

In a recent consular report, Frank Mason, United States consul general at Berlin, said that the business situation in Germany could not regain its former prosperity as long as the future respecting duties continues uncertain and the danger of foreign reprisals remains. A German paper, the Kreuz Zeitung, commenting upon Mr. Mason's statement, declares that tariff duties in Germany are no more uncertain than in the United States. The Kreuz Zeitung adds, "Let the United States make and inaugurate a tariff reform favorable to commercial treaties before accusing other countries of endangering trade relations through preparations for tariff legislation." It will occur to a great many people that this German paper has come very near to hitting the nail on the head. For a country that is so immovable on its high protective tariff provisions as the United States, it would seem we are indulging in considerable complaint concerning the tariff laws of other nations.

Senator Frye, who is one of the senatorial leaders of the fight for the ship subsidy, announced some time ago that he had "worked out a new subsidy bill." When asked for its provisions he replied: "I am unwilling that its features should become the shuttle-cock of journalistic comment." Why should the bill be shielded from public scrutiny? Why should its features be kept in the dark? Truth and justice do not fear the light; neither has any good measure reason for avoiding the public gaze. It is a significant fact that the republican leaders of late years have refused to give any considerable time for the discussion of their pet public measures. When they want something done they spring a bill upon congress and hurry it through. They failed to get the last subsidy bill through and it was announced that it was going to be materially changed, but the public has had no chance to consider the changes. Publicity has never defeated a good measure, but had measures have often been passed hurriedly which could never have been passed if sufficient time had been given for consideration and discussion.

It is a mistaken notion that the postal department should produce a revenue. Its mission is to serve the people at the smallest cost, and when the department finds the receipts equalling the expenditures it should immediately better the service. It is undoubtedly true, as the postmaster general claims, that the department is the victim of mail abuses, but it is not true that the abuse is confined wholly to a too liberal construction of the second class mail privileges. The greatest abuse is in the letting of mail carrying contracts at exorbitant figures to railroads, and in the payment of unreasonable rentals for mail cars. It costs no more to haul an express-car than it does to haul a postal car, yet the postoffice department pays from seven to ten times more for hauling postal cars than the express companies pay for hauling their cars. It costs the railroads no more to carry a ton of mail than it does to carry a ton of express, yet the government pays from seven to ten times more for mail hauling than express companies pay for their express haul. Before the benefits to the people are curtailed the exorbitant sums paid for carrying the mails should be brought down to just and reasonable figures.

Governor-elect Cummins of Iowa, speaking before the New York chamber of commerce, said: "I know that the people of this country will not stand for industrial monopoly any more than they would for a monarchical form of government. If we wish to preserve the manhood of our citizenship

the time will come when it will be necessary to nationalize the questions now agitating the public mind in this particular domain." What Mr. Cummins intended to do was to utter to the assembled republicans a warning against trusts. Mr. Cummins, however, touched very gingerly upon this question. If the "manhood of our citizenship" is threatened, then the time to act is at hand, rather than in the indefinite future, when that "manhood" shall be destroyed. The questions now agitating the public mind in "this particular domain" are already "nationalized." The democratic party has taken a firm and unequivocal position on those questions. The republican party has deliberately and persistently encouraged the processes of industrial monopoly and when the people become thoroughly awakened as to the dangers confronting them the republican party will be convicted upon its record.

Representative John S. Williams of Mississippi has introduced a resolution providing for the appointment of a committee to investigate the charges made by Historian Maclay that Crowninshield, Sampson and other naval officers read the proof-sheets of Maclay's bitter attack on Admiral Schley. It cannot be doubt that Mr. Williams, who is one of the forceful members of the house, will push his resolution with all possible vigor, and yet it is not likely that republicans will permit the adoption of any such resolution introduced by a democrat. They will perhaps prefer to adopt a similar resolution introduced by a republican. At all events, the American people will expect the charge that Admiral Schley has been the victim of a conspiracy, to be thoroughly investigated. There seems, also, to be a disposition in congress to prevent the creation of the grade of vice admiral unless provision is made for conferring that grade upon Admiral Schley and restoring him to active service. It required a long time for some of the politicians in the republican party to realize that injustice was being done Admiral Schley, but it is now probable in spite of the court of inquiry's decision that many of them will compete strongly with democratic members in the effort to do justice to Schley.

