

of this kind with which to contend—elements against which the American people are at present struggling with no seeming success—the economic ruin of the Philippine islands and the premature death of the political ideals of the Filipinos are a sure prediction. I say this not as a mere opinion of mine. I am here voicing the feeling of my people expressed through their representatives. * * * After the Philippine islands become independent, free trade would be more advantageous to both countries. The United States would be able then to reimburse herself through the commerce that would be established between the two countries, for all the expenditures consequent upon the occupation of the islands and the Filipinos would be in a better position to develop the resources of their country. Therefore, taking advantage of this opportunity offered by the close connection of the political aspect which the question bears with its economic viewpoint, I ask in the name of my people—better still, I request in the name of the 8,000,000 inhabitants of the Philippines—imploping in the most respectful attitude, that congress adopt a resolution granting to the Philippine islands their independence, if not now, at least after a definite number of years. In this way the American people will sanctify the noble work of liberating the Philippines as it liberated Cuba and other countries. (Applause.)”

THE HOUSTON (Texas) Post printed an interesting dispatch from Austin, Texas, as follows: “The state of Texas enjoyed its final triumph in its litigation with the Waters-Pierce Oil company when Sam Sparks, state treasurer, received from the attorney general \$1,718,009.14 in payment of the penalty assessed against the defendant company, Mr. Davidson a few minutes prior to his release of the money, having received from former Judge E. B. Perkins of Dallas and N. A. Stedman of Austin, representing the company, \$1,808,483.30, from which amount he deducted \$90,474.16, the county attorney's fee. As in every other phase of the fight against the company, the payment of the fine was accompanied by a blare of trumpets. Just about noon, the quietude of Austin was disturbed by an automobile race between H. A. Wroe and Captain James E. Lucy, in the car of the former being the enormous amount of money. In this car were Vice Presidents Wroe and Roberdeaux of the American National bank, and J. W. Hoopes of the Austin National bank, N. A. Stedman and his private secretary, Max Bickler; Judge E. B. Perkins and George S. Matthews, sheriff of Travis county. In the machine driven by Captain Lucy were himself and Vice President W. H. Felts of the Austin National bank. The automobile of Wroe first collected one-half of the money which was held by the American National bank, and then the second half which had been deposited with the Austin National bank, and immediately the two machines opened wide their throttles and the speed limit of the city of Austin was violated. Upon reaching the gates to the capitol yards, one machine went to the right, the other to the left, both machines reaching the state house entrance at about the same time. The occupants, with the money in traveling bags, hurriedly left the cars and entered the office of Sam Sparks, state treasurer, where it was turned over to Attorney General Davidson.”

IN CONNECTION with the Houston incident the New York World says: “It is probable that a solemn rite performed the other day at Austin, Texas, escaped the eyes of most Americans. There are some ceremonies which all should see or note, and this was one of them. An automobile containing several armed men and a bulging coffee sack drew up in front of the office of the state treasurer. The bag was carried into the building and opened. Its contents were counted, a receipt was written and delivered and certain entries were made upon the cashier's books. The fine of \$1,808,000 recently inflicted upon the Waters-Pierce Oil company by the state courts and fully sustained by the supreme court of the United States had been paid. Fines larger than this have been assessed, but they have not been collected. When Texas prescribed the penalty which it deemed just for the violation of its anti-trust laws most people probably thought that there would be some escape for the offender. Our skeptics and cynics should not fail mentally to digest the fact that this colossal fine, the largest ever paid in this country, was adjusted by the monopoly,

just as accounts are settled by poor men in the police court, with cash. As an example of exact justice this proceeding was and must continue to be very impressive. It possessed much interest also as a financial transaction. No bank and no group of banks in the vicinity could furnish the currency needed, and arrangements had to be made at the nearest sub-treasury. Stage money and promissory notes would not answer the purpose. The fine was paid in bills of large denominations. Works of art can not clearly show the methods by which monopoly filches millions from the pockets of the people, but a painting setting forth the scene when this princely restitution was made would be worth a place among the treasures of the republic.”

GOVERNOR SHAFROTH of Colorado has signed a bill, passed at the recent session of the Colorado legislature, providing for payment by the state of a share of the election expenses of candidates. This is the first state to pass such a measure. Referring to this measure the Denver News says: “Colorado takes a step far in advance of other states by enacting this law, which is one of the most drastic ever drafted on the question of elections. Slush funds can be eliminated if the law is enforced. Corporation officials will find themselves facing the penitentiary if they violate it. Candidates found guilty of receiving campaign contributions from sources other than those provided in the law also will see the inside of prison cells. Under the new law which was introduced in the senate by Senator Campbell and in the house by Representative Weiser, the state gives each party in the next general election 25 cents for each vote cast for governor by that party at the last election. One-half of this goes to the county chairmen, according to votes cast. The only other contributors can be the candidates themselves, and their contributions are limited to 40 per cent of the first year's salary, or 25 per cent of the fees in case the office to which they aspire is on that revenue basis. Under the new law the political parties will receive the following amounts for campaign expenses at the next election: Democrats, \$32,229; republicans, \$29,708; socialists, \$1,970; prohibitionists, \$1,384.50. Total cost to state, \$65,291.50.”

