

CURRENT TOPICS

FRANCIS B. LOOMIS, first secretary of state, will be appointed, according to an Associated Press dispatch, ambassador to Mexico in succession to Edwin H. Conger, when the latter will retire to become a candidate next summer for the governorship of Iowa. The Washington correspondent for the Chicago Tribune says that Mr. Loomis is to be made the scapegoat in the San Domingan affair. It is claimed, that he is personally responsible for the protocol of January 20th which subsequently was repudiated by the state department. While the Tribune correspondent says that Mr. Loomis stands well with the president, "There is no doubt of the fact that the incautious public statement issued by the acting secretary of state in which he appeared so oblivious of the treaty-making powers vested in the United States has brought a peck of trouble upon the administration." As an attempt at pacification Loomis is to be transferred.

REPRESENTATIVE GROSVENOR of Ohio has announced on March 13 that the Ohio republicans would present the name of Senator Joseph B. Foraker to the republican national convention of 1908. Mr. Grosvenor also said that Secretary Taft expected to be appointed to the United States supreme court and would not be a candidate. It was recently reported that Harry S. New of Indiana would be chosen chairman of the republican national committee to succeed Mr. Cortelyou, but it is understood that Vice President Fairbanks objected to New's appointment and newspaper dispatches indicate that Mr. Fairbank's objections will prevail. It is no longer a secret that Indiana republicans will present Mr. Fairbank's name to the republican convention of 1908.

OFFICIAL REPORTS from Field Marshal Oyama, says a writer in the Chicago Record-Herald, covering only a portion of the great Mukden battlefield, indicate that Kuropatkin's losses are more than double those of the French in the famous battle of Sedan and far exceed the results of any modern combat. This writer says: "In the Shakhe region alone the Russian dead number 26,500, and the total killed and wounded are estimated at 90,000. This does not take into account the slaughter west of Mukden, where the Russians made a desperate attempt to stop the turning movement by General Nogi's Port Arthur veterans, the fighting which Kuroki led on the eastern flank, the work of Kawamura's flying column, or the slaughter of the Russian rear guard which has been going on north of Mukden ever since Friday. The Japanese already have counted 40,000 prisoners, and the number is growing hourly. Oyama's reports account for 130,000 men from Kuropatkin's army, which probably is less than half of the Russian losses. The Japanese lost 41,222 men from February 26 to March 12 in accomplishing this tremendous victory. The French loss at Sedan, killed, wounded and taken prisoners, totaled 103,000, while the Germans lost 9,000."

ACCORDING to the same authority, the following shows approximately the number of troops engaged and the losses on both sides in the principal land battles fought previous to the Mukden conflict: Mukden—Forces engaged: Japanese, 500,000; Russian, 325,000; losses, Japanese, 30,000; Russian, 65,000. Sha River—Forces engaged, Japanese, 250,000; Russian, 275,000; losses, Japanese, 35,000; Russian, 56,000. Liao-Yang—Forces engaged, Japanese, 200,000; Russian, 180,000; losses, Japanese, 18,000; Russian, 22,000. Port Arthur—Forces engaged, Japanese, 100,000; Russian, 32,000; losses, Japanese, 47,000; Russian, 15,000. Yalu River—Forces engaged, Japanese, 60,000; Russian, 10,000; losses, Japanese, 1,000; Russian, 2,500.

