

"I could have run him in. I didn't care to do that. He has got to earn a living. That slapping will be a lesson to him. Here, Johnny, take back to your team. Here's my hand, boy. Don't you do this again." In a moment the teamsters changed their attitude. "Say, pard, you're all right," said one of them. "We don't want your number. Bingham needn't know this. Bully for you." The crowd cheered and the bells in the tall steeples changed their part. Everybody moved on chatting and laughing. Some patted the policeman on his back, and the teamsters from their perches waved a hand as they moved on."

THE PHILIPPINE agricultural bank bill is described by the New York Evening Post in this way: "Under the terms of the act, the Philippine commission is authorized to guarantee 4 per cent interest on the capital stock of the bank for a period of twenty-five years, the commission's liability never to exceed \$500,000. The bank itself can make loans only for the purpose of assisting agriculture. None of its loans may exceed \$5,000, and interest may not be charged above 10 per cent. That it will do much to improve the agriculture of the Philippines, is the prediction of those closest to the situation. Since we are not willing to give the Filipino farmer access to our markets, this is at least something to be thankful for."

REFERRING to the retirement of Senator Spooner the New York Evening Post says: "There are, of course, dozens of republicans and democrats who have never approached Senator Spooner in vigor and independence. But they have been of smaller, calibre; from them we have expected nothing, and we have not been disappointed. Senator Spooner's commanding abilities make it impossible to judge him by the standards which we apply to the average man. He was capable of the highest, but through some subtle flaw in will power, some unhappy hesitancy at a moment when inflexible resolution was demanded, he more than once fell short of the mark set by the hopes of his friends and admirers."

E. H. HARRIMAN increased the capitalization of the Chicago and Alton from \$39,000,000 to approximately \$122,000,000. Out of this increase of \$83,000,000 only \$22,000,000 has been spent in improving the property, leaving a balance of \$61,000,000 to the credit of frenzied finance. The New York World says: "The constitution of Illinois provides that 'no railroad corporation shall issue any stock or bonds except for money, labor or property actually received and applied to the purposes for which such corporation was organized. All stock dividends and other fictitious increases of the capital stock or indebtedness of any such corporation shall be void.' There is hardly a phrase in this article of the Illinois constitution which Mr. Harriman and his associates have not violated in their juggling of the Alton, yet the governor and the attorney general of Illinois never seem to have troubled their heads about it. They were as little concerned about Mr. Harriman's constitution-defying financial operations as was the government of New York about the systematized criminality of its life insurance companies. Is it not a logical conclusion that this \$61,000,000 out of \$122,000,000 in the Alton case represents roughly the amount for which Mr. Harriman was able to capitalize official neglect of duty in Illinois?"

WILLIAM YOURS STRONG, a farmer living near Caldwell, New Jersey, owns a goose which he swears is seventy-two years old. The New York World says: "'William Yours, the man I was named after, gave me this goose in 1871,' said Strong yesterday. 'Yours was going back to the old country, and he said: 'Bill, I've owned this goose for thirty-six years. I would take her with me, but I fear she cannot stand the voyage. So I give her to you. Cherish her, Bill; be kind to her in her old age, for she is almost like a sister to me.' Yours kissed the goose good-by," Mr. Strong added. "Look at her; she is as active as a gosling." This was affectionate exaggeration. It is true that the goose was waddling around Mr. Strong's farmyard; but her carriage better comported an aged and dignified bird than a giddy fledgling."

COMPARISON of the Dominican treaty recently ratified by the senate, with the corresponding treaty upon which President Roosevelt told the senate on February 15, 1905, that there was "urgent need of prompt action" shows, according to the New York Evening Post, that the two documents are radically different. The Post says: "What Mr. Roosevelt proposed two years ago was, practically, a protectorate over Santo Domingo; now the United States is simply to name a 'general receiver of Dominican customs' officer. But their suspicions were groundless, for

In the treaty of 1905, it was set forth: "The United States government agrees to attempt the adjustment of all the obligations of the Dominican government, foreign as well as domestic." The treaty of today starts out by reciting that "the Dominican government has now effected a conditional adjustment and settlement of said debts and claims." The ambitious plan of Mr. Roosevelt two years ago was to "grant" to the Dominican government "such other assistance as the former (i. e., the government of the United States) may deem proper to restore the credit, preserve the order, increase the efficiency of the civil administration, and advance the material progress and welfare of the Dominican republic." All that perilous stuff has now been stricken out. So much for intelligent discussion. Two years ago it was regarded as little short of treason to oppose the immediate adoption of the president's plans. He himself predicted the direst things, including the strong probability of a war with some (unnamed) European country, if his impetuous demands were not at once complied with. But time and argument are—we must suppose—Roosevelt have taught him better things."

IN HIS TESTIMONY before the interstate commerce commission, E. H. Harriman said: "A little matter of \$2,000,000 doesn't amount to much one way or the other." Which caused W. J. Lampton, of the New York World, to burst into rhyme in this fashion:

"Only \$2,000,000!  
Merely a wisp of hay  
To stop up the crack in a window,  
To keep the wind away.  
Certainly not worth counting,  
A paltry little sum  
That isn't enough to distinguish  
A well-to-do from a bum.

Only \$2,000,000!  
A measly, miserable wad  
That wouldn't pay for the water  
In a good Kentucky tod;  
Simply a sign of the spirit  
To moisten the thirsty tongue;  
Merely a fleeting nothing  
More than a smell at the bung.

