coats of "expansion" are as careless of the dictionary as of the constitution. The Philippines do not mean expansion. It does not expand the fire of freedom to pour the water of tyranny upon it. A man is not expanded by filling his pockets with apples nor by putting a bushel basket over his head. Expansion is enlargement in kind. If the Spanish colonies applied for admission to this republic as states and we accepted them, that would be expansion. What is proposed to do with them is no more like expansion than the present administration is like Lincoln's. But a straight use of words is not to be expected from those who have to excuse themselves.

California should either exempt Stanford University from taxation, or clap a fine of ten dollars or ten days on all persons guilty of the misdemeanor of teaching school. If education is a finable offense, let us "get" all the malefactors.

The Eastern newspapers will be pleased to learn that the January rains drowned over one hundred thousand people in California. They were all of one family, the surname being Croaker.

It is a very poor person, indeed, this year of grace, who cannot persuade himself that Providence desires him to do just what he wishes to do.

Is there any logical connection between the Napoleonic face and the First Empire?

Rather than bear longer his present weather, the Easterner who thinks of visiting Heaven sometime later might as well get his ticket punched for a stop-over in California now, so as to be getting acclimated to the suburbs.

There are just two men in the United States who are satisfied with the secretary of war. One is the one who "fills" the place; the other, the one who filled it with him.

If the president would like to get rid of Alger, possibly John Sherman could suggest a way.—From The Land of Sunshine (February), Los Angeles.

VALUED POLICY LEGISLATION.

It is interesting to note that simultaneously with the decision of the United States supreme court affirming the constitutionality of the Missouri valued policy law, in the case of Dagg vs. Orient Insurance company there have appeared in the different state legislatures about a dozen valued policy bills. We believe these events are largely, if not wholly, coincident and that the bills would have been introduced notwithstanding the decision. While the argument presented in this case was a strong one, the insurance fraternity at large was not unprepared for the outcome, realizing, from past experience, that where state legislation against corporations is concerned, the equities of the situation have had very little to do with influencing the decisions of the court. The position of the supreme tribunal of the land appears to be that the state has the right to do with corporations just about as it pleases, regardless of rights, equities, justice or equality. State legislation upon valued policies began in 1874, Wisconsin passing the first bill. In 1879 Ohio and Texas adopted measures of this kind. Since that date, fifteen states and territories have passed valued policy laws, the larger portion of them since 1892. In many states legislation of this character has been defeated, but the constant tendency has been toward an increase. No valued policy law has, we believe, ever been repealed. Unquestionably a number of state legislatures will adopt this law at present sessions. While the supreme court decision may not have influenced the introduction of bills, it will undoubtedly be used to strengthen the hands of their advocates. Our opinion is that so long as the states retain supervision over inter-state insurance transactions, the fire insurance companies will be compelled to accept the valued policy as a condition of the business in the future, and adjust their premium rates in accordance with the experience met with thereunder. Good public policy never demanded the enactment of a law of this kind, but so long as the insuring public is willing to accept the increased cost imposed by such a law, we believe there is little for the companies to do except to take the situation exactly as it is, and conduct their business in conformity with the new conditions. Some day we shall have national regulation, and this, with other bad features of state control, may disappear. National regulation is not, indeed, a panacea for all ills, but it will be a great improvement over the present system.—Boston Standard.

MAXIMUM RATES.

The mania for fixing compensation for services seems to have assumed a new phase in Kansas. The barber pole and its stripes have attracted the law-making lunatics of that starving, shrieking state and hence the following from Topeka on the thirteenth of February, 1899, in the telegrams to Kansas City journals:

"Barbers had their day in court today. The bill which 'regulates' the barbers' profession came up in both the house and the senate this afternoon. When time for adjournment was reached at 6 o'clock neither branch had finished consideration of the bill and it will be resumed tomorrow.

"Much opposition to the bill as it stands was manifested, although the passage of some sort of a barbers' bill is altogether likely. The present bill requires every tonsorial 'artist' to pass an examination and receive diploma before being eligible to practise his profession. A state barbers' board is created which shall have charge of everything pertaining to barbers and barber shops. The board is estimated to cost $8,000 per year, which is to be raised by taxing the licensed barbers $2 per year. Cleaner shops and more care in sanitary methods are also contemplated under the law.

"When the bill came up in the senate this afternoon Senator Titus offered an amendment creating a maximum rate which barbers may charge in Kansas hereafter and the amendment was adopted. The schedule is: Shave, 15 cents; hair cutting, 25 cents; shampoo, 15 cents; dyeing hair, $1; dyeing whiskers, 50 cents; dyeing moustache, 25 cents. There are twenty-seven sections to the bill and the senate got as far as section 13 before adjourning.

Poking Fun at It.

"In the house there was a tendency to make light of the barber bill. Mr. Harris of Lyons submitted the two following sections as an amendment, which was lost:

" 'Section 27. It shall be unlawful for any citizen of Kansas to shave himself, or cut his own hair, or trim his own beard, without first obtaining the consent of the state barbers' board.

" 'Sec. 28. This act shall also apply to persons who cut horses' hair and shear sheep.'

"Mr. Scott of Elk moved that the bill be killed, but after a heated debate this motion was lost, only 16 votes being cast for it. Mr. Dawes and Mr. Benefiel argued that, whether the bill was just or unjust, the barbers of Kansas were entitled to more courteous treatment. Some members suggested the passage of the bill would drive out the 'cheap shop' where shaves are given for 5 cents and hair is cut for 15 cents. This brought Mr. Grattan of McPherson to his feet.

" 'Any man,' declared Grattan, 'who will get a 5-cent shave does not deserve any face; and any man who gets a 15-cent haircut does not care whether labor is paid or not. Such a man deserves to be bald-headed.'

"Adjournment was taken while the bill was yet pending."

THE DECEASED AND HIS HEIRS.

A man died leaving a large estate and many sorrowful relations who claimed it. Some years after, when all but one had judgment given against them, that one was awarded the estate, which he asked his attorney to have appraised.

"There is nothing to appraise," said the attorney, pocketing his last fee.

"Then," said the successful claimant, "what good has all this litigation done me?"

"You have been a good client to me," the attorney replied, gathering up his books and papers, "but I must say you betray a surprising ignorance of the purpose of litigation."—Ambrose Bierce.