

# The Forum

---

JULY, 1902.

---

## AMERICAN POLITICS.

EVER since Congress assembled last December, the political leaders of both parties have kept constantly in view the Congressional campaign which is now approaching. Nearly every speech which has been delivered, almost every vote which has been recorded, has been influenced by political considerations. Although the election will not occur until next November, the groundwork of the campaign has been laid. The committees have been organized, headquarters have been secured, and other details have been arranged. It is too early, of course, to indulge in prediction. The recent reelection of Republican Congressmen in Oregon by increased majorities, although not unexpected, has naturally stimulated the enthusiasm and buoyed the hope of the rank and file of that party, and indicates, unquestionably, that the policy of the Administration in regard to the Philippines meets with popular favor on the Pacific Coast. This could hardly be otherwise. The prospect of increasing commerce with the Orient through the permanent retention of the Philippines is too alluring to the enterprising spirit of the West to be viewed with indifference.

There are other advantageous factors in the West for the dominant party. President Roosevelt's action in instituting proceedings to determine the legality of the merger of great railroad corporations, while it may have given an unpleasant shock to Wall Street, has been of incalculable value politically to the Republican party in the West and Northwest. It has given the people of that section, who are, more or less, at the mercy of these corporations, an assurance that their interests are to

*Permission to republish articles is reserved.*

be protected. The considerations which prompted the President's action are, it seems to me, very logical, if not unanswerable. If the merger was illegal, he argued, it should be so declared by the courts; if it was not in violation of the statutes, the exoneration of the railroads would be welcomed as a settlement of a disputed question, and by none more than by the corporations involved. The general belief that a Republican Administration would not, under any circumstances, be found antagonistic to the interests of great corporations may not rest upon an assured foundation; but of its existence there can be no doubt whatever. President Roosevelt, who is nothing if not courageous, has shown that, in his case, he is not the creature of corporations; and I greatly misjudge public sentiment if the exhibition does not add to his reputation and materially aid his party in the approaching contest.

In the Congressional campaigns during the last decade there has been some basis of calculation. It has been easy to segregate the doubtful districts from those where the majority, on one side or the other, was too large to admit of a successful inroad by the minority candidate. The labors of the party managers were then centred upon the few districts where the change of a comparatively small number of votes would affect the result. This year it will be impossible to work upon these lines. The situation has been complicated by the fact that, under the Apportionment Law enacted last year, a new alignment of Congressional districts has been made necessary in a little less than one-half the States. The present House of Representatives consists of 357 members; the next House will contain 386. The number by States will be as follows:

Alabama .....	9	Minnesota .....	9
Arkansas .....	7	Mississippi .....	8
California .....	8	Missouri .....	16
Colorado .....	3	Montana .....	1
Connecticut .....	5	Nebraska .....	6
Delaware .....	1	Nevada .....	1
Florida .....	3	New Hampshire .....	2
Georgia .....	11	New Jersey .....	10
Idaho .....	1	New York .....	37
Illinois .....	25	North Carolina .....	10
Indiana .....	13	North Dakota .....	2
Iowa .....	11	Ohio .....	21
Kansas .....	8	Oregon .....	2
Kentucky .....	11	Pennsylvania .....	32
Louisiana .....	7	Rhode Island .....	2
Maine .....	4	South Carolina .....	7
Maryland .....	6	South Dakota .....	2
Massachusetts .....	14	Tennessee .....	10
Michigan .....	12	Texas .....	16

Utah.....	1	Wisconsin.....	11
Vermont.....	2	Wyoming.....	1
Virginia.....	10		—
Washington.....	3	Total.....	386
West Virginia.....	5		

The increase of twenty-nine members of the House is divided among twenty States, as follows:

One each in Arkansas, California, Colorado, Connecticut, Florida, Kentucky, Louisiana, Massachusetts, Mississippi, Missouri, North Carolina, North Dakota, Washington, and West Virginia.

Two each in Minnesota, New Jersey, and Pennsylvania.

Three each in Illinois, New York, and Texas.

A majority of these additional Congressmen are to be chosen, it will seen, in States which are assuredly Republican. This gives an advantage to that party in the event of a close contest.