Only \$2,000,000!  
Homes for a thousand or more,  
Or clothes for two hundred thousand  
Or food for a million poor.  
Only \$2,000,000!  
Gee! what a little stack,  
When you come to learn  
Of the limitless yearn  
Of a Harrimaniac!"

THE USE of the legend "In God We Trust" on some of the coins of the United States grew out of—according to a writer in the Chicago News—a letter written by a Maryland farmer to Salmon P. Chase when he was secretary of the treasury. The News writer says: "The letter was written in November, 1861, the writer urging that we should, as a Christian people, make some recognition of the Deity on our coins. Mr. Chase referred the letter to Director Pollock of the mint, who approved the suggestion and proposed one of the legends, 'Our Country, Our God,' or 'God Our Trust.' Mr. Chase then referred the matter to congress, and again in 1862 and in 1863 he urged that the matter be acted on. Finally, on April 22, 1864, congress authorized the coinage of a two-cent bronze piece, and on it was stamped the legend 'In God We Trust,' instead of 'E Pluribus Unum.' Subsequently, on March 3, 1865, the director of the mint, with the approval of the secretary of the treasury, was authorized to place the legend on all gold and silver coins susceptible of that addition thereafter to be issued. The legend is taken from the following line in 'The Star Spangled Banner': 'And this be our motto: In God is our trust.'"

TWO INCIDENTS promised a sensation of an unpleasant and perhaps serious sort in connection with Mr. Roosevelt's recent visit to Boston. The Boston Herald says: "These incidents occurred at the North station as the president was leaving for Groton on his special train to visit his son, Kermit. Through a double line of policemen, escorted by his special bodyguard of secret service men, the president was advancing across the platform toward his train. Suddenly one of the men turned, and grasping one of the cheering spectators by the shoulder sharply demanded, 'What is that in your hand?' Only those who stood near the man could see that his hand was held in a sling over his left breast and that it was done up in a bandage. Thoughts of the assassin of President McKinley rose in their minds, and they saw the reason for the stern question of the officer. But their suspicions were groundless, for

the supposed anarchist showed his bandaged hand to the policeman, and the incident was closed. Again, after the president had entered the car and the train was just about to pull out of the station, with the president waving and bowing farewell upon the back platform of the 'Signal,' a middle-aged man ran quickly down the station platform toward the car, and when he had come within a few feet of it deliberately threw what appeared to be a paper parcel directly at the president's feet. Instantly, one of the detectives jumped to the front and tried to ward the missile off before it struck the car. But it landed safely. The dreaded detonation failed to follow. Upon examination the parcel was found to contain a small silk flag. The president did not appear to notice either incident, but the ever watchful secret service men were plainly alarmed by the flag throwing and they were very much relieved when the missile proved to be harmless."

THE NEW YORK PRESS, a republican paper, in its issue of March 3, printed this remarkable editorial: "There has never been a more shameless exhibition in American government than the manner of passing the ship subsidy loot bill in the house of representatives. After the measure had been beaten by the members who were ashamed to perpetrate such an infamy, the legislative proceedings were delayed while the subsidy crew forced a reconsideration of the vote and compelled enough representatives to change to get the measure through by the skin of the teeth. The shrieking scandal of the performance was that this was accomplished through the open lobbying on the very floor of members who have been kicked out of congress by their constituents. In the last few hours of their official service they thus made good to the subsidy grafters, to the everlasting disgrace of a republican congress and to the terrific injury of the republican party. It was just such skulduggery as this in Albany that excited the voters of New York to expel the republican party from every state department last fall, Governor Hughes alone being elected. If the national legislature has entered upon such a course as all but exterminated republican administration in New York, the national party will be as surely driven from the control of the government of the United States."

ASKED by a reader "who would be our strongest candidate for president next year," the Boston Herald says: "We don't mind saying that a promising candidate might be found among democrats of these types: Judge George Gray of Delaware, a statesman and jurist of high character and proved ability; Woodrow Wilson, president of Princeton University, born in Virginia too late (1856) to have participated in the civil war, a Jeffersonian democrat, a scholar, a wise man and a capable administrator; Governor Folk of Missouri, a reformer who has reformed things and sent grafters and bribers to prison; Governor Johnson of Minnesota, born in a cabin, like Lincoln, knowing the 'plain people' as one of them, a progressive and yet level-headed democrat, who has been twice elected governor—the last time by a plurality of 76,000 in a state that gave Roosevelt above 160,000—and has 'made good' in office."

THE UNITED STATES supreme court has sustained the Nebraska state law prohibiting the use of the United States flag for advertising purposes. In the case under discussion the flag had been used as an advertisement on beer bottles. Justice Harlan, who delivered the opinion, said that such use of the flag cheapens and degrades it. "No one," said Justice Harlan in conclusion, "can be said to have the right secured by the constitution to use the country's flag merely for purposes of merchandise. If every one was entitled to use it for such purposes then perhaps the state could not discriminate among those who so used it. It was for the state of Nebraska to say how far it would go by way of legislation for the protection of the flag against improper use, taking care in such legislation not to make undue discrimination against a part of its people. It chose not to forbid the use of the flag for the exceptional purposes above specified in the statute prescribing the fundamental condition that its use for any of those purposes should be disconnected from any advertisement. All are alike forbidden to use the flag as an advertisement. It is easy to be seen how a representation of the flag may be wholly 'disconnected from any advertisement' and the use upon a newspaper, periodical, book, etc., in such way as not to arouse a feeling of indignation nor offend the sentiment and feeling of those who love it. In any event the sentiment classification made by the state cannot be regarded as unreasonable or arbitrary or as bringing the statute under condemnation as denying the equal protection of the laws."