

No one doubts that the rank and file of the republican party is favorable to the election of senators by the people. But it is significant that republican leaders in state as well as in nation seem to fight shy of everything intended to encourage the plan.

**Conspicuous
by Their
Absence.**

A hearing was held on March 3 in the city of Boston, and a Boston dispatch to the New York Journal says: "Not a republican appeared at the legislative hearing today on the resolve favoring an amendment to the federal constitution providing for the election of United States senators by the people. There were present Democratic National Committeeman George Fred Williams and Hon. W. S. McNary, chairman of the state committee, the father of the resolution; Hon. Thomas J. Gargan, George E. McNull, the veteran labor leader; W. E. Greensley, representing the Boston central labor union, and C. R. Barstow, all of whom pleaded for the amendment."

Bishop Brent, who is soon to leave for Manila to become the first Episcopal bishop of the Philippines, recently delivered a sermon in Washington city in which, referring to the Filipinos, he said: "The time will come when they shall be an independent people." The Philadelphia North American, commenting upon this statement, gives the good bishop a timely warning when it says: "Creditable as this sentiment is to Bishop Brent, he must discard it before he sets foot on the shores of the archipelago committed to his spiritual charge. The laws against treason and sedition enacted by the Philippine commission plainly prohibit such incendiary doctrines. No spoken or written word shall be delivered there in support of Philippine independence under pain of long imprisonment and heavy fine. For the moment Bishop Brent is safe because he is still in the United States, but let him not fall into the pernicious habit of being consistent and preaching in Manila what he preaches in Washington."

In his message to congress Mr. Roosevelt said: "I must earnestly ask your attention to the wisdom, indeed the vital need, of providing for substantial reduction in the tariff duties on Cuban imports into the United States." The republicans in the house propose to make a 20 per cent reduction, which, according to General Wood, is by no means sufficient, and there are indications that on this point some republicans in the house are determined that justice shall be done the Cubans somewhere reasonably in line with the suggestions made by General Wood. This will be another opportunity for President Roosevelt to test himself and for the American people to test Mr. Roosevelt. The Chicago Record-Herald, a republican paper, says that on this question "American honor is at stake." The Record-Herald says that the republican majority "has made a sorry exhibition of itself in its anti-Cuban caucuses." It remains to be seen whether Mr. Roosevelt will compromise upon this "vital need" and accept whatever sop to Cuba the trust magnates are willing for the republican leaders in the house to bestow.

The American people are at last obtaining some information concerning slavery in the Philippines. Governor Taft in his testimony before the house committee, said that slavery in the Philippines was so thoroughly ingrained that it would require much time and care to eradicate it. He explained that there are about 300,000 slaves, a majority of whom are held for debt; and he said that until they could buy their liberty, the obligation would run from generation to generation. Governor Taft

said that the greatest difficulty in the way of a solution of the problem was the attitude of the slaves who do not appear to desire freedom, and he predicted that any effort to free them by force would result in all of them taking up arms against the United States. So, according to Governor Taft, Philippine slavery is one of the several enormous problems confronting this government in those islands. There are but three ways in which a slave could obtain his freedom: One would be for the United States to liberate him by force of arms. According to Governor Taft, if this was attempted every slave would take up arms against this government and in defense of slavery. Another plan would be for the slave to purchase his freedom. That precious boon is guaranteed in the agreement entered into by the Sultan of Sulu and the president of the United States; but a slave whose labor belongs exclusively to his master and who earns nothing can obtain no money with which to purchase freedom. The third plan would be for the master to voluntarily emancipate the slave; and this appears to be the only hope for the abolition of slavery in the Philippines under the authority of the United States.

The following story is going the rounds of the press in regard to ex-Governor Hogg of Texas:

**He Won
the
Governor.**

"The ex-governor is one of the new millionaires of the Beaumont oil field. He made early investments there and has reaped a rich harvest. He has been at Beaumont lately looking after his interests. At the hotel at Beaumont his particular waiter was one George, a sable-skinned gentleman of numerous accomplishments. George is a model waiter. The governor valued him highly. Each day at dinner George received from the governor his tip, \$1. George reveled in wealth. He was the envied of all the other waiters. He was the happy possessor of a 'good thing.' The other day when the governor entered the dining room a strange darky stood behind his chair. 'Where's George?' asked the governor brusquely. The new waiter bowed low. 'Ise youh waitah now, sah,' he said softly. 'But where's George?' again asked the governor. Again his new retainer assured him: 'Ise youh waitah now.' The governor looked up from his newspaper sharply. He was somewhat mystified, and with increasing emphasis demanded to know where George was, anyhow. 'Well, you see, sah,' began the new-comer with some hesitation; 'Gawge and I was out las' night playing craps. Gawge went broke; I won his pile. Then—' here his voice dropped lower and his manner was confidential—'he put you up agin three dollahs and I won. So, Ise youh waitah.'"

