

fore he was elected. Several republican papers call upon Mr. Pollard to deny the charge, but he admits it, claiming that it was customary for a man elected to fill a vacancy to draw pay for the entire term. Some republicans insist that Mr. Pollard be renominated.

THE LAW RELATING to the Pollard salary grab follows: "Whenever a vacancy occurs in either house of congress, by death or otherwise, of any member or delegate elected or appointed thereto, after the commencement of the congress to which he has been elected or appointed, the person elected or appointed to fill it shall be compensated and paid from the time that the compensation of his predecessor ceased." While Mr. Pollard and his friends insist that in accepting the money he was entirely within the law, others claim that it was an illegal as well as an immoral act. One lawyer evidently not friendly to Mr. Pollard says: "That phrase 'after the commencement of the congress to which he has been elected or appointed,' destroys the force of Mr. Pollard's explanation. Mr. Burkett never entered into the duties of the congress for which he was elected. The congress for which he was elected began March 4, 1905, and it will close at midnight, March 3, 1907. He sent his resignation to the governor of Nebraska in January, 1905, to take effect March 3, 1905, at midnight. Of course he never began to serve the term for which he had been re-elected and, consequently, Mr. Pollard can not claim the money under that statute. If congress had meant to cover all cases where there was a vacancy, it would never have inserted the phrase, 'after the commencement' etc."

THE THIRD CONFERENCE of the American republics opened at Rio de Janeiro July 24. The "Drago doctrine" was one of the important subjects under discussion. This doctrine derives its name from its exponent, Dr. Luis M. Drago of Argentina. The Drago doctrine in brief is that no nation has the right forcibly to undertake to collect debts owing to its individual citizens by another nation. The conference at Rio de Janeiro was asked to submit to The Hague tribunal, the question, "to what extent, if at all, is the use of force justifiable in the collection of such debt." Referring to this doctrine, a writer in the Chicago Record-Herald says: "The Drago doctrine is said by publicists to be merely an expansion of the Calvo doctrine, dear to the hearts of Latin Americans, but never engrafted upon international law. In its essence that doctrine was a declaration that any claim against a nation by a foreign citizen, or even a foreign government, must be adjudicated by its own courts, and under no circumstances was a proper subject of diplomatic representation or negotiation. The United States state department has disregarded it, notably in forcing a settlement of the claims of the Salvador Improvement company against Salvador, and is again pursuing the same course as to Venezuela in the matter of the asphalt and other American claims. But the principal basis of the action of the United States up to this point has been found in two reasons: First, an assertion on the part of the United States that no American citizen, by the mere signature of a contract or concession in terms submissible for construction only to the courts of the grantors, can cancel the right of his own government to protect him in his rights, and second, an insistence upon the right of the government of the United States to make sure that there has been no miscarriage of justice in the courts, according to Anglo-Saxon standards of law."

IN AN EDITORIAL entitled "Bryan's eloquence and the growing peace sentiment," the Chicago Record-Herald says: "Since progress toward arbitration must be gradual, the 'model' treaty drafted by the union excluded questions affecting national sovereignty and honor. It is to this limitation that Mr. Bryan, a 'distinguished guest' at the conference with the right to address it, raised objections in a speech that seems to have been singularly persuasive and impressive. Mr. Bryan urged the adoption of an amendment covering to some extent even questions of the most 'vital' kind. He proposed that any controversy over any of the excluded questions should be submitted by the disputants, severally or jointly, to an international commission of inquiry, the decision of the commission not, how-

ever, to have any binding effect. Mere publicity and delay and sober second thought, Mr. Bryan argued, would prevent war, in most cases, even over the 'vital' questions excluded from the scope of the projected arbitration agreement. It is certainly a tribute to Mr. Bryan's force and eloquence that the conference has adopted his very material 'rider.' His address in support of it will in due time be reprinted in full on this side and will be read with interest, as was his admirable 'Fourth' address on the higher moral standards which we now demand of nations and governments. It is a pity Mr. Bryan has no opportunity to address a body of monarchs, especially of the 'mailed fist' variety, and try the effect of his magnetic eloquence on them. The noble cause of peace, arbitration and partial disarmament might be measurably advanced by such experiments."

A LONDON CABLEGRAM to the New York Herald says that Mr. Bryan, interviewed upon the dissolution of the Russian douma, said that the czar's latest move in the struggle with the peoples' representatives was a calamity of the gravest character. The Herald's cablegram quotes Mr. Bryan as saying: "While I should hesitate to forecast the effect on the empire, I believe the result can only be the establishment of a second douma which will have the same ideas and principles as the recent one. No one who has been in touch with the men who composed that body can doubt their competency. They appeared thoroughly representative of the ablest citizenship, qualified in every particular to perform the duties of their office. The douma, though, still lives. Its members in the future may be different, but the Russian people have been given a taste of representation and the government can take no backward step."

JOHN BRISBEN WALKER, formerly owner of the Cosmopolitan Magazine, has written an open letter to President Roosevelt relating to the conditions of the packing houses. A New York dispatch to the Chicago Record-Herald explains: "John Brisben Walker has taken up the cudgels in defense of the packers and has not hesitated to rap President Roosevelt for his crusade which resulted in the passage of the meat inspection law by congress. In a letter to the president which Mr. Walker gave out tonight the praises of a certain Chicago packing house are sounded in a way that would make the average press agent turn green with envy, although Mr. Walker insists his motives are disinterested. From the letter it seems that Mr. Walker has been taking the part of a self-appointed investigator of stockyards conditions, and about two weeks ago sent in a report to the president which was as far from the Neill-Reynolds document as it could be. In his letter to Mr. Roosevelt, due apparently to the fact that the president neglected to publish Mr. Walker's findings to the world, it is alleged that extraordinary injustice has been done to this packing house, and the beef agitation is compared to the Dreyfus case."

WILLIAM JEFFERSON POLLARD, of St. Louis, celebrated as a police magistrate, has adopted the plan of giving to the men brought before him charged with drunkenness, the choice between signing the pledge to abstain from all intoxicating liquors for a period of one year and going to the work house. Having signed the pledge, the offender is required to report to Judge Pollard twice a week. If he breaks his pledge he is sent to the rock pile. A writer in the Indianapolis News says that of more than two hundred men who have signed the Pollard pledge in the last year, barely three per cent have failed to keep it. This writer is also authority for the statement that Tom L. Johnson, mayor of Cleveland, has a plan which promises to be a worthy rival of the Pollard plan. The News writer says: "Mayor Johnson proposes to establish a sanitarium for drunkards at the city's farm colony, and to instruct police magistrates to sentence victims of the liquor habit to this retreat, instead of to the workhouse. The city physicians look askance at the scheme and all other Cleveland doctors are opposed to it, because, they say, it is 'unprofessional.' But Mayor Johnson and the Rev. H. R. Cooley, directors of the city's charities and corrections department, are both enthusiastic on the subject, and are experimenting with several 'jag cures.' As soon as they shall have found one that seems to be effective the mayor

will have a bill introduced in the legislature to establish a sanitarium of the sort he has in mind. Pure air and hard work on the city's farm will not only rejuvenate the individuals, he thinks, but will result in greater good to society than any service the offender could render the city inside of prison walls. Society makes drunkards; why should it not provide the means of curing them? Besides, he believes, the best way to cure a jag is to acquire 'immediate municipal ownership' of it—not 'immediate' as they use the word in Chicago, but instant, forthwith, before it has had a chance to do anybody save the proprietor harm. Advocates of municipal ownership will watch the mayor's experiment with more than ordinary interest."

THE STAND-PAT ORGANS point with pride to the fact that notwithstanding the extreme tariff duties, the imports as well as the exports for the fiscal year just ended, surpass all previous records. The Springfield (Mass.) Republican says: "The manner in which these figures are being used by the stand-pat people is calculated to convey the impression that they regard a large foreign trade as a good thing and that a high tariff in no wise interferes except in so far as it operates to reduce undesirable imports. We concede, they seem to say, that foreign trade is desirable; but behold the figures under a high-tariff policy—almost three billions and increasing every year; and what better can you expect than this under any other policy? The party in power has asked that its appropriations for the current fiscal year be considered on a per capita basis instead of as a lump sum which is big enough to cause some misgivings. And we are further asked to compare this per capita expenditure with that of other leading nations. Let us, then, consider the foreign trade on a per capita footing and in comparison with certain other nations noted either for their free trade or protection policies: Per capita exports and imports:

|                      | Exports. | Imports. |
|----------------------|----------|----------|
| United States .....  | \$20.45  | \$ 14.60 |
| Germany .....        | 22.15    | 26.69    |
| France .....         | 23.56    | 23.12    |
| Canada .....         | 28.91    | 41.93    |
| Netherlands .....    | 145.45   | 181.81   |
| United Kingdom ..... | 31.32    | 68.54    |

THE SPRINGFIELD Republican points out that "the United States, with the highest tariff of all, has the smallest foreign trade of all relative to population. Germany stands next to us in devotion to the tariff policy, and next to us also in the relative smallness of its foreign trade, while the country's experience shows how baseless is the contention that a high tariff on imports and a so-called favorable trade balance possess necessary relationship. France, also much given to protective duties, has a per capita foreign trade about as small as that of Germany; while free trade England far exceeds all three countries mentioned, and the free trade Netherlands, even more given to commerce than England, presents figures unapproached by any of the countries. It is obvious from this comparison that protective tariffs are a hindrance to foreign trade, and the higher the tariff the greater the hindrance. If we are to find advantage and glory in foreign commerce, we shall plainly consult both by effecting tariff reductions. Otherwise we should see in such foreign trade figures as we are now able to present a matter for national commiseration instead of congratulation."

A GOOD STORY concerning the late speaker of the house of representatives, David B. Henderson, is related by Harper's Weekly: "Mr. Henderson's early professional experiences were not materially different from those of most young lawyers. Finally he was retained in an estate case which involved large interests. The future speaker was mighty hard up, and he was seriously thinking of asking the heirs to pay his bill, which he had never rendered. He was meditating whether to charge them \$200 or \$300, when one of the heirs, representing them all, stepped briskly into his office and, taking out a roll of \$500 bills, said: 'Mr. Henderson, I want to pay your bill,' and commenced laying down these \$500 bills until he had \$2,500 before the astonished young lawyer. Looking up at Mr. Henderson the heir said: 'Is that enough?' And the lawyer, with that self-possession which subsequently made him famous, calmly said: 'Peel off another one and we will call it square.'"