

A wealthy woman in Chicago offered to Mrs. Mary Carlyle, a washerwoman, the sum of \$5,000 if Mrs. Carlyle would give her seven-year-old son to the woman of wealth. Mrs. Carlyle indignantly declined the offer, and now some newspaper paragraphers are referring to the Chicago washerwoman as a heroine. In refusing to part with her beloved for gold, Mrs. Carlyle showed herself to be a real mother—and all real mothers are heroines.

All Real Mothers are Heroines.

A newspaper dispatch says: "Senator Patterson of Colorado has also defied the tradition which decrees that a senator must not make a speech for two years after his installation. As a member of the committee on Philippines the Colorado senator has become an important factor in the debate upon Senator Lodge's bill, and his incisive, scholarly method of speaking has won for him a great deal of admiration." Senator Patterson did well in defying this absurd tradition, not only because, by his defiance, the senate was given the privilege of hearing a forceful man upon an important public question, but, now that Senator Patterson has blazed the way, other new members may be induced to follow. The idea of a senator, who is presumed to represent his state, avoiding a discussion of great public questions for a period of two years, is too absurd to be tolerated in a representative government.

An Absurd Tradition.

Great Britain is having considerable trouble about those horses whose purchase in the United States has aroused considerable criticism on this side of the Atlantic. In the house of commons, it was pointed out that on one contract for the purchase of horses amounting to \$555,000 the profit to the contractor selling them to Great Britain amounted to \$220,000. One member pointed out that a similar percentage of profit on the \$93,000,000 spent in the purchase of horses would have bestowed on the contractors a profit amounting to \$40,000,000. Henry Labouchere, famous for his habit of plain speaking, after listening to this report, declared that somebody ought to be hanged in connection with these exposures. And Labouchere certainly must have expressed the indignation that would naturally be felt either by the people who were required to pay the bill, or by men generally who do not approve of the manner in which unscrupulous men take advantage of the people during a war period.

How the British Goose is Being Plucked.

In view of the fact that the United States authorities have adopted the reconcentration policy in the Philippines, some of the things which Mr. McKinley said on this subject will be interesting and instructive at this time. In his message of December 6, 1897, referring to the reconcentration policy in Cuba, Mr. McKinley said: "The cruel policy of concentration was initiated February 16, 1896. The productive districts controlled by the Spanish armies were depopulated. The agricultural inhabitants were herded in and about the garrison towns, their lands laid waste and their dwellings destroyed. This policy the late cabinet of Spain justified as a necessary measure of war and as a means of cutting off supplies from the insurgents. It has utterly failed as a war measure. It was not civilized warfare. It was extermination. Against this abuse of the rights of war I have felt constrained on repeated occasions to enter the firm and earnest protest of this government." In his message of April 11, 1898, Mr. McKinley said: "Reconcentration adopted avowedly as a war measure in order to cut off the resources of the insur-

Mr. McKinley on Reconcentration.

gents worked its predestined result. As I said in my message last December, it was not civilized warfare; it was extermination. The only peace it could beget, was that of the wilderness and the grave." These are stern words and yet they are as true when applied to the reconcentration policy in the Philippines or in South Africa as they were when Mr. McKinley applied them to Spain's policy in Cuba. If the reconcentration policy of Spain in Cuba was not civilized warfare, if it was extermination, if "the only peace it could beget was that of the wilderness and the grave," what shall we say of the same policy adopted by Great Britain in South Africa and by the United States in the Philippine islands?

In a dispatch from Washington under date of February 20, Walter Wellman, Washington correspondent for the Chicago Record-Herald, says: "Naval officers were naturally jubilant today over Admiral Schley's signal defeat at the hands of the president. They point out that he has now been censured by his superior officer, Admiral Sampson; by President McKinley, by the navy department, by the three admirals who composed the court of inquiry, again by the navy department, and now more severely than by any of the foregoing by President Roosevelt." This does seem to be rather complete for a man who by nine-tenths of the American people is regarded as the hero of one of the greatest sea battles in history. But it is significant that after all this condemnation, Admiral Schley has not lost his place in the American heart.

Condemnation by the Wholesale.