The Boer delegates called on President Roosevelt and Secretary of State Hay March 5. The Associated press dispatch says that these delegates spent fifteen minutes in the president's presence and they retired after being assured that this government would not intervene. No one has asked that this government intervene by force of arms. It would, however, be of advantage to the Boers if one word of sympathy could be given to their cause by the president of the United States. President Monroe did not hesitate to speak a kind word for the Greeks. Nor did John Quincy Adams neglect an opportunity to express his sympathy for that same people. President Taylor did not attempt to conceal his ardent admiration for the Hungarians; and even after the Hungarians had been defeated, President Taylor went so far as to say: "Although she is now fallen and many of her gallant patriots are in exile or in chains, I am free still to declare that, had she been successful in the maintenance of such a government as we could have recognized, we should have been the first to welcome her into the family of nations." Why could not President Roosevelt have

said something like this? Why could he not have told the Boer delegates that although it was impossible for this government to intervene in the South African war, that as a matter of truth, in any struggle between an empire and a republic, the sympathies of this people, true to their traditions, were with the republic?

One is inclined to dwell a bit on the emphasis which Governor Taft gives to his prediction that if the United States undertakes to abolish slavery in the Philippines by force, they will be met with a strong show of resistance. The United States were met with "a strong show of resistance" when they sought to force a government upon the Filipinos against their will. And yet the prospect of resistance did not deter this government and the fact that resistance is yet made does not appear to alter this government's determination that it will govern the Filipinos without their consent, and if need be, at the point of the bayonet. Is it not somewhat strange, therefore, to hear Governor Taft present the probability of armed resistance as a reason for the failure of this government to wipe out slavery on soil that is subject to United States authority?

On March 4 Mr. Broderick, the British war secretary, presented the army estimates amounting in the neighborhood of \$350,000,000. In explaining the necessity for this immense sum, Mr. Broderick said that the war office was feeding 300,000 men and 243,000 horses in South Africa. He said that no reduction in the strength of the army could be expected and probably the Indian garrison must be increased. He pointed out that the government was offering a special inducement for recruits and he believed this would have the desired result. Mr. Broderick certainly made a good showing in defense of his large estimate and yet one cannot avoid the question: How does it happen that it is necessary for Great Britain to appropriate such enormous sums of money and maintain so large an army if the British forces in South Africa are battling against "a mere handful of Boers?" If the British authorities would keep the truth relating to the South African war entirely from the world, they should establish a censor at the door of the house of commons. Every army estimate presented by the war secretary shows to intelligent men that not one-half of the truth has been told in the newspaper dispatches concerning the South African war.

When the Boer delegates called upon Secretary of State Hay, they were assured that it was necessary that the United States maintain a "neutral" attitude concerning the South African war. So long as this government is permitting British agents to use its ports for the shipment of horses and mules to be used in Great Britain's war against the Boers, it will be difficult to convince an intelligent man that this country is in fact maintaining a neutral attitude. In an interesting brief prepared by Judge Murray F. Tuley and other lawyers of Chicago, it is pointed out that according to "Wharton's International Law" and "Hill's International Law" horses are contraband of war. In this same brief it is also shown that in its treaty with Holland, Great Britain is on record as declaring that "horses and other warlike instruments are contraband of war." And it is further shown that on the day following the declaration by the United States of war against Spain, the British government issued a proclamation in which it was ordered that neither power was to "make use of its (Great Britain's) ports or waters as a base of naval operations against the other or for the purpose of renewal or augmentation of military supplies or arms or the recruitment of men." It would seem therefore that if the administration was really anxious to maintain a strictly neutral attitude, it would prevent the British agents from using the ports of the United States for the purpose of shipping horses and mules for use in the South African war.

**Neutrality and
the South
African War.**

But Mr. Roosevelt was silent.