Opinion in Washington is divided as to the effect which the result of the Congressional elections will have upon the Presidential contest two years hence. There are Democrats who doubt the political advantage of the election of a Democratic House; there are Republicans who look forward with equanimity to a Republican defeat. The Democrats who are not anxious for Democratic victory argue that nothing can be accomplished when both the Senate and the President stand between the House and the enactment of reform legislation; while the Republicans who would not be downcast over defeat would welcome a condition of compulsory inaction relieving them from the danger of party friction and division over troublesome legislative problems.

On the whole, however, it may be set down as a fact that these indifferant partisans are in the minority. The managers on both sides will struggle as usual for success. If the Democrats win, it will be claimed that the political pendulum has begun to swing toward a Democratic President in 1904; while the Republicans will very properly regard the return of a Republican majority in the House as an indorsement of their policies. There is every indication of an earnest, even bitterly contested, campaign; and the announcement that the President, after consultation with his party leaders, will make several political speeches during the approaching fall may be taken as an indication that the Republicans propose to use their heaviest artillery against the opposition. The great advantage of victory to the Democrats would, of course, lie in the fact that they would be able to pass embarrassing resolutions of inquiry through the House, calling upon the heads of the executive departments for information which is now withheld. They would also adopt the old

Tilden cry of "open the books," which was so effective in 1876; and it would not be surprising if some of the facts laid bare proved to be of considerable importance from a political point of view.

If campaign issues are formulated in Congress, then the Philippine question ought to be the paramount topic of the approaching struggle. Two measures relating to the Philippines have been before the present session of Congress. The first relates to the tariff to be imposed upon importations from the archipelago; and the second embraces a scheme of civil government for the islands. In the House, the debate upon the first-named bill, which is the only one that has been considered by that body at this writing, was, as usual, of little value. The rules of the House, as enforced by the majority, allow only the minimum of discussion of great questions. In the Senate, however, the Tariff Bill was debated for five weeks, while the Civil Government Bill occupied no less than seven weeks in its consideration. During this extended period the entire Philippine question was exhaustively treated; the fire of debate being daily fed by the investigation into the conduct of Philippine affairs, which is still in progress. Appreciating the political importance which the Philippine question would assume, the Republicans of the Senate placed upon the Philippine Committee, under the chairmanship of Senator Lodge of Massachusetts, a strong representation of their party, the list containing such well-known leaders as Allison of Iowa and Hale of Maine, and including Proctor of Vermont, Beveridge of Indiana, Burrows of Michigan, McComas of Maryland, and Dietrich of Nebraska, the last-named being the only senator lacking in long experience. The Democrats, for their part, named five of the most persistent and vigorous fighters in the Senate — Messrs. Rawlins of Utah, Culberson of Texas, Dubois of Idaho, Carmack of Tennessee, and Patterson of Colorado. These five senators bore the brunt of the debate for the minority.

During the progress of the investigation conducted by this committee many interesting facts concerning the situation in the Philippines were elicited, notably the administration of the "water cure" to Filipinos by American soldiers for the purpose of obtaining information. The Democrats at once attempted to make political capital out of these disclosures; their move in this direction being immediately met by the President and the Secretary of War, who cabled directions to General Chaffee to allow no further tortures of this character. About the same time, General Smith's order to make the province of Samar a "howling wilderness," to "kill and burn," and to regard all persons over ten years of age as combatants whose punishment should be death, was made pub-

lic; and this, too, became a text for Democratic denunciation. Court-martials to determine the nature and extent of General Smith's policy of extermination, as well as his liability for disregarding the laws of war, were at once ordered by the Administration. The result of these court-martials has not yet been made known. In the mean time, the Democrats, in emphasizing the conditions in the Philippines, have been compelled to utter severe strictures upon the army, and for this they have been denounced with equal severity by the Republicans. Realizing that criticism of the army in the field is always unpopular, the Democrats have undertaken to make clear that their position is one of hostility not to the American soldiers, but to the policy which has placed the army in its present position. In Washington, at close range, it is easy enough to distinguish this difference; but it is doubtful whether the average reader of the condensed debates as printed in the newspapers has been able to appreciate the fine distinction. In other words, the Democrats have been placed in the position, much against their will and utterly at variance with their first intention, of deliberately seeking to traduce and embarrass the American army; and this fact will, in all probability, operate to Democratic disadvantage.