A Waukegan, Ill., correspondent of the Chicago Record-Herald thinks that Mrs. E. M. Briggs of Rockford, Ill., is entitled to distinction because, when a girl, Mrs. Briggs was kissed by Lafayette. According to the Record-Herald's correspondent, "it was in 1824, on the occasion of the grand reception given at Montpelier, Vt., to the general upon the occasion of his last visit to the United States. She was one of the thirteen girls representing the original states and wore a white gown with a blue sash. She remembers that Lafayette wore a dark blue coat, cutaway style, a low-cut cream-colored vest, a big ruffled white shirt front and light colored trousers. He gave each of the girls a hearty kiss and shook hands with the boys." Now if it could be shown that Mrs. Briggs had danced with George III. or had been saluted by Lord North, then, indeed, would this good woman be famous and her picture might be given a conspicuous place in the columns of those papers that show so much interest in the coronation of Edward VII.

But it was "Only Lafayette."

The people who have no personal interest to serve and no prejudice to pervert their judgments will in all probability accept the opinion of Dewey rather than the opinion of the president. If Mr. Roosevelt's decision is based upon testimony already before the public it will have no influence with those who have drawn a different conclusion from the same testimony. If, on the other hand, the president bases his decision on new evidence, that new evidence should be submitted to the public so that it can be examined and weighed. The president by clear and unmistakable implication renews the charges of falsehood and cowardice made by Maclay, but rejected by the commission. The president speaks of Schley's "disobedience to orders and misstatements of facts in relation thereto." What is this if not a charge of falsehood? In discussing the loop he speaks of "dangerous proximity" and says: "This kind of danger must not be too nicely weighed by those whose trade it is to dare greatly for the honor of the

Roosevelt Condemns Schley

flag." This means nothing unless it is construed as a reflection upon the courage of Admiral Schley. The Chicago Record-Herald charges that the president consulted with leading republicans before announcing his decision. If this be true he evidently considers the questions involved as political rather than judicial.

In a letter to the New York World, George Rice of Marietta, O., a gentleman who appears to be well informed on the affairs of the Standard Oil trust, declares that the capitalization of the trust, instead of being \$100,000,000 as popularly supposed is \$200,000,000; and he also advances the information that the recent 20 per cent dividend just declared, instead of amounting to \$20,000,000 as reported in the newspapers, really amounted to \$40,000,000.

Some Standard Oil Figures.

The character of Mr. Roosevelt's search for the truth is shown by his statement that he had summoned before him "the surviving captains of the five ships, aside from those of the two admirals, which were actively engaged at Santiago." In other words, in order to do "perfect justice" Mr. Roosevelt swept aside all the testimony of the men on the Brooklyn who were in the heat of the fight because in order to do "perfect justice" he had swept aside all the testimony of the men on the New York who were nearly twelve miles away and could not tell anything about the fight!

Mr. Roosevelt's Peculiar Plan.

In an editorial entitled "God Give Us Men," the Chicago Inter-Ocean, republican, says that the republican congress "has been long enough in session to reveal its tendencies and to outline its record." The Inter-Ocean arraigns the republican congressmen for their sins of omission and of commission and concludes: "'God give us men' prayed a great American poet in the dark hour of the nation's life. The republican party of the nation, as they contemplate the record now making by the Fifty-seventh congress, may well re-echo that prayer, 'God give us men.'" The American people have seen a number of changes in the personnel of the republican congress, and yet it seems that it is not a question of men so much as it is of principles and of policies, of sincere profession and patriotic practice; and in this view one may be pardoned for believing that the people's interest will not be subserved by a mere change in the individual republican office-holder, but that the party itself must be driven from power and replaced by a party that is willing to represent the people.

A Republican Organ's Prayer.

Senator Hoar, in a recent speech in the senate, referred to the fact that an order had been issued by the Philippine commission prohibiting the reading of the Declaration of Independence in the Philippine islands. The senator further pointed out that by the law promulgated by that commission it was a penitentiary offense to read the Declaration of Independence. The Declaration is said to be barred from the Philippines on the ground that it is an incendiary document. Is this not a curious charge to make against that document? It sets forth certain self-evident truths, and discusses the inalienable rights of man. Are we as a nation in a position to punish people for believing in that Declaration or in reading it aloud to others? Imperialism has certainly brought us into a strange situation, and one is forcibly reminded of the time when a Christian monarch felt it necessary to suppress a publication which contained extracts from the Bible condemning monarchy. If we are going to have imperialism we will find it embarrassing to preach free government here while we practice imperialism elsewhere.

An Incendiary Document.