

The supreme court of North Carolina has decided that applicants for license to practice law must be "able to write legibly and spell reasonably well." There are many lawyers throughout the country who will not seriously object to the condition relative to orthography; and yet we may expect a general protest from the bar against the "able to write legibly" provision of this opinion.

Draw the Line.

Commenting upon the "annual currency squeeze," Henry Watterson in the Louisville Courier-Journal says that "the remedy could be easily found either in some form of an asset currency or an emergency issue of bank notes." It is significant that those who so vigorously objected to bimetallism as a remedy for our financial ills on the ground that it would provide dishonest money, take so readily to the asset currency proposition.

A Bit Significant

President Elliot of Harvard said recently that no man can work too hard, and the Cincinnati Enquirer adds: "Possibly Professor Elliot has never tried it. Let him go to the country some day and take note of some farmer who has gone forth with his hoe at sunrise every morning and worked till sunset, and is bowed, broken and rheumatic at 45 and dies in the '50's, leaving the farm he has paid for with hard work to some 'young feller' who has captured his daughter with a horse and buggy."

Elliot's Big Mistake.

Walter Wellman, the Washington correspondent of the Chicago Record-Herald, seeks to make it appear that Minister Bowen has made a dismal failure of his contest over the Venezuelan situation with the representatives of Great Britain, Germany and Italy. Mr. Bowen seems to have exerted himself to bring about arbitration and although some of the conditions exacted by the European powers may not strike every one as being entirely fair, it will be generally believed by the American people that Mr. Bowen is entitled to credit for his earnest efforts.

Not a Failure.

John D. Rockefeller, jr., says that the best thing to give a man who asks for assistance is a kind word. How would it do for the government to adopt this plan when it is asked to confer upon the trust magnates special privileges? Perhaps it would not be entirely satisfactory to the trust magnates, but we may have the consolation of knowing that it would be satisfactory to the people and that, so far as the magnate is concerned, it would be no less satisfactory than the kind word substituted for alms in the presence of a hungry man.

Alms and Words.

Senator Patterson of Colorado, in his speech in favor of the statehood bill, quoted from an address delivered by Theodore Roosevelt at the Rough Riders' reunion at Las Vegas, N. M., June 25, 1899. In that speech Mr. Roosevelt said: "All I shall say is if New Mexico wants to be a state you can count me in and I will go to Washington to speak for you or do anything you wish." Mr. Roosevelt is now in Washington and if he could not speak for New Mexico, he might at least have refrained from exerting any of his influence against the admission of that territory.

Let Him Speak.

The Washington correspondent of the New York World is authority for the statement that the features of the so-called anti-trust legislation as recommended by Attorney General Knox and indorsed by the president were approved by J. Pierpont Morgan and James J. Hill. The World correspondent makes the wholly unnecessary statement that the plan "will prove of no practical value in controlling the trusts." If there was the slightest chance of this plan proving of practical value in controlling the trusts, Messrs. Morgan and Hill would not have given their approval. And yet does not the fact that republicans submit their legislation to Morgan and Hill suggest that it is about time for republicans who are really opposed to the trust system to begin to carefully inspect the manner in which we are proceeding to "shackle cunning" as in the past we have shackled force?"

Morgan and Hill.

The Kansas City Journal tells an interesting story showing how a Carthage (Mo.) real estate agent lost a client, but secured an extraordinary compliment. A Jasper county farmer decided to sell his place and called upon a real estate agent who wrote for publication an extravagant description of the property. When the agent read the notice to the farmer, the old man said: "Read that again." After the second reading, the farmer said: "I believe I'll not sell; I've been looking for a place of that kind all my life, and didn't know I had it until you described it to me."

A Bit Overdone.

The following from the New York Tribune is a graceful acknowledgement that the law is better enforced in the west than in the east against dishonest officials. The Tribune says: "Western prosecutors of unfaithful officeholders are steady and persistent sleuths who stick to the trails. A trans-Mississippi ex-mayor of an important community has been wandering about in the hope that he might escape the bloodhounds of the law. Of course, he was chased down, and now he must make amends for his misdeeds. Eastern criminals too often go at large. Western lawbreakers come to grief."

An Honest Confession.

The New York Tribune, edited by Whitelaw Reid, discussing England's part in Venezuela, says that "it is especially gratifying to observe that the British part in Venezuela has been played with unflinching consideration for the rights and susceptibilities of the United States." This is as it appears through the spectacles of Whitelaw Reid, and yet newspaper readers will remember that they were told that even though British ministers were pretending to preserve "unflinching consideration for the rights and susceptibilities of the United States," true to history, the British ministry was covertly giving encouragement to a program that gave scant consideration to the interests of this government.

The British Part.