THE NUMBER of troops engaged in the battles of modern times and the losses on both sides—the losses including dead, wounded, missing and prisoners—are shown by the Record-Herald writer as follows: "Austerlitz—French, men engaged, 60,000; losses, 12,000; Russo-Austrians, men engaged, 80,000; losses, 30,000. Antietam—Federals, men engaged, 65,000; losses, 12,410; Confederates, men engaged, 28,000; losses, 6,500. Bautzen—French, men engaged, 110,000; losses, 20,000; Allies, men engaged, 90,000; losses, 13,000. Blenheim—Allies, men engaged, 52,000; losses, 11,500; French-Bavarians, men engaged, 60,000, losses 35,000. Borodino—Russians, men engaged, 110,000; losses, 35,000; French, men engaged, 130,000; losses, 45,000. Boyne—English, men engaged, 36,000; losses, 500; Irish, men engaged, 30,000; losses, 1,500. Chickamauga—Federals, men engaged, 57,000; losses, 15,851; Confederates, 50,000; losses, 17,804. Fontenoy—French, men engaged, 70,000; losses, 11,500; Allies, men engaged, 50,000; losses, 12,000. Gettysburg—Federals, men engaged, 93,500; losses, 23,000; Confederates, men engaged, 70,000; losses, 20,450. Gravelotte—Germans, men engaged, 211,000; losses, 13,000; French, men engaged, 140,000; losses, 13,000. Jena—French, men engaged, 100,000; losses, 10,000; Prussians, men engaged, 60,000; losses, 27,000. Leipzig—Allies, men engaged, 240,000; losses, 35,000; French, men engaged, 160,000; losses, 40,000. Magenta—French-Sardinians, men engaged, 55,000; losses, 4,000; Austrians, men engaged, 75,000; losses, 17,000. Majuba Hill—Boers, men engaged, 450; losses, 100; English, men engaged, 700; losses, 240. Marengo—French, men engaged, 28,000; losses, 7,000; Austrians, men engaged, 33,000; losses, 12,000. Sadowa—Prussians, men engaged, 221,000; losses, 10,000; Austrians, men engaged, 205,000; losses, 40,000. Sedan—French, men engaged, 150,000; losses, killed and wounded, 17,000; surrendered, 86,000; Germans, men engaged, 250,000; losses, 9,000. Shiloh—Federals, men engaged, 55,000; losses, 13,573; Confederates, men engaged, 40,000; losses, 10,669. Smolensk—French, men engaged, 175,000; losses, 20,000; Russians, men engaged, 120,000; losses, 40,000. Solferino—French-Sardinians, men engaged, 150,000; losses, 18,000; Austrians, men engaged, 170,000; losses, 20,000. Wagram—French, men engaged, 150,000; losses, 25,000; Austrians, men engaged, 120,000; losses, 25,000. Waterloo—Allies, men engaged, 214,671; losses, 22,976; French, men engaged, 124,588; losses, 25,600."

THE \$190,000 mileage grab undertaken by the house of representatives has brought upon the members of congress widespread condemnation. Walter Wellman, Washington correspondent for the Chicago Record-Herald, referring to this attempted grab, says: "Proceeding upon the assumption that their constituents' memory is no longer than their own, a majority of the house of representatives voted themselves \$190,000 mileage in the closing days of the last session, whereas one year ago not a single member, with the elections following in the fall, had the courage to stand for such an appropriation. To the ordinary congressman it makes a great deal of difference in handling public affairs whether he is to come before his people for election in a few short months or whether a couple of years are to intervene. The mileage grab is not a new question. It has been up several times in congress, but never has been successful. Nevertheless, had not the senate interposed and removed from the general deficiency bill the item inserted by the house, the raid upon the treasury probably would have been successful this year."

MR. WELLMAN directs attention to the fact that the majority who voted for the mileage grab also voted to impeach Judge Swaine on the charge of falsifying accounts, because he charged the maximum allowance of \$10 per day when his actual expenses were less. Mr. Wellman has compiled from the Congressional Record the names of members who voted for or were favorable to the mileage grab and arranged them by state delegations. Those who voted for the grab were as follows: Arkansas—Dinsmore. California—Bell, Daniels, Gillett, Livernash, Wynn. Colorado—Brooks. Connecticut—Brandege. Delaware—Houston. Illinois—Emerich, Foster, Graff, Knopf, Lorimer, McAndrews, Mann, Rainey, Rodenberg, Snapp. Indiana—Sterling, Cromer, Crumpacker, Griffith, Miers, Overstreet, Robinson. Iowa—Hull, Smith. Kentucky—Hunter. Louisiana—Breazeale, Broussard, Davey, Pujol. Maryland—Wachter. Massachusetts—McNary, Sullivan. Michigan—Bishop, Fordney. Minnesota—Davis, McCleary, Tawney. Mississippi—Hill. Missouri—Dougherty, Hunt, Robb. New Hampshire—Sulloway. New Jersey—Gardner, Howell, Hughes, Loudenslager, McDermott. New York—Draper, Fitzgerald, Goul-

