

ting her sovereignty recognized everywhere, we can speculate upon the duration of the enforced silence for which General Funston asks. No nation ever welcomed a foreign master and no one can estimate how long it will take to subdue those who love liberty better than life. Neither can any one tell how often the fight must be renewed. If criticism is not to be tolerated while the war is in progress, is it to be tolerated when, though the war is over, it is likely to stir up another insurrection? General Funston is sensible enough to see and frank enough to admit that free speech is inconsistent with the doctrine of empire. When President Schurman made his recent speech in Boston, General Wheaton at once announced that the distinguished educator would not be permitted to make such a speech in the Philippines, but General Funston is even more radical. He says: "There are many men in the United States who did more with their mouths and minds to aid the insurgents than did men with Krag-Jorgenson rifles and I would rather see these men hanged for treason than see one of our soldiers dead on the field of battle." He not only attempts to shift the blame for the death of our soldiers from those who urge a war of conquest to those who oppose such a war, but he shows his contempt for free speech and a free press. Some might think him entitled to the first place on the ticket, but in view of the fact that the senate is now the only deliberative part of the national congress it would be especially fitting that Gen. Funston should (if his views are indorsed by the people) be placed in position to throttle discussion in the senate.

If imperialism is to be the issue, let it be made as plain as possible, and nothing would contribute more to this end than the selection of Beveridge and Funston or Funston and Beveridge as republican standard-bearers.

That "Captains' Fight."

It will be remembered that in his opinion on the Schley case, President Roosevelt said that the Santiago battle was a captains' fight. The Chicago Chronicle is moved to reply, "Why is it that the captains have not had the prize money?" According to the Chronicle, the record discloses that the score of the various officers was something like this:

Captains absent and not engaged—	
W. T. Sampson, acting rear admiral.....	\$25,797.44
F. E. Chadwick of the New York.....	14,026.08
Captains present and engaged—	
W. S. Schley.....	3,334.00
F. A. Cook.....	2,190.32
R. Evans.....	2,166.40
C. E. Clark.....	1,989.60
J. W. Philip.....	1,740.28
H. C. Taylor.....	2,152.89

It will be seen that the total amount distributed to officers was \$53,397.01. Of this amount Schley, Cook, Clark, Evans, Philip and Taylor, who were present and engaged in the fight, received \$13,573.49. Sampson and Chadwick, who were absent and therefore did not participate in the fight, received \$39,823.52. Thus it will be seen that the two men who were not engaged in the fight received \$26,250.03 more than the entire amount paid to the six officers who were engaged in the fight. If it were indeed a captains' fight, there is something radically wrong in our method of distributing the honors.

The Tariff on Wool.

A South Dakota subscriber asks why wool is so low under the present high tariff law. As in the case of other things, the price of wool is probably the resultant of several forces, no one alone entirely controlling the situation. Some of the wool growers have complained that an increased use of shoddy is responsible for the low price of wool, but this increased use of shoddy may be, and probably is, the result of the high tariff on wools. The customer not being able to pay for good goods is compelled to buy an inferior qual-

ity. It is also probable that the combination formed among wool manufacturers whereby competition in the purchase of wool is lessened, has had something to do with lowering the price. Then, too, as imported wool is often mixed with domestic wool in the manufacture of wools, an increased price in the foreign wool may under certain circumstances compel a reduction in the price of the domestic wool, in order to prevent too great an increase in the price of the joint product. In case we export the product, the tariff on the imported wool is a direct injury to the American wool grower.

The wool situation shows how difficult it is to plan legislative aid to any one class with the assurance that even that class will get the benefit of it. The editor of The Commoner has never believed that the farmers who raise other products should be taxed on wools to aid a small percentage of the farmers who raise sheep, and he has never believed that a high tariff on wool could in the long run be beneficial to the country. Many wool growers have, however, favored a high tariff on wool regardless of its injustice to other farmers, and its injustice to the country generally.

The present wool market furnishes an argument that may convince those who have been willing to advocate high tariff so long as they enjoyed a pecuniary benefit therefrom, but who will abandon a high tariff if they see that there is nothing in it for themselves.

A Foul Deed.

