

EX-PRESIDENT HARRISON.

Ex-President Harrison, in an address at Ann Arbor, Michigan, before the lecture association of the University of Michigan, upon the "Status of Annexed Territory and of its Civilized Inhabitants," declared that the constitution follows the flag and that the theory of territorial annexation of the administration was not in accord with American history. General Harrison's address is of peculiar interest at this time as the question is now before the supreme court of the United States for settlement, and the ex-president appears as counsel in support of the principle of the application of the constitution to the newly acquired territory.

"A government of unlimited and absolute executive powers," says General Harrison, "is not an American government. For one, I do not believe the makers of our Constitution ever intended to confer the power of any such government over any one in the Constitution. It is not right to say that because of slavery our fathers did not mean all men. It is a different thing to allow an existing condition to continue from creating an entirely different condition to meet commercial necessity.

"Perhaps it should be asked further whether the rule of equal taxation must apply to all people. The instructions of the president to the Philippine Commission seem to indicate that the Constitution must apply to any government that should be established there. The provisions our fathers fought for were for rights, not for privileges. No man can read that schedule of rights which the president gave to the Philippine Commission, in an inverse order, without horror. Did you ever read one of the treaties made by the United States with an Old World Power? On one side they speak of the 'subjects of her Majesty,' and on the other 'the citizens of the United States.' Now if these provisions, guaranteed to citizens of the United States, do not apply to the citizens of the Philippine Islands, it is time for us to amend these treaties by adding 'and subjects' after the words, 'and citizens of the United States.'

"The Constitutional provisions regulating the crime of treason seem to apply to these people. We have never had any trouble with this question in our government of the territories before. What have we been doing? Have we acquired these territories that we might hold them for crown colonies? There was only one door of escape from the provision for uniformity of taxation in the Constitution, and that was to declare that Porto Rico was not a part of the United States. It would seem that a region, where the educational and sanitary and other regulations are of in-

terest to the United States, is of itself a portion of the United States. It would seem that we should seek to find a way to govern this territory that providence has thrown upon us, for which we paid \$20,000,000.

"But don't you see that there is a graver peril hanging over us? Are the rights of the people upon the mainland secure when we exercise arbitrary power over people from whom we demand entire obedience? The flag cannot stand for the benevolent policies of the administration. It must stand for permanency. Is it not a mockery to raise the flag over the people of Porto Rico and bid them respect it, and then issue to them an absolute power of government from the staff beneath? If the act of annexation does not carry the Constitution, I can think of nothing that does. The Constitution goes to annexed territory because of the act.

"A gentleman wrote me that it was absolutely necessary to pass the Porto Rican tariff to protect the beet-sugar business. I thanked him but I could not see that it referred to the question. The fact that we give all the money secured by the tariff back to Porto Rico does not affect the question. It did not satisfy our fathers when it was proposed to expend the money derived from the Stamp Act in this country.

"These Constitutional questions will soon be settled by the supreme court. If the court shall hold that the Constitutional provisions extend to all portions of the United States, and all portions that are governed by the United States, then we shall conform our legislation and policy to this doctrine, and be sorry that we have ever held them at length in the government we offered them. The question of whether the government can take and control a hostile people is not a Constitutional provision, but one of conditions which exist. The consent of the governed to legislative action is an entirely different question. The entire written Constitution provides no rule for this question. The right to conquer and hold territory is a different question from the question of how we shall govern that territory when we have acquired it.

"I have been making no argument against expansion. The recent acquisitions from Spain may present a question of greater loss than gain. You will pardon me if I cannot rejoice because of the acquirement of territory which must be governed by authority rather than by the provisions of that grand old Constitution.

"In conclusion, allow me to suggest the sentiment: 'God forbid that the day should ever come when the thought of man as a consumer should absorb that grand old doctrine that man is a creation of God endowed with inalienable rights.'"

CLAIMS.

Congress will be required at this session to pass upon claims amounting to \$25,000,000, most of which are for property alleged to have been destroyed during the civil war. A part of these claims may be founded upon equity, but the bulk of them are originated by unscrupulous citizens who employ the assistance of equally unscrupulous lobbyists to push them through congress. It is nearly forty years since the close of the civil war and the government would long ago have satisfied any just and reasonable demand presented for payment. It is quite probable that claims of this character would have been brought to the attention of congress before this time. There would be no object in delaying the presentation of proofs in meritorious cases.

THE SENATORIAL ELECTION.

The election to fill the unexpired term of the lamented Senator Hayward will, as a matter of course, it is said by knowing ones, be taken up as soon as the legislature is convened and organized.

The law and regulations which apply to the ordinary elections of United States senators, upon the expiration of each six years term, cannot be so construed—some allegedly good lawyers declare—as to prevent or postpone immediate elections to fill vacancies caused by death; and subsequently made malignant by gubernatorial appointees, like Allen, who bristle all over with "the stings of ingratitude."

If this really is the law, why not elect somebody and eject Longtalker Allen on the first day of the next session of the legislature of Nebraska? That somebody will represent the conscience and intelligence of this commonwealth. It is important, therefore that he be an able, honest, cultivated man.

THE FARM STUDENTS REVIEW.

At St. Anthony Park, Minnesota, the Review is published. It is a superior periodical and devoted particularly to the dairy interests. In its issue for December, 1900, is advertised "Alderny Butter Color." This cosmetic for cow butter is described as "free from all sediment. Does not fade" and "recommended by hundreds of creamery men."

While this beautifier of the complexion of butter is advertised and praised as giving Congress. "a perfect June tint" to the product of the creamery, congress is asked to make it a penal offense to attempt to give an "Alderny hue" or "a June tint" to any other bread-greaser to be used as a substitute for butter. Between the colored brother and the colored butter, paternalism is kept busy at Washington.