



A REPUBLIC.



AN EMPIRE.

(This cut is used by courtesy of Judge. The idea was suggested by Mr. Bryan on invitation of Judge, and the drawing was made by Grant Hamilton.)

His Explanations Do Not Explain.

In explaining his vote for the army bill, Congressman Clayton, of New York, (it is necessary to give his state as there is a Congressman Clayton of Alabama, who is a very different kind of a democrat) said, "I voted on the army bill, on the currency question and a number of other questions with the party in power; I have done so because of my convictions that by so doing the best interests of my constituents and of the country would be served."

This is the defense that any republican might make and it raises the question, why does he call himself a democrat if he agrees with the republicans in convictions?

In regard to the appointment he said: "I had not made up my mind to ask for an appointment at all at the time the bill was passed."

It is evident from his language that he had considered the matter, although he had not "made up his mind." Would he have "made up his mind" to apply if his convictions had led him to vote against the bill? If he had "made up his mind not to apply" would his convictions in regard to the bill have been the same? It is impossible to search the human mind and measure the influence of logic against the influence of a

selfish interest. For this reason officials, when they act for the public, are not allowed to deal with themselves. It is often provided that a legislator is not eligible to an office created during his term.

It is possible to conceive of a man so just in his judgments as not to be swayed by his own interests, but such men are very rare. No one would try a case before a judge or a juror who had an interest on the other side. In his vote on the army question Mr. Clayton was acting as a judge and after deciding in favor of the bill he did not lose much time in applying for one of the offices. If he had been more democratic in his ideas he would not have voted for a large standing army; if he had had a higher sense of official duty he would not have applied for a position which he helped to create.

An Unamerican Punishment.

In response to a Senate resolution, Gen. MacArthur has reported to the War Department, his reasons for deporting Editor Rice of Manila. The General says that Rice's offense was the "malicious publication of false charges affecting the integrity of the administration of the office of Captain of the Port." The report declares that

Rice was told that he must give bond not to republish the offensive charges or must leave the island. According to Gen. MacArthur the editor "maintained an attitude of defiance and was necessarily sent home." The complete report of this affair will be awaited with interest. Deportation is an unamerican punishment and ought to have no place in our criminal code. If Rice was guilty of libel he should have been tried for libel. The fact that he suffered deportation rather than agree not to republish the charges would indicate that he believes the charges to be true. The administration did not think the jury system necessary for the protection of Filipino subjects, but are American citizens to be denied the right of trial by jury when they criticize military or carpet bag officials? Even those who are indifferent to the denial of justice to the Filipinos are likely to resent this arbitrary treatment of an American. Especially should newspapers protest, for if a free press is not to be tolerated in the Philippine islands what can be said in defense of the freedom of the press here?

Gen. MacArthur in his report gives us another side light on imperialism. It would seem that freedom of the press has as much difficulty as the constitution in following the flag into "our new possessions."