

In a speech delivered in the United States senate April 7, 1871, the late Senator Morrill said:

Not a
Subject of
Commerce.

"We desire to retain the prestige of teaching nations by our example how to govern themselves, rather than to imperil our own existence by attempting to govern the incapables, whether near or remote, upon fat soils or lean. We cannot confer freedom upon any foreign people—freedom is the reward of merit, and not a subject of commerce or charity."

William Hobbs, a man well known in newspaper and political circles in the city of St. Louis, died recently and his biographer said of him: "He was loved by little children." No tribute could be paid that would be more replete with meaning than this simple sentence. Not every man is "loved by little children," and one may not doubt that at the bier of this man there were many sincere mourners.

An interesting prophecy made by Wendell Phillips is pointed out by the New York World. The World says that on July 28, 1865, speaking in Music Hall to school children, Wendell Phillips said: "I expect if I live forty years to see a telegraph that will send messages without wires, both ways at the same time." Mr. Phillips' forty years would expire in 1905, and from the progress already made by Marconi, there is reason to believe that had he lived, Mr. Phillips would have realized his prophecy.

A Washington dispatch says that Mr. Roosevelt has been advised by republican politicians that it would be extremely poor politics for the president to retire General Miles because of his criticism of the army bill. There are indications, too, that Mr. Roosevelt with all his strenuousness is inclined to take this bit of good advice. Great prestige attaches to the president, but all of that prestige would not be sufficient to justify Mr. Roosevelt, from a purely political standpoint, in adding another hero to his list.

In a speech delivered in San Francisco, General Funston said: "The Filipinos are absolutely incapable of self-government today, and I do not think the next generation of the race will be." As a prophet General Funston is not at all backward. He assumes to pass on the qualifications for self-government, not only of the present but of the coming generation of Filipinos; and in the light of this prophecy, one is tempted to ask, "What is to become of the promises made by the orators for the republican administration to the effect that the republican party will teach these people the art of self-government?" If the Filipinos are so "absolutely incapable" that no reasonable hope may be entertained for them even to future generations with what reason do the republican leaders insist upon maintaining this great and hopeless burden?

Referring to the marked advance in the price of beef, the Chicago Tribune says that the explanation of the secretary of agriculture that the advance is due "to the large supply of prosperity and the small supply of corn," is "undoubtedly the correct one." The Tribune explains that when Americans are hard up they manage to live on inferior meats and bread and potatoes; when prosperous they demand beef. "Never," says the Tribune, "were there so many people who consider

themselves entitled to demand this superior meat as they are now; naturally this increased demand has its effect on prices." As a matter of fact the explanation of the secretary of agriculture needs a diagram; but the sensible man, knowing that the beef trust reigns supreme in its chosen field, needs no index to the cause for the advance in the price of beef. The Tribune itself prints all the explanation that is necessary on this point although it does not indorse this particular explanation. It admits, however, that the explanation "which seems to meet with the most favor is that there is a combine which has the consumers of the country by the throat." To the average man this will appear reasonable and satisfactory.

A London cablegram under date of March 22 says: "The opinion here is that if the United States should stop supplying horses and mules to the British, the Boers would get acceptable terms of peace within six months." When it is remembered that the use of our ports for the shipment of these horses and mules is a distinct violation of the law of neutrality, what republican will undertake to apologize for the refusal of the republican administration to put a stop to the use of the United States ports for the unholy purpose of shipping horses and mules to be used by an empire in its war against a republic?

The Washington correspondent of Henry Watterson's Courier-Journal wired his paper under date of March 31 that "politics are now run entirely upon business lines, and principles and sentiment count for little, if anything." It is to be hoped that Mr. Watterson's optimistic views concerning democratic prospects in the congressional elections are not based on the estimate placed upon public intelligence by Mr. Watterson's Washington correspondent. If "principles and sentiment count for little, if anything," then Mr. Watterson has missed an opportunity by not insisting upon an abandonment by the democratic party of all of its principles.

A London cablegram to the New York World says: "It is thought that the chancellor of the exchequer will take advantage of the cheerfulness over the South African situation, because of the unexpected resuming of peace negotiations, to submit a new loan. That new loan, assuming that the war continues, cannot be less than £50,000,000 (\$250,000,000)." If serious importance is to be attached to these peace negotiations, why is it necessary for Great Britain to obtain this new loan? Can it be possible that the same news sources through which the world has been deliberately and persistently deceived concerning the situation in South Africa, is now being used in an effort to bolster up Great Britain's credit in the money market, in order that the British ministry may saddle a new load upon the English taxpayers?

General Samuel Pearson has presented charges that the British authorities have set up a regular military establishment in Louisiana. General Pearson alleges that this establishment has provided 42,000 men to aid the British in their fight against the Boers and has furnished the British government with 201,149 horses and mules. According to General Pearson, "these men are shipped as muleteers, and when they arrive in South Africa, are used as soldiers. He alleges that one British general, two colonels, and sixty captains and lieutenants are in this country now with headquarters at New Orleans. Does it not seem fair to be-

lieve that the British ministry has received assurances that its representatives in this country will not be interfered with under the republican administration? It was bad enough when the administration permitted United States ports to be used for shipment of horses and mules, but it is amazing that the British should actually establish a military camp within one of the states. Compare the inactivity, to use no harsher term, of the republican administration toward the use of United States soil by the British, with the activity of the republican administration in the effort to prevent any aid being given to Cuba during its war with Spain prior to our own declaration of war. The comparison is indeed an odious one, and the odium rests very heavily upon republican authorities.

A Washington dispatch reports that Congressman Babcock, having abandoned his contention as to the reduction of the tariff on steel and iron products, is to be rewarded by reelection to the chairmanship of the republican congressional committee. Many people expected much when Mr. Babcock first announced that he would insist upon a reduction of the tariff on articles controlled by trusts, but little by little the Wisconsin congressman has yielded his ground and now it seems to be generally accepted that he has surrendered it altogether. The man who said that "a very little reform goes a long way with the republican leader" evidently knew what he was talking about.

The effort to subjugate the Boers has cost Great Britain so far more than \$700,000,000. The cost now is averaging about \$22,500,000 per month. Up to January 1, 1902, the British had lost 24,299 officers and men. In addition to these 64,330 men were sent home on the sick list. The British troops now in the field number about 250,000. The British war department is hurrying reinforcements to the front. Even though it be admitted that Great Britain will finally win, is it now evident to all that England needs in this moment, more than at any other time in her history, a Gladstone who is brave enough to say as Gladstone said on one occasion, when he compromised with the Boers, that "England is big enough to do right?"

In several treaties the United States is on record as having recognized horses as contraband of war. In the treaty with Brazil in 1828, "cavalry belts and horses with their furniture," are among the contraband list. In the treaty with the Dominican republic in 1867, "cavalry belts and horses with their harness," are among the contraband list. In the treaty with Hayti, 1864, "cavalry belts and horses with their harness," are among the designated contraband. In the treaty with Peru, in 1887, "cavalry belts and horses with their harness," are on the list. In the treaty with Salvador in 1870, "cavalry belts and horses with their harness," are on the list. In the treaty with Great Britain in 1871, it is provided that a neutral government is bound "not to permit or suffer either belligerent to make use of its ports or waters as the 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." Great Britain, in its treaty with Holland, December 1, 1774, is on record as declaring that "horses and other warlike instruments are contraband of war;" and Hill's International Law declares "Horses are generally considered as contraband of war, and are so mentioned in many treaties between different states."