

Paying the Piper in South Africa. It is reported that the British government has levied a tax of \$250,000,000. on South African gold mining companies in order to obtain war funds. This is an enormous tax, but when it is remembered that these gold mining companies were largely responsible for bringing about this unholy war, few will sympathize with them because of the great burden they are now required to bear.

Mr. Shaw Goes in Training. Governor Shaw of Iowa has written a letter to Senator Allison urging him to be a candidate for the republican presidential nomination in 1904. Senator Allison has replied with the information that he is too old to be a presidential candidate, and with the suggestion that the governor stand as Iowa's favorite son. In some quarters the unkind suggestion is made that perhaps Governor Shaw is anxious to remove Senator Allison from the senatorial field, but it is evident that Mr. Shaw will be trained for the 1904 race.

Corporations Should Pay For Privileges. The Supreme Court of New Jersey has held that the towns of that state may tax the roadbed and appurtenances of street railway and other companies using public thoroughfares. This decision is in support of a franchise tax law enacted in 1900. Under this law New Jersey towns may collect two per cent on the gross receipts of corporations enjoying the privilege of using the public streets. To be sure the corporations object to this tax, but it is strange that all the municipalities of this country have not required corporations to pay for the high privileges they enjoy.

A Large Volume of Money in Circulation. The Washington correspondent of the Chicago Record-Herald says that "an indication of national prosperity is to be found in the large volume of money in circulation. This now amounts to \$2,184,576,890., a gain of more than \$100,000,000. over the amount in circulation one year ago. In the last 22 years the gain in circulation amounts to the tremendous sum of \$1,368,310,169. The circulation per capita is now the largest in the country's history, amounting to \$28.13. One year ago it was \$26.71."

Can it be possible that the large volume of money in circulation is any basis for national prosperity?

Can it be possible that the bimetaillists were not wholly wrong when they insisted that the country needed a larger volume of money in circulation?

The Abuses of Despotism. "For good or for ill," says the Philadelphia Ledger, "the principle has been declared that the United States may, through Congress, govern subject peoples. It is unlikely that any abuses will be committed under this principle, but it is a principle that admits of the abuses of despotism."

The Philadelphia Ledger is to be congratulated on its sublime confidence. The Ledger should, however, know that already great

abuses have been committed under this "principle," the very abuses in fact against which our own forefathers rebelled, and for the destruction of which they took up arms.

A principle that admits of the abuses of despotism has no place in a free country.

Eternal vigilance is the price of liberty, and no people can safely depend for their liberties upon the pleasure or generosity of one man or one set of men.

The government that sanctions "a principle that admits of the abuses of despotism" has already taken on the elements of a monarchy.

When any men seek to establish, in a free country, "a principle that admits of the abuses of despotism" it is time for men who love liberty to make effective protests against the innovation.

They "Dis-trust" a Cuban Patriot. Now it is reported that the administration politicians propose to take a hand in Cuban politics. They are opposed to the election of the Cuban patriot, Maximo Gomez, to be the first president of the new republic. It is said that these administration politicians "distrust" General Gomez, and the present mayor of Havana, acting under the inspiration of Governor-General Wood, is now organizing a party to accomplish General Gomez' defeat.

It will be interesting to have some of these administration politicians explain to us by what authority they interfere in the political affairs of Cuba. It is interesting to be told that these politicians, who properly have no concern in Cuban affairs, "distrust" the man who imperiled his life in defense of Cuban independence.

"If this be Treason—" The New York Herald is occupying a conspicuous place these days in the copperhead column. Commenting upon the Supreme Court's decision in the Porto Rican case, the Herald makes this treasonable utterance:—

"Can such an amazing exhibit of judicial conflict and absurdity either command respect for the highest court of the nation or prove acceptable to the country? Opposed to principle and precedent, undermined with the dissent of its own framers, based on a bare majority of one, protested against by all the rest of the court as "overthrowing the basis of our constitutional law," can it be said to settle even the one special point it decides, to say nothing of the momentous issues it throws into dispute? In short, can it endure permanently and withstand the attacks that-time and its own weakness are sure to bring? We think not.

"We believe that it is only a question of a short time when it must give way to the cornerstone principle of our government, maintained by the four minority members of the court, headed by the chief justice, that wherever the flag floats and American sovereignty extends the constitution is the supreme law to which president, congress and the people must all bow."

Is it True? The New York World is authority for this statement: "The World is also in a position to announce on unimpeachable authority that two days before the Porto Rican cases were decided the Court had unanimously agreed that the Constitution was in force

wherever the United States exercised sovereignty. But immediately before the Court met to make its decision public, Justice Brown changed his attitude on the question."

If we accept this as a correct statement, it would seem strange that Justice Brown could on so short a notice make so material a change. Justice Brown's opinion was a most radical one. It is to be hoped, however, that the World's "unimpeachable authority" may be successfully impeached. The character of Justice Brown's opinion, bad as it is, is not so bad as would be a condition wherein Justices of the highest court in the land flopped on a moment's notice. In the income tax decision we had one instance of a judge changing his mind between sessions, and that instance did considerable damage to the Supreme Court.

Justice Brown Consistent. Considerable has been said to the effect that Justice Brown was inconsistent in his ruling in the Downes case and his ruling in the De Lima case. It is true that when in one case Justice Brown held that a country could not be foreign and domestic at the same time, and that Porto Rico was not foreign country, and when in the Downes case he held that a tariff against Porto Rico was lawful, he appeared to be a bit inconsistent. The truth is, however, that while Justice Brown held Porto Rico to be not foreign country, he used that position as reason for barring out the Dingley law which was a law enacted for the purpose of levying tariff against foreign countries. Justice Brown did not hold at any time that the constitution followed the flag. He held that congress had full power and authority to do what it saw fit to do in our possessions. Had the tariff that was ruled out in the De Lima case been levied against Porto Rico by a special act of congress, according to Justice Brown's reasoning, that tariff would have been sustained.

The New York World points out that "of the five Justices who voted for colonialism Justice Brown alone was consistent throughout. The World says:

"He held that the new territories are wholly without the constitution and subject only to congress. This made him in the De Lima case declare unlawful the duties collected by presidential proclamation before congress acted. This made him in the Downes case declare lawful the duties collected under the act of congress, the Foraker civil government act.

"It was McKenna, Gray, Shiras and White who shifted ground. In the first case they voted for the lawfulness of the president-made tariff, which was a clear usurpation of the legislative powers of congress; in the second case they insisted strenuously, if most foggily, that the colonies are under the constitution and subject only to congress. They first abandoned and then tried to get back upon the constitution.

"Justice Brown turned only one corner."

Mutterings and rumbling in the political horizon indicate that the congressmen who represent the tariff protected trusts and combines will have to earn their salaries in the next congress. The people are awakening to the folly of taxing themselves poor in order to build up the fortunes of a select few.