If the Ohio campaign has served no other purpose, it has given the democrats of Ohio an insight into Mr. McLean's views and plans. The Inquirer, which reflects his sentiments, recently contained the following: "A kindly commentator says that Colonel Kilbourne made as good a race as could have been expected under the circumstances. Perhaps so. Not much was expected." The democratic papers of Ohio are now calling attention to the fact that Mr. McLean did not feel any interest in Mr. Kilbourne's election. He was interested in securing a repudiation of the Kansas City platform because he thought it would help the reorganizing element to get control of the party. The adoption of the Tom Johnson planks, however, made the platform about as odious to him as the Kansas City platform would have been, and having no love for Mr. Kilbourne he did not take interest enough in the election to return to Ohio to vote. Mr. Kilbourne and Tom Johnson are growing factors in Ohio politics and neither one of them is in harmony with McLean's machine methods. At present the Kilbourne men and the Johnson men together control the state organization in Ohio. In future fights it ought to be possible to combine the national principles entertained by the Kansas City platform with the state policies urged by the Johnson democrats and the clean politics advocated by the Kilbourne democrats, and thus put the democratic party of Ohio in good fighting trim.

A London cablegram to the Chicago Tribune says that keen interest has been excited by the report that the ceremonies of doing homage and anointing with oil will be omitted from the coronation service of King Edward. Assurance is given, however, that this report is not well grounded. It is generally admitted, so this cablegram says, that it is no longer necessary to kiss the king's foot, yet even this was done as late as the coronation of Edward VI. But the ceremonial of anointing with oil is a very old one. The anointing is to be made on the hands, breast, shoulders, elbows and head of the king, and while it is possible that King Edward will not require that his foot be kissed, he will, it is said, adhere to all the ancient customs concerning anointing. This, to be sure, is not the affair of outsiders, and if the English people conclude to drown their king in oil, no one on this side of the pond will have authority to complain. If, however, we were permitted to make a suggestion, we would say that if all the men in authority in Great Britain, from the king to the humblest member of the British ministry, could be thoroughly anointed with the milk of human kindness, the coronation services would be more successful both from the standpoint of the loyal Britisher and from the standpoint of humanity—having in view the reconcentrado camps of South Africa.

The Independent of New York, which makes some pretensions to being independent in politics, is sometimes more partisan in its editorial comments than the most pronounced party organs. In a recent issue it has the impudence to remove all the important questions from the field of discussion by declaring them settled on the republican side. For instance, it says: "There is no question of militarism before the country, nor of imperialism. Nobody defends either. Our army is very small, and is being reduced. Nobody wants war. Nor is there any difference to amount to anything about imperialism. Nobody complains that we have Porto Rico, and nobody wants Cuba unless Cuba should ask to come to us. The Philippines are ours, and it cannot be helped. Everybody is pleased with the way we are trying to give them self-government, perhaps faster than the people know what to do with it. The question of imperialism, if there ever was one, is forgotten in the pressing task of establishing schools and courts and free government. If anybody has any suggestions for better conditions there, let him make them; the administration will be glad. It is of absolutely no use to try to make a party cry of imperialism any more. It has gone to Letha with sixteen-to-one, and it is not strange that the new party never thought of it. And trusts? We wait for practical working suggestions that will differentiate parties." We now have in the Philippines more soldiers than we had in the whole United States four years ago, and there is no prospect of our being able to materially reduce the forces there. Instead of it being true that nobody wants imperialism, the republican readers not only favor imperialism, but are today administering an imperialistic government in the Philippines. The Independent entirely ignores the real situation in Porto Rico, and makes no reference to the subject of Cuba's representation in congress. It also assumes that we must necessarily hold the Philippine islands, and praises the manner in which the government is being administered there. Its position on the trust question is in entire harmony with its views on the other questions—it simply accepts the position of the republican party, and, without trying to defend it, denies that there is any necessity for defense. It would be difficult for the most bitter republican partisan to prepare a more misleading, untruthful or partisan editorial than the one above quoted, and yet it comes from a paper pretending to be independent.

Sauce for the Goose and the Gander.

Afraid of Publicity.

Express and Mail.

Mr. Cummin's Stern Warning.

Doing Justice to

Admiral Schley.

The Retirement of Mr. McLean.

Drench Them in the Milk of Kindness.

The Independent not Independent.