It is also a matter of considerable doubt whether the popular interest in the Philippine question is in proportion to the amount of time and care spent in debating it in the Senate. The American Indian, for instance, has always had a few sympathizing friends; but the people, as a whole, looked with indifference, if not callousness, upon the relegation of the race to meagre reservations, while the dominant white man took possession of broad acres, converting the hunting grounds into prosperous farms. Very much the same feeling, as I view it, exists in regard to the Filipinos. They are so far away; their side of the case is only presented through reports of army officers, which tell of savage cruelties, base deceptions, and utter unworthiness; and the sentiment is so strong in favor of our holding the Philippine Islands that it seems doubtful whether the efforts of the Democrats to arouse an opposite feeling will be successful. The time may come when the American people will pause and begin to question whether the game is worth pursuing. There will be a disposition to strike a balance on the national ledger. Already it is estimated, although the actual figures are carefully concealed, that the Philippines have cost us about \$500,000,000; and if the natives refuse to be "pacified," an increasing and never-ending expense will be entailed. At the present time, however, with prosperity abundant in the United States, the cost is not being taken into considera-

tion, and the hope of future recompense is too strong to be overcome. This being the case, coupled with the Anglo-Saxon disposition to acquire territory and then permanently retain it, one is disposed to believe that the Democrats will not be able to use the Philippine question as a successful campaign issue.

In discussing the subject on the stump, however, the two parties will have their lines clearly drawn. The Republicans are in favor of the permanent retention of the islands, establishing a civil administration which is to continue until the Philippine Islands "are capable, fit, and ready for the establishment of a permanent popular representative government." The Constitution of the United States is not to be extended over the islands, but the natives are to enjoy the privileges of the Bill of Rights, save the right to carry arms and enjoy trial by jury. The Democratic policy, as set forth in the substitute for the majority bill, proposes that the United States shall occupy the archipelago until the people thereof shall have established a government; that ninety days after the President of the United States has declared that all armed resistance to the United States has ceased, the Philippine Commission shall arrange for a popular convention which shall be the first step toward the election of a President for the islands; and that sixty days after the election of officers under the Filipino constitution, the United States shall relinquish all claim of sovereignty over the islands, withdrawing her military and naval forces, with the exception of such as may be maintained for naval, military, and coaling stations. In addition, it is provided that the President of the United States shall request Great Britain, Germany, France, and other powers to enter into a treaty agreement for the perpetual neutrality of the Philippines and their inviolability from foreign interference, and also for equal opportunities of trade to foreign countries.

The Senate disposed of the Philippine question on June 3, when, by a vote of 48 yeas to 30 nays, the measure reported by the Republican majority of the Philippine Committee was adopted. The vote was along party lines, with the exception that Mr. Hoar of Massachusetts and Mr. Mason of Illinois, Republicans, voted with the Democrats. Mr. Wellington of Maryland, who is a Republican only in name, voted with the Democrats, while Mr. McLaurin of South Carolina, who, despite the fact that he was elected as a Democrat, constantly votes with the Republicans, was arrayed with them upon the vote. All propositions submitted for consideration by the Democrats were voted down by a series of majorities ranging from 16 to 20, including the following offered by Mr. Teller:

It is not the intention of the Government of the United States to harass or oppress the inhabitants of the Philippine Islands, or to deprive them of their liberty, but, on the contrary, to assist them to establish a government of their own that shall secure to them all privileges, advantages, and blessings enjoyed by a free people, and ultimate independence under the protection of the United States against foreign powers and domestic violence. And to secure these ends as speedily as possible, the Government of the United States invites and urges the people of said islands to aid the United States authorities now exercising power in the islands to secure peace and order.

Messrs. Hale of Maine, Hoar of Massachusetts, and Jones of Nevada were the only Republicans to support this amendment. The bill was promptly sent to the House, where a substitute proposed by the House Committee on Insular Affairs is now being considered. This measure differs from the Senate bill in providing a Philippine legislature and in establishing the gold standard for the archipelago.

Two other important topics have been before Congress, namely, the Isthmian Canal Bill and the so-called Ship Subsidy Bill. Both of these measures may affect, in greater or less degree, the political situation.

The division in the Republican ranks regarding the necessity and advisability of enacting ship subsidy legislation, which was so marked in the last session as to prevent action, has not been entirely removed, even though the present bill has been shorn of many of the objectionable features of the former measure. When the subsidy bill passed the Senate on April 3 by a vote of 42 yeas to 31 nays, six Republicans, Senators Allison and Dolliver of Iowa, Proctor and Dillingham of Vermont, and Spooner and Quarles of Wisconsin, voted with the Democrats in the negative. This serious break in the Republican lines has had its effect in deterring the leaders of the House from attempting to enact the measure, and it is now pigeonholed in the Committee on Merchant Marine, where it will remain until after the approaching elections.