The advocates of the proposition that the salary of the president be increased to \$100,000 insist that the expenses of living have become so much higher that an increase in the presidential salary is necessary. Referring to this claim, the Boston Herald is moved to inquire if those who advocated the advance on this ground realize how much the position they take implies. The Herald observes: "If this increase in the price of living bears hard upon the president, why not also on the people? If the state of the case calls for so much additional salary there, most certainly it must mean the propriety of substantial addition to laborers' wages. Before the legislators at Washington engage in such projects as this one it may be well for them to reflect upon what they may logically lead to if reasonably carried out."

On Dangerous Ground.

The New York Tribune says: "The conviction that this republic needs a navy at least as strong as that of any other nation except Great Britain appears to be spreading all over the country. The interests to be safeguarded are of incalculable value, and the resources of this prosperous people will not be unduly strained if a plan of naval development on a great scale is adopted. The American flag must be respected on every sea." Now, if the conviction that this republic "needs a navy at least as strong as that of any other nation except Great Britain" is based upon intelligent and patriotic ground, will the Tribune be good enough to explain why Great Britain is excepted? If it is important that this republic have a navy as strong as that of Germany, for instance, why should not this republic have a navy as strong as that of Great Britain?"

Why the Exception?

Senator Platt of Connecticut is quoted as saying in reference to the Rockefeller telegrams: "I don't think that it is anybody's business what telegrams any senator receives from any individual or corporation." Of course, and it is not anybody's business how a United States senator votes; and it isn't anybody's business if men chosen to represent a people come to be recognized as the representative of the trust magnates on the floor of the senate; and it isn't anybody's business that United States senators and other members

It's Nobody's Business.

of congress rigidly adhere to policies that take the money out of the pockets of the many in order to place it in the pockets of the few. And yet, after all, the time may come when the American people may conclude to make it their "business" to look after the things that are being done to their disadvantage and to the advantage of men who contribute liberally to the republican campaign fund.

A Connecticut subscriber calls attention to a recent communication from the patent office which says that as the applicant (a Filipino) for a patent is not a citizen of the United States, nor a citizen or subject of any foreign country, the United States could not consider the application. The patent attorneys were compelled to notify the Filipino that he could not secure a patent under the laws of the United States. Will some defender of imperialism please explain the benevolence of a colonial system which denies to the Filipino not only patent privileges accorded to an American citizen, but also the patent privileges accorded to the citizen or subject of any foreign nation? To be a colonial subject of the United States puts the Filipino in a worse position, so far as our laws are concerned, than he would have been had he remained a subject of Spain.

Here's a Pretty Mess.

The New York World says that "the Littlefield bill goes much further against the 'bad trusts' than any of the bills the senate is willing to enact. The publicity it requires of trust accounts is fuller and more searching, the powers given for enforcing it are larger, the penalties for evading it more sincere. Above all, it is the Littlefield bill alone that applies the most drastic of all the remedies for monopoly proposed in Attorney General Knox's famous Pittsburg speech—the exclusion from interstate and foreign commerce of the products of any corporation that is shown to have made different prices in different localities for the purpose of destroying competition." And yet according to the Washington correspondent of the Chicago Record-Herald, Mr. Littlefield has been informed that Mr. Roosevelt cannot encourage the passage of the Littlefield bill. Is it possible that in his effort to "shackle cunning" Mr. Roosevelt has forgotten how "in the past we have shackled force?"

The Littlefield Bill.

"We do not believe that even in this state of Massachusetts, which today seems so soundly anchored to one great party," says the New Bedford Standard (rep.), "there is any actual assurance of tomorrow in politics. The events of the times are tending to enormous changes in the ways of the thinking people, and these changes in thinking are bound to reflect themselves in the voting. The republican party, or the organization bearing that name, will be powerful in the future as in the past, not as it adjusts itself for its own benefit, but as it heartily and honestly responds to the needs of the times—and thus only." What the Standard says of the republican party will apply with equal force to the democratic party. The democratic party, or the organization that bears that name, will be powerful in the future not as it adjusts itself for the benefit of a few would-be leaders or for the purposes of temporary victory, but as it heartily and honestly responds to the needs of the times.

A Powerful Party.

The Philadelphia Bulletin, a republican paper, says: "Senator Hoar, as chairman of the judiciary committee, in its rejection of the nomination of Byrne for United States district attorney in Delaware, is reported to have taken the ground that to confirm Byrne in face of his association with Addicks would have been to indorse Addicks and his methods. The Massachusetts senator arraigned these methods as corrupt and demoralizing, and declared that it was a public duty to make a stand against them. The truth which Senator Hoar uttered should sink deeply into the presidential mind, for it expresses the sentiment of all decent republicans. Mr. Roosevelt now has an opportunity to unload Addicksism and wash his hands clean of complicity with it by withdrawing the Byrne nomination. Let him be big enough to acknowledge the mistake he made." But the press dispatches announce that Mr. Roosevelt had no intention of "washing his hands," but, on the contrary, he engaged in making earnest appeals to republican senators to reject the report of the judiciary committee and confirm Byrne.

Washing His Hands.