COLORADO'S NEW law provides that the treasurers of the political parties must give a bond to the state treasurer for the full amount of their contribution to the state. The News says: “Violations of the law by corporations or individuals in making contributions to campaign funds, or by candidates or political leaders in receiving such contributions is made a felony, punishable by imprisonment for not more than two years, or a fine not exceeding \$5,000, or both. Governor Shafroth, who put this exceedingly advanced and sweeping piece of legislation into about six hundred words, commented on the bill as follows yesterday: ‘It is the first law passed in any of the states of the union which attempts to remedy the evils arising from excessive and interested contributions to campaign committees and candidates. The sums authorized in this bill are sufficient to conduct a campaign in a reasonably economical manner, being about the sums expended by the various campaign committees at the last general election in this state, as shown by the sworn statements of the chairmen of the respective committees. The tendency of this measure will be: To prevent corporations and interested parties, by contributions, from placing a political party or its candidates under obligations for proposed legislation or state favors. To prevent campaign committees from expending large sums in the employment of thousands of workers at high prices on election day, resulting almost invariably in the workers casting their votes in favor of the political party employing them. To prevent the bribery of voters. A limited campaign fund prevents the use of any part for other than legitimate purposes. To place the political parties on as near an equal basis, considering the numerical strength of each, as possible. I am confident that this measure will greatly tend to the purity of elections.’”

SO MUCH discussion has been caused by the brief and incomplete reports of the pope's recent remarkable expressions on woman's suffrage that the New York American has received from its Rome correspondent the exact words of what the pope said on April 21, speaking to a delegation of the Union of Italian Catholic Ladies. On that occasion the pope said:

“After creating man, God created woman and determined her mission, namely, that of being man's companion, helpmeet and consolation. It is a mistake, therefore, to maintain that woman's rights are the same as man's. Women in war or parliament are outside their proper sphere, and their position would be the desperation and ruin of society. Woman, created as man's companion, must so remain—under the power of love and affection, but always under his power. How mistaken, therefore, is that misguided feminism which seeks to correct God's work. It is like a mechanic trying to correct the signs and movements of the universe. Scripture, and especially the three epistles of St. Paul, emphasizes woman's dependence on man, her love and assistance, but not her slavery to him. Woman's duties, however, are not confined within the household's walls. She has a great social mission; a place in every charitable cause; work to perform on behalf of the sick, the suffering and the criminal; the protection of women and children. In this great and common action women should unite and should strive to secure the means necessary to exercise the apostolic injunction of social charity.”

THE MEN who, elected to congress as democrats, bolted their party will be interested in the resolutions recently adopted by the “Democratic Union of the City of New York.” “The last democratic national convention held at Denver made the following explicit and unconditional pledge honorably binding on every candidate accepting the democratic nomination for congress last year. The house of representatives was designed by the fathers of the constitution to be the popular branch of our government. As controlled in recent years by the republican party, it has ceased to be a deliberative and legislative body, responsive to the will of a majority of its members, but has come under the absolute domination of the speaker, who has entire control of its deliberations and powers of legislation. Legislative control becomes a failure when one member in the person of the speaker is more powerful than the entire body. We demand that the house of representatives shall again become a deliberative body, controlled by a majority of the people's representatives, and not by the speaker; and we pledge ourselves to adopt such rules and regulations to govern the house of representatives as will enable a majority of its members to direct its deliberations and control legislation. Six representatives from New York having to choose between a telephone order of instruction sent from Tammany Hall on March 8 and their obligation to the democratic party and to their democratic constituents who elected them, betrayed their trust and voted against the adoption of the new rules framed and in favor of continued control of the house of representatives by Speaker Cannon. In the present plight of the democratic party in New York City a statement of the purely commercial reason which instigated this treachery is inopportune but it illustrates the corrupt relation which the present control of Tammany bears to the democratic party and the absence of all political relation to democratic policies, pledges and aspirations.”

THE DENVER NEWS prints the following: “This is just a little story of mother love, and its heroine is not the mother of any of Colorado's famous sons. She is only Tip, who lives at Reudi, away over on the Frying Pan river, where she has brought up some of the prettiest families of Scotch colliers that any collier mother in Colorado can boast of. But Tip is a thoroughbred and that is just the reason that most of her children are taken from her when very young. They are much in demand and she is seldom fortunate enough to see any of them grow to maturity. It has not been long since Tip's mistress, Mrs. H. A. Brown, gave away the last of Tip's most recent family and Tip's heart was more deeply wounded by the loss than it ever had been before on a similar occasion. She was in the depth of her mourning when her friend Puss, the mother of five kittens, was killed by a handcar on the Denver and Rio Grande railroad, which passes in front of her home and Tip's. The sorrow of the motherless kittens appealed so strongly to Tip that she at once adopted the entire family. The kittens have now grown up to cathood under Tip's maternal care and have had little reason to regret the change of mothers.”

Of course, if you can not afford to buy flour you can eat corn meal.