

through a long list, averaging about the same. This is not a case where an American manufacturer is disposing of his surplus abroad, but the company makes that price in a deliberate effort and as a settled policy to get the business abroad. Senator Beveridge said he understood it intended building a factory in England. The amendment of Senator Beveridge was that the duty be reduced to 15 per cent. The senate rejected this, and adopted the committee amendment, which gives the concern a 30 per cent protection against foreign competition."

MORFIELD STOREY, president, and Erving Winslow, secretary of the anti-imperialist league, have addressed to President Taft the following letter: "The executive committee of the anti-imperialist league respectfully but earnestly deprecates the transfer of Porto Rican affairs to the insular committee of the war department from the department of the interior, its previous connection with this department being in line with the aspirations of the inhabitants of Porto Rico as presented by her resident commissioner for 'statehood within the union whenever congress will see fit to grant it; meanwhile self-government and the right to make our own laws in some form or other.' The action taken must inevitably tend to create discouragement and discontent and to suggest indefinite postponement of the hopes of the islanders. And this committee desires also to express most emphatically its hope that the administration will not give any encouragement to the proposal which has been made from time to time that the affairs of the Philippines and other dependencies shall hereafter be confided to a new colonial department to be created, thus crystallizing and tending to give permanence to their retention; such retention in the case of the Philippines being contrary to the solemn declaration of the senate of the United States on the 14th of February, 1899, that nothing in the conduct of affairs with the Philippine Islands should be 'construed as farthing an intention to incorporate the inhabitants of the Philippine Islands into citizenship of the United States nor to permanently annex said islands as an integral part of the territory of the United States.' As recently as the 9th of July last, the senior senator from Massachusetts, speaking for his party and for your administration, did in effect renew this declaration when a repetition of it was urged; against such repetition the sole special plea available having been that such action would throw 'suspicion' upon the good faith of the government."

ERVING WINSLOW, of Boston, writes to the New York World to say: "Those who had hopefully anticipated some steadying and sobering effect from his high office with great regret see that Mr. Taft in his address at Norwich last Tuesday took occasion to reiterate former animadversions upon the declaration of independence. Of course his interpretation of the loyal and traditional adherence to the doctrines of that instrument was mere burlesque when he said that the instrument is so construed by some as to make it mean 'that any body of men or children or women are born with the instinct of self-government so that they can frame a government as soon as they begin to talk.' But after this unworthy frivolity the president proceeded seriously to expound his previously expressed views that the declaration of independence is but a glittering generality when he declared that men 'are not fit to govern themselves until they have sense and self-restraint enough to know what is their interest and to give every other man all that is coming to him according to right and justice.' Here, between the lines, is to be read the defense with which Mr. Taft must stifle the reproaches of conscience for undertaking the satrapy in the Philippine Islands, absolutely inconsistent with his previous convictions of the duty of the United States in the matter, in pursuance of the ambition kindled by Mr. McKinley with auguries like those of the witches in 'Macbeth'—now duly fulfilled! Of course Mr. Taft must maintain the doctrine that men 'have to be led on and taught the principles and lessons of self-government.' Abraham Lincoln is a better interpreter of the declaration of independence than William H. Taft. He would say today, scorning the trimming and quibbling of the president, as he said in 1859, that such a contention inevitably leads to 'the supplanting of the principles of free government and restoring those of classification, caste and legitimacy.' Mr. Lincoln believed, and the American people believed with scarcely

any exception until the dereliction of the republic ten years ago, that the nations of the earth were entitled to pursue their own evolution, and that Jefferson and his associates 'had the coolness, forecast and capacity to introduce into a mere revolutionary document an abstract truth, applicable to all men and all times, and so to embalm it there that today and in all coming days it shall be a rebuke and stumbling block to the very harbingers of re-appearing tyranny and oppression.'"

IN AN EDITORIAL on the cost of living the New York World says: "Without impugning the accuracy of the bureau of labor's 'relative prices of commodities,' published by the World yesterday, the figures can not measure the actual rise in the cost of living from 1897 to 1908. An increase of 37 per cent only in the price of all commodities does not begin to state the actual situation of the consumer. Still, the figures do follow the tendency of prices. They reveal the huge revolution which has come about in the control of industry in the last fifteen years. In 1893 we had a panic. Prices had begun to fall in 1891, when it was foreseen. By 1894 the statistical average of prices was 14.8 'points,' or say 15 per cent, below the boom year 1890. Prices remained low for five years, showing at the bottom a decline of more than one-quarter. The panic was cured by natural means. People who needed money sold their goods cheap, and purchases were stimulated. At the least, men out of work for a time could live cheaply. How different the course of the panic of 1907! In the interval the trusts had grown to giant size and the law of supply and demand had, we were told, given place to benevolent industrial dictatorship. The steel trust for months held up prices to its own loss and the general disadvantage. The big glass makers held the little ones in line. Lumber could not decline much, because under high tariffs we have cut nearly all our trees. Food and clothing rose in cost. And the stated prices of all commodities averaged ten points higher in 1908, in the profound depression after the panic, than they were in the boom year 1890. Twenty years of progress and invention had gone for naught. Processes were cheaper but prices were higher. It was costing much more to live in 1908, when a vast army of honest and industrious men were out of work, than in 1890, when all were employed. And all that we had to compensate us for this manifest lowering of the conditions of general prosperity was a sheaf of vast and sudden fortunes whose vulgar and profligate display amazed the world."