The Canal Bill, providing for the construction of an isthmian waterway along the Nicaragua route and limiting the cost to \$180,000,000, passed the House by a vote of 309 to 2, and was reported to the Senate without amendment by a majority of the Committee on Inter-oceanic Canal of that body. At the present writing it is being debated in the Senate. The proposition of the Panama Canal Company to sell their rights, concessions, grants of lands, unfinished work, etc., to the United States for \$40,000,000 has met with considerable favor, and has led to the introduction by Senator Spooner of a substitute for the Canal Bill. This substitute authorizes the President to accept the offer of the Panama



Company unless he shall be unable to obtain satisfactory title, in which case he is to direct the Secretary of War to construct a canal across the isthmus via Lake Nicaragua. If this substitute shall be adopted, the whole question will be thrown into conference between the two Houses, and adjournment of the session may come before the different propositions are reconciled. Many of the Republican leaders, however, express an unwillingness to go before the country with a record of inaction upon the canal question.

There was an outcropping of politics during the debates upon the Chinese Exclusion Bill. In the House, which passed a very drastic measure, the vote was unanimous, so that party lines were obliterated. In the Senate, however, the bill reported from the Committee on Immigration, which was also quite drastic, was rejected, and the Platt substitute, which effected exclusion through milder methods, was adopted. Of the forty-eight affirmative votes for this substitute all were Republican except five, while the Democrats voted almost unanimously against it. The labor interests of the Pacific Coast demanded the enactment of the committee bill and protested against the Platt substitute, while the business interests appealed urgently for the adoption of the less vigorous, and, therefore, less objectionable law. When the substitute had thus been adopted, the bill as amended was passed by a vote of 76 to 1, the solitary negative being cast by Senator Hoar of Massachusetts, who expressed his opposition to all exclusion legislation on the ground that it violated the principle of human rights.

The Republicans will, during the campaign, probably claim the credit of passing the Oleomargarine Bill, which protects the dairymen by placing a tax of ten cents a pound upon colored oleomargarine. This credit is due them, inasmuch as they control Congress, but the vote by which the measure became a law was not divided upon partisan lines.

It is a remarkable fact that the question which is really agitating the popular mind has received little or no consideration in Congress. Not one speech — certainly not one of commanding importance — has been made in Congress upon the trusts. If history is to repeat itself, the most potent political factor in this country is the price which is paid for the daily necessities of life. Let us recall, for instance, the year when the McKinley Tariff Bill was passed. Long before that measure became a law, the manufacturers, certain of protection from foreign importation, increased the cost to the consumer of even the smallest articles



of household use and wear; while, when the bill was finally signed by the President, the rise in prices was without precedent in time of peace. The result was a revolt on the part of the people. Something of the same condition now exists, when the beef trust has so increased the price of beef as to make the use of that food almost impossible among the poorer classes. Other articles of necessity are also costing more money than ever before. Not only are trusts of national extent fastening themselves upon the country, but in every city and town the various ice companies and other vendors of necessities are consolidating for the purpose of destroying all competition and leaving the consumer with the alternative of paying an arbitrary exorbitant price or of doing without the desired article. It has so happened that these trusts have reached their greatest power under a Republican Administration, which, until now, has been inactive in enforcing the laws enacted to prevent combinations in restraint of trade. The people, either rightly or wrongly, regard the Republican party as being largely responsible for the existence of these extortionate combinations. Antagonism to trusts, on the other hand, is naturally the position of the Democratic party.

In this case, as in the proceedings against the merger, President Roosevelt has boldly grasped the nettle. His direction to the Attorney General to invoke the law against the beef trust is one of the wisest acts, politically speaking, of his Administration. While the Republican majority in Congress has been inactive, the President has taken the one step which may prove the salvation of his party when the trust question becomes an issue on every stump next fall. Through his action the Republican orators will be enabled to assert that the Administration is honestly endeavoring to break down the trusts. In fact, the injunction recently obtained in Chicago against the beef trust is an earnest of the sincerity and ability with which the Government's legal representatives are making their fight. There are many who minimize President Roosevelt's wisdom as a politician; but certainly he is the only one in his party who has had the forethought to discount, by affirmative action, one of the most vigorous assaults that will be made upon his party. But for his course it would have been impossible for the Ohio Republicans, in their recent State Convention, to declare that the Sherman Anti-trust Law "is now being vigorously applied by a Republican Administration in the prosecution of unlawful combinations."