A London cablegram to the Chicago Tribune, under date of March 11, quotes a British soldier who formed one of the hollow squares, enclosed in which Commandant Scheepers met his doom. The Tribune's story is as follows:

Commandant Scheepers was shot at 3 o'clock. They brought him from town in an ambulance van with a band playing and the firing party following behind. When they got him to his grave he begged to be allowed to stand up and face death, but they tied him down in a chair and blindfolded him. Then fifteen of the Coldstream Guards stood ten paces from him and fired. The volley almost blew one side of him away, and it was a sickening sight. He must have been a brave man; he did not flinch or turn pale. They buried him as he was and broke up the chair upon which he had sat, throwing the pieces on top of him.

When it is further added that the tune played by the band that convoyed Scheepers to death was a rollicking one and that the victim at the time was suffering from severe wounds the rage and horror excited among the Boers by the execution may be imagined.

This is indeed a strange story, and, if true, it has placed a foul blot on civilization. Every friend of the Boers will echo the wish that no representative of the republics of South Africa will ever be guilty of so foul a deed as that said to have been perpetrated with relation to the execution of this brave Boer commandant.

A Tremendous Cost.

A London cable to the Chicago Record-Herald states that the Britons are beginning to count the cost of the struggle in South Africa. The war office has issued a statement covering the entire period of the war up to the end of last December. According to this statement there have been nearly 19,000 deaths in the Transvaal and over 64,000 officers and men have been sent home as invalids. This is a fearful showing when it is remembered that there are only about 250,000 Boers, of whom not more than 50,000 can be counted as of fighting age. To have killed one-third as many of the enemy as they have adult men and made invalids of more than their total number is a record scarcely if ever paralleled by patriots, and look at the cost in money! Republicans boast that our people are worth a thousand dollars per capita (not very equitably distributed,

however). England has spent enough on the war in South Africa to purchase the Boers, men, women and children, at more than two thousand dollars per capita or at more than ten thousand dollars for each fighting man. When the English soldiers burned De Wet's home and drove his wife and children into a reconcentration camp he sent word to them that his home had not cost him over seven hundred pounds, but that the burning of it would cost the English government more than seven million pounds. He seems to have underestimated England's expenses. What a lesson this is in imperialism! Verily, the Boers have shown that it does not pay to attempt the overthrow of a republic.

Below are the statistics furnished by the English war office:

	Officers.	Men.
Killed in action.....	469	4,762
Died of wounds.....	161	1,635
Died in captivity.....	5	97
Accidental deaths.....	20	542
Died of disease.....	276	10,997

Total deaths in South Africa..	931	18,033
Missing and prisoners (excluding those who have been recovered or have died in captivity)...	7	435
Sent home as invalids.....	2,664	61,666

Total	3,602	80,134
Total reduction of the military forces through war in South Africa:		

	Officers.	Men.
Deaths in South Africa.....	931	18,033
Missing and prisoners.....	7	435
Invalids sent home who have died	7	449
Invalids sent home who have left the service as unfit.....	4,437
Total	945	23,354

Can They be Trusted?

Commenting upon the fact that the house of representatives has for the fourth time voted to submit to the states an amendment to the constitution providing for the election of senators by popular vote, the Chicago Tribune, republican, says:

The senate presumably will not concur in the joint resolution for the submission of this amendment. Its members favor the present method of electing senators. They are familiar with it. It has put them where they are. They are inclined to believe that their prospects for re-election are better under the present system than they would be under that of popular election. This is undoubtedly true except as to a man of commanding ability and considerable popularity. In Henry Clay's case it would have made no difference whether the legislature or the people elected the senator.

It is true that in this statement the Tribune reflects the popular notion concerning the indisposition of some senators to concur in the house resolution. But a reader of The Commoner suggests that "after all perhaps the senators who oppose the popular election plan may not be actuated by selfish motives." This reader says that in an address delivered before the students of the Baptist College at Kalamazoo, Mich., in September, 1894, Senator Burrows said: "I once thought I was in favor of electing United States senators by direct vote of the people; but I could not vote for that now, because the people cannot be trusted." This reader adds that "perhaps other senators than Mr. Burrows have come to the conclusion that the people cannot be trusted. After they have really reached that conclusion, are they not playing a patriotic part when they refuse to give the people the authority to directly select their senators?"

This is an interesting view, to be sure. Perhaps those senators who object to the popular election plan intend that the people shall have all the privileges they are "capable of enjoying." This, once described by a distinguished republican as "the argument of kings," has come to be very popular now in republican circles.