THE NEWSPAPERS are printing just now an instructive story from New York City and relating to the redemption of a young man who, although born to brilliant prospects sounded the depths. A New York dispatch to the Chicago Tribune tells the story in this way: "The scion of the man who by laying the first Atlantic cable became world famous, and later a financial ruler, Edwin F. Field, is working as a day clerk in a Chatham square lodging house, trying to regain his manhood after years of dissipation. The eldest son, confidant and business successor of Cyrus W. Field, who owned his own steam yacht, coaches, and a palace on 'the avenue,' and who was surrounded by luxury, is now the associate of Bowery habitues, longshoremen, fakers, broken down 'touts' and a scattering of those who really work. The transition seems almost incredible. Field is cheerfully laboring to regain a place and name in society, a place lost through dissipation and a name obliterated for almost ten years while the man lived on the bounty of former friends. Such was the condition of Field when one night he wandered into the Hadley rescue hall, 293 Bowery. Providence that night led another man into that mission. It was Bradford Lee Gilbert, the architect of the Grand Central station and an old friend of Field. Mrs. Gilbert and the widow of Jerry McAuley, the slum missionary, were also there. Mr. Gilbert was a college chum of Field; they had not met in all the years intervening since they were graduated until the chance meeting in the mission. Mr. Gilbert from a poor boy had become rich and famous in his craft. Field had lost his inherited riches, his home, his friends and even his name. Mr. Gilbert persuaded Field to become one of the 'mourners' seeking a changed life, and a few nights later in the McAuley's Water street mission Field professed conversion. Superintendent John H. Wayburn of the mission interested himself in Field and helped him to get a job. That was two years ago. 'I don't like to talk of the past with its nightmare of misery, but if it will

help any one to 'come to himself' I will gladly tell how," said Field. "When I was a homeless, helpless, and hopeless man, a slave to drink, and lost to all that was upright and good, I wandered into a mission and found that it was possible for me to reform and lead a different life." Singularly Bradford L. Gilbert who 'found' Field in the mission and led him into the better life, now occupies the old Field suite in the Mansard of 1 Broadway."

NORMAN BUCK died recently at Spokane, Washington. He was at one time associate justice of the supreme court of Idaho, and rendered a famous decision known as the "donkey case." An Associated Press correspondent says: "Judge Buck was appointed associate judge of the supreme court of Idaho in 1881. He was assigned to the four northern counties and took up his residence at Lewiston. In this service he had some interesting experiences. He first held court at Pierce City, the old seat of Shoshone county. This was changed to Eagle, and the judge was taken up the river in a canoe to hold the first session in the new court. The discovery of the mines in northern Idaho shifted the scene and Judge Buck established court at Murray, where United States Senator Heyburn, W. H. Claggett, Fred Ganahl, Patrick Henry Winston, Frank Allen, Major Wood, Judge Mayhew and others were engaged in the practice of law. These were the days when the court room was often filled with miners and when 'Teddy' Guthrie, former prize fighter and sheriff, stood by the judge and maintained order with drawn revolvers. During that period Judge Buck rendered his famous decision in the 'donkey' case. Cooper and Peck, who owned the burro, which Kellogg and O'Rourke found while kicking up 'pay dirt,' instituted suit for a share of the 'find.' The case was tried before Judge Buck and a jury. The latter had decided against the plaintiffs when the court reversed the finding and handed down his opinion, which is part of the judicial records of Idaho: 'From the evidence of the witnesses, this court is of the opinion that the Bunker Hill mine was discovered by the jackass, Phil O'Rourke and N. S. Kellogg; and as the jackass is the property of the plaintiffs, Cooper and Peck, they are entitled to a half interest in the Bunker Hill and a quarter interest in the Sullivan claims.' The case was appealed to the supreme court, but compromised before it came to trial, Cooper and Peck receiving \$76,000 for their share and many thousands of dollars were distributed among other principals, lawyers and middlemen."

IN AN EDITORIAL entitled "Fighting It to the Last Ditch," the Saturday Evening Post says: "In June, 1906, it may be recalled, congress passed an employers' liability act, the purpose of which chiefly was to enable railroad employes to recover damages for injuries resulting from accidents even though the negligence of some far-off 'fellow-servant' had contributed to the accident. In January, 1908, the supreme court declared this act unconstitutional on the ground that it applied to accidents arising in state as well as in interstate commerce, and congress had power over the latter only. To cure this defect congress passed a new act, in April 1908, applying only to accidents arising in interstate commerce. Article VI, Section 2, of the Constitution says: 'This constitution and the laws of the United States made in pursuance thereof * * * shall be the supreme law of the land, and the judges in every state shall be bound thereby.' Under the act of April, 1908, two Connecticut brakemen sued a railroad. The trial court dismissed the suit, and recently the Connecticut supreme court of errors, on appeal, upheld the trial court, ruling that congress did not intend, and had no power, to make the act of April, 1908, incumbent on state courts. Consequently, if the brakemen wish to recover damages they must sue in the United States court. Generally speaking, to sue in the United States court is expensive and inconvenient. In one western case, recently ended, where a brakeman sued for loss of both feet, there were seven different trials—in the state circuit court, the state supreme court, the United States circuit court and the United States supreme court—before the cripple finally got his money. How much of the money there was left, after paying costs and counsel fees, we do not know. The spectacle of an affluent corporation fighting to the last ditch in order to beat a maimed workman out of his claim for damages is common, but not edifying."