It is worth while, in this connection, to reproduce the opening sentence of the trust plank of the Ohio Convention. It reads as follows:

We recognize the necessity of coöperation in order to meet new conditions in the

industrial world, and to compete successfully for the world's markets; but all combinations that stifle competition, control prices, limit production, or unduly increase profits or values, and especially when they raise the prices of the necessities of life, are opposed to public policy and should be repressed with a strong hand.

This may be regarded as stating very explicitly the Republican position; and its reproduction, or paraphrase, may be expected in the remaining Republican State conventions yet to be held. The Democratic platforms will contain, as usual, a wholesale condemnation of all trusts. The increase in the cost of trust-controlled articles is, however, a more eloquent declaration against these great combinations of capital and industries than can be penned by any framer of convention platforms.

Exhibitions of political sagacity on the part of the Democratic leaders in Congress are so rare as to make worthy of note the tactics displayed by them when the Cuban Reciprocity Bill was before the House. This measure provided for a concession of twenty per cent in the tariff imposed upon all articles entering the United States from Cuba. It was asserted by the opponents of the proposed legislation, who were mainly Representatives from beet-sugar States, that the benefit of this reduction would largely inure to the profit of the sugar trust. That corporation being a very large purchaser of Cuban sugar, the principal item of export from the island, and also controlling the price at which refined sugar is sold in the United States, it is easy to understand how it could put into its own treasury the immense amount of money saved through the payment of lower duties. In order to offset this alleged benefit, the Democrats of the House, assisted by what are known as the beet-sugar Republicans, secured the adoption of an amendment to the bill abolishing the tariff on refined sugars, known as the differential tariff. This was a severe and unexpected blow at the sugar trust; for it aimed at the removal of the protective barrier which gives the trust the monopoly of the American market by preventing the importation into this country of the product of the German beet-sugar refineries.

When the bill went to the Senate, therefore, it provided for the desired reciprocity with Cuba with the certainty that the sugar trust would not benefit thereby. Owing to serious divisions among the Republican senators, the bill has not yet been reported to the Senate from the Committee on Relations with Cuba. It is expected, however, that the committee will allow the reciprocal provision to remain, while the amendment adversely affecting the trust will be eliminated. The Republicans will explain this action on the ground that unless protection is removed from all other manufactured articles, such as steel, iron, glass,

etc., there is no reason why the sugar refiner should be singled out and made to suffer. The Democrats may be expected, however, to make the most of the dilemma in which the Senate Republicans find themselves. At the present time, the bill has not been taken up in the Senate for consideration, and a long and bitter contest is promised before the final vote is taken. It will be opposed upon the grounds that increased importations of Cuban cane sugar will threaten the rapidly growing beet-sugar industry, and also that it is an insidious assault upon the protective system; it will be advocated as a necessary prelude to increased trade with Cuba and as a redemption of the promises made to the Cubans by the late President McKinley. The proportion of Republicans in the Senate is so large that it can lose at least twelve votes and still leave the forty-five necessary for a majority. The prospect is that the bill will pass the Senate in the shape in which it is reported; but whether the coalition in the House between the Democrats and the beet-sugar Republicans will then remain firm is a question which cannot now be answered. The House may recede from its position; but if, on the other hand, it compels the Senate to accept its view, the removal of the differential tariff will be the first serious blow ever dealt at a trust. Failure to enact any legislation will be tantamount to a confession that no relief could be given Cuba if such relief was coupled with legislation adverse to the sugar trust; and this is a position which, it seems to me, the Republicans will hardly care to assume.

Although the Ohio Republicans, in their State Convention, declared in favor of reciprocity with Cuba, thus indorsing the President's position, it is hardly likely that the question will become a political issue, except in so far as its consideration is interwoven with the attitude of both parties toward the sugar trust. It should be remarked, in passing, that the action taken by the House in amending the bill after it had been reported from the Ways and Means Committee was the first successful revolt against the Republican leaders of the House. Since that time the House has, more than once, exercised the same independence, notably in passing the bill for the admission of Oklahoma, New Mexico, and Arizona as States. The party managers in the House threw the weight of their influence against it, but without avail. The bill is now before the Senate Committee on Territories, with little prospect of favorable action. There is no desire on the part of the Republican majority of that committee to increase the number of Senators.