den, Rider, Ryan, Sherman, Shober, Smith, Wilson. North Dakota—Marshall, Spalding. Ohio—Beidler, Grosvenor, Kyle, Morgan, Snook, Southard, Van Vorhis, Weems. Pennsylvania—Dresser, Patterson, Shull. South Carolina—Alken, Lagare. South Dakota—Burke, Martin. Tennessee—Brownlow, Richardson. Utah—Howell. Virginia—Maynard. Washington—Cushman, Humphrey, Jones. Wisconsin—Adams, Brown, Minor.

THOSE who were paired in favor of the grab were as follows: California—Knowland, Needham. Colorado—Bonyng. Connecticut—Lilley. Illinois—Foss, Marsh, Prince, Wilson. Indiana—Watson. Iowa—Birdsall, Cousins, Hedge, Hepburn, Thomas. Kansas—Campbell, Curtis. Maine—Burleigh. Maryland—Mudd. Massachusetts—Gillett, Lawrence, Tirrell. Michigan—Gardner. Minnesota—Bede, Stevens. Missouri—Bartholdt. Montana—Dixon. Nebraska—McCarthy. New Jersey—Fowler. New York—Ketcham, Perkins, Vreeland, Wadsworth. Ohio—Kennedy, Longworth. Pennsylvania—Acheson, Adams, Cooper, Deemer, Moon, Morrell, Sibley, Wright. West Virginia—Dovener, Hughes. Wisconsin—Esch.

EVEN NEW JERSEY is stirred by the anti-monopoly movement. Some time ago a movement was set on foot in New Jersey to do away with franchise grabbing and to provide that hereafter no special franchises shall be granted in the state for a longer term than 25 years. A joint resolution condemning perpetual franchises was introduced in the New Jersey legislature. This was followed up with a bill limiting future franchises to public service corporations as aforesaid. A writer in the Chicago Record-Herald describes the proceedings in this way: "Hearings were granted, however, and several mayors and leading citizens of the state appeared and argued for the bill, pointing to the example of Chicago, New York and other American cities and showing that in her franchise policy New Jersey was far behind the procession. Local illustrations and object lessons were not wanting. In Jersey City an 'old wreck' of a horse car service which was not worth \$50,000 brought \$4,000,000 to its owners. And the syndicate which paid this sum is reaping fat dividends. The whole value of the property lay in the perpetual franchise, from which the city derives next to no revenue. The advocates of the 'good old plan' made a poor showing at the hearings, but that did not disconcert them. They knew their legislature. As a matter of fact, the limited franchise bill was promptly killed. A committee substitute was offered in the house providing for the appointment by the governor of a commission to 'investigate the entire subject' and report to the next legislature whether any franchise legislation ought to be enacted by happy New Jersey. This substitute has been adopted and the opponents of limited franchise bills breathe freely again. The reformers are disappointed, but was it not unreasonable, in the circumstances, to expect progress at a more rapid rate? An investigation is an admission that possibly things are not ideal—which is a good deal for the majority of the New Jersey legislature. Painful and slow and reluctant motion is better than none at all—when it is not backward."

FOR the purpose of fortifying the position of republican senators who favor the ratification of the San Domingan treaty, the state department has issued a statement to show that there is precedent for the proposed collection of Dominican revenues by the agents of the United States. The following account of action taken by James G. Blaine, secretary of state, in an effort to settle the dispute between France and Venezuela, is presented: "In 1880 a difficulty arose between France and Venezuela with regard to the failure of the latter government promptly to pay the installments due to France on the settlement of the claims against Venezuela made in 1864. The Venezuelan government represented to the United States that there was danger that the French government would institute a blockade and take possession of custom houses for the purpose of collecting the money. Under these circumstances Venezuela proposed to deliver certain monthly sums to the government of the United States, which should distribute the money among the