her resources by foreign landlords. It is very difficult for a foreign representative to arbitrate impartially between his own people at home and the natives among whom he temporarily resides, and Lord Cromer will deserve great credit if he is able to protect the Egyptians from exploitation. However well meaning, the English advisers are now or hereafter may be, Egypt's safety must lie in the development of her own people. The legislative council understands this and insists upon the extension of the school system. It is wise in so doing for every educated man or woman adds to the moral force that restrains and directs the government. An increase in the number of the educated not only tends to the preservation of law and order but furnishes a larger number fit to be officials and thus lessens the excuse for the employment of foreigners. There has been, among reformers, some discussion of a constitution but as that would curtail the powers of the Khedive as well as define the authority of England, it would probably be opposed at present by the Moslem leaders.

I can not conclude without a reference to the pioneer work done in the field of education by the United Presbyterians. They have several churches and a number of very successful schools and must be credited with having contributed largely to the progress which Egypt has made and is making.

Copyright.

QUANTITATIVE THEORY

The Boston Herald says that Mr. Bryan's statement with respect to bimetalism "discloses a strain of Bourbonism in his composition which some of his speeches and writings had lead the conservative members of his party to hope had been eradicated by the educational influences of foreign travel." The Herald adds:

"Mr. Bryan holds that the 'quantitative theory' of money, which he upheld in 1896, has been vindicated by the wonderful increase in the supply of gold for coinage which followed his campaign for the free coinage of silver. So far as the quantity is concerned, his claim may be admitted."

There is something of a "strain of Bourbonism" in the composition of this Boston editor. His writings indicate that since 1896 he has made no progress in conception of the money question. He answers Mr. Bryan's claim that the "quantitative theory" has been vindicated by the decidedly diplomatic statement: "So far as the quantity is concerned his claim may be admitted." Now that is as clear as mud.

"So far as the quantity is concerned" the quantitative theory of money has been vindicated! And this from Boston—the hub of the universe; the center of the intellectual circle!

Would the Boston editor be surprised were he told that the quantitative theory was not "vindicated by the wonderful increase in the supply of gold," but by the results flowing from that wonderful increase.

THEY FEAR THE JAIL

Judge Kinkaid, who sentenced to prison several of the Toledo, Ohio, ice trust magnates, refused to be swerved from his determination to make the punishment fit the offense. He fined each of the defendants \$5,000 and imprisonment in the work house for one year and provided that when the men reduced the price of ice to a reasonable point, he would decrease the term of the sentence. The trust magnates lowered the schedule and Judge Kinkaid cut the sentence in two, telling the attorneys for the defendants that he would make further reduction when the trust magnates had made full restitution to the people of all they had illegally taken from them.

Judge Kinkaid insists that these men who have preyed upon the necessities of the people must obtain a taste of prison life. He says: "Nothing could have less force than to waive the penalty or to impose a fine to be paid by one amply able to pay it or to be paid by his relatives. It has been said by counsel that a night in jail is more punishment to these men than a year's imprisonment is to many who come before this bar, and it is true. But under the law if a man comes before me convicted of having stolen property to the mere value of \$35, this court can

do no less than send him to the penitentiary for a year, and if you sat upon the bench and saw the weeping of women and children when men come here for sentence, having committed crimes which do not affect society, as this crime does, you would recognize the position of this court and its duty."

Judge Kinkaid has the correct idea. These influential men who violate the law care little for fines. They do fear the prison bars and they go very quickly to their knees when confronted by a public official determined to enforce the law.

AN OVERSIGHT

The republican congress passed the rental item of \$130,000 for the use by the government of the old New York custom house. That was one instance which Mr. Roosevelt doubtless overlooked when in referring to the work of congress he said "not a single measure which the closest scrutiny would warrant us of calling of doubtful propriety, has been enacted." No one pretends to deny that the New York custom house deal is a fraud on the people.

REMEMBER THIS, TOO!

The Chicago Tribune says: "Mr. Bryan will have no difficulty in recalling the circumstance that things looked fully as rosy in 1896 as they do now."

And the editor of the Chicago Tribune will have no difficulty in recalling the circumstance that it required several million dollars stolen from the helpless policy holders, in order to interfere with that "rosy" condition in 1896—and with all of that a considerable number of people believe that even then they had to steal it.

WHY?

The London Lancet asks: "Why should officials appear before the public as if they held a brief on behalf of Chicago packers and seem desirous of defending the packers rather than the cause of hygiene, which it is their business as health officials to endeavor to promote?"

That question has occurred to a great many American citizens. Why should United States senators, representatives in the lower house, and even in some instances judges on the bench appear as if they held a brief on behalf of great corporations? Why should these public officials seem desirous of defending corporate greed, rather than the public interests which it is their business as public officials to endeavor to promote?

WHERE IS THE CALHOUN REPORT?

The Independent reminds the Roosevelt administration, and incidentally the public, of a very important report that has not yet seen the light of day. The Independent says: "One of the results of the Loomis scandal was the sending of William J. Calhoun, of Chicago, to Caracas to investigate the past and present relations of the United States with Venezuela, and report the truth to the president. Judge Calhoun went to Caracas, stayed there several months, and then returned to Washington. Month after month has gone by, and yet his report has not been made public. 'If not incompatible with the public welfare' we respectfully suggest that it is time it be published. It was certainly expected that the report would not be withheld from the public."

"BY ITS FRIENDS"—OF COURSE

The South Dakota republican state convention declared that it "specifically adheres to the republican policy of protection of American enterprises, but believes that tariff rates should be modified from time to time to meet changed conditions, such modifications to be made by the friends of protection and not by its enemies." In the same platform it said, "for the benefit of the American home builder and the protection of our forests, we favor abolishing all tariff on lumber." But our South Dakota friends certainly would not have the tariff on lumber abolished other than by the "friends of protection," and certainly they will not find fault if the "friends of protection" are just as averse to free lumber for the republicans of South Dakota as they are to free hides for the republicans of Massachusetts.

THE ANNUAL MASSACRE

Attorney General Moody will have the cordial support of the people in his move to prosecute railroads that have flagrantly violated the

safety appliance law. The government has been unusually lenient with the railroads, extending, on several occasions, the time set for equipping all cars with safety appliances. And, although the roads have had many years in which to meet the requirements of the law, thousands of cars are still equipped with the old hand brakes and link-and-pin couplings. In 1904 the number of railroad employes killed while in the discharge of their duties was 3,632—a number greater than the deaths on both sides in many heavy battles of the civil war. The total number of people killed in railroad disasters and at grade crossings in 1904 was 10,046. A majority of the deaths among the employes is due to the lack of safety appliances. Certainly it is high time that the legal department of the government move in the matter of compelling the railroads to comply with the law.

FUSION IN THE EAST

The New York World rejoices because the democrats of Pennsylvania have fused with the "Lincoln republicans" of that state in an effort to wrest control from the hands of the political buccaneers who have so long controlled that great commonwealth. The democrats have endorsed the Lincoln republican nominee for governor, Lewis Emery, jr., and the Lincoln republican convention will re-convene shortly for the purpose of endorsing the democratic candidates for lieutenant-governor, auditor-general and secretary of internal affairs. The World's favorable comments on fusion in Pennsylvania are in sharp contrast to its many and heated editorials in opposition to fusion in some of the western states—a fusion that sought to wrest control from political machines as corrupt in point of opportunity as the machine in Pennsylvania. The World would do well to offer some explanation as to why it makes flesh of fusion in Pennsylvania and fowl of fusion in Nebraska or Kansas.

WHERE THINGS ARE DONE DIFFERENTLY

An American millionaire who was making an automobile tour of France ran over and killed a girl. He was arrested, put on trial and sentenced to pay a fine of \$120 and damages to the amount of \$400, and to spend six weeks in jail. The fact that he possessed millions and had many influential friends cut no figure with the French judge and jury. He had to pay up and go to jail. In this country it would have been different. The auto scorcher's number would have been taken and he would have been summoned to appear in court. On the day appointed he would have sent his chauffeur to court with a blank check properly signed. The complaisant prosecutor would have accepted the plea of guilty to the charge of exceeding the speed limit and a nominal fine would have been assessed. The chauffeur would have filled in the amount, handed the check to the clerk and returned to take his employer out on another wild ride in which the rights and safety of pedestrians would have been ignored. The French way of attending to this sort of thing is the better way.

IT MIGHT BE WORSE

Some enthusiastic member of the New York reception committee invited President Roosevelt to attend the reception given Mr. Bryan in New York. Referring to this incident the Chicago Chronicle says:

"To invite the president to go to Madison Square garden to do honor to such a man is as absurd and insulting as if he were invited to preside at a dinner in honor of Lew Dockstader or at one of Carrie Nation's temperance meetings, or at a boxing bout."

The Chronicle can't keep its comparisons on straight. Lew Dockstader is a pretty good fellow and mixes and associates with some of the best of men, while Mrs. Nation, with all her eccentricities, has been welcomed to some good homes. Now if the Chronicle really wanted to say something mean it would have said: "To invite the president to go to Madison Square garden to do honor to such a man, is as absurd and insulting as if he were invited to preside at a dinner in honor of John R. Walsh, proprietor of the Chicago Chronicle, 'defender of the national honor,' violator of the law and wrecker of banks."

Perhaps, however, the Chronicle was not in its usual bad humor, and did not care to go quite so far as that.

ASSOCIATE EDITOR.