Examination of the party platforms already adopted by State con-

ventions indicates that the principal political issues are the Philippines, the trusts, and the tariff. All efforts on the part of Western Republicans to lower the rates of the present Dingley Law have been futile, and it is quite certain that Congress will adjourn without any legislation in this direction. The Democrats, arguing that high tariff breeds trusts, will urge a reduction. Nearly ten years have passed since the Democrats made a sad exhibition of incapacity in their attempt to revise the tariff, and plunged the country into a long and gloomy period of uncertainty and business derangement. Perhaps the memory of that disastrous experience has faded from the minds of the American people; if not, it is hard to imagine that its repetition will be deliberately invited. There may be inequalities and even iniquities in the present tariff; but a wholesale overhauling of the schedules by unfriendly hands is a contingency not to be contemplated without some anxiety on the part of the business interests of the country.

It is very easy to predict that one issue will not appear in the campaign. We shall hear nothing about the free coinage of silver. Even in Kansas, where the advocates of free coinage once thrived in generous numbers, a Democratic State Convention recently met, adopted a platform, and adjourned, without mentioning silver. The Indiana Democratic State Convention was equally silent. In the Senate a few days ago Senator Stewart of Nevada, formerly the most rabid believer in the white metal, announced that the silver issue was dead, and added, quite truthfully, that any man who attempted to revive it upon the stump would be greeted with laughter. Mr. Stewart's explanation of the changed condition is that the enormous discoveries of gold have made money plentiful, and that additional coinage of silver is unnecessary to meet the demands of trade. Whether or not this be the true explanation, the fact remains that the financial question has been eliminated for the present, at least, from the field of politics. The lack of public interest was shown when the House recently discussed a bill relating to subsidiary silver coinage. Two years ago the debate would have been followed with close attention, and would have engaged the leaders of both parties. As it was, the bill was discussed in a most perfunctory manner. Even the proposition to continue the silver standard in the Philippines and enter upon the coinage of an American Philippine dollar, to be worth only its bullion value and not to be legal tender in the United States, was agreed to in the Senate without the slightest debate. Indeed, if Senator Lodge had not briefly explained the proposition in his analysis of the bill, the subject would not even have been mentioned.

The disappearance of the silver issue will undoubtedly affect the selection of the next Democratic candidate for the Presidency.

When Mr. Bryan visited Washington some time ago and conferred with Democratic Senators and Representatives, he manifested considerable interest in the effort to secure an amendment to the Constitution providing for the election of United States Senators by the people. His desire to make this proposition a political issue met with the sympathy of many of his party friends, and they pledged him their support. The progress of the amendment toward ratification has, however, been blocked by an adroit move on the part of its opponents.

The amendment passed the House without debate and by a unanimous vote. In the Senate it was referred to the Committee on Privileges and Elections, of which Senator Burrows of Michigan, an advocate of popular election of Senators, is the chairman. Senator Depew of New York offered the following amendment:

The qualifications of citizens entitled to vote for United States Senators and Representatives in Congress shall be uniform in all the States, and Congress shall have power to enforce this article by appropriate legislation and to provide for the registration of citizens entitled to vote, the conduct of such elections, and the certification of the result.

Very innocent these few lines appear; and yet they have naturally aroused the earnest opposition of the Democrats who favor popular election of Senators. An analysis of Mr. Depew's proposition shows that it proposed federal supervision of elections, in the most wholesale manner. Its enactment would at once enable a Republican Congress, supported by a Republican President, to pass laws which would nullify all that has been done in Louisiana, Mississippi, South Carolina, and North Carolina in the direction of suppressing the negro vote by imposing conditions under which the illiterate negroes cannot qualify. Mr. Depew's argument for the adoption of his amendment is a plausible one. He says that under the present system the Legislature elects Senators and is the judge of the qualifications of its members. When, however, legislative authority for the election of Senators is removed, some competent tribunal must be substituted to judge the qualifications of the people who vote, and he proposes to give Congress this jurisdiction.

Mr. Depew's amendment has created a deadlock in the committee. There is a majority against the original proposition as it came from the House; there is a majority, composed of Republicans, in favor of adding Mr. Depew's suggestion; and there is a majority against the original

proposition with the amendment added. At the present writing a resolution is pending in the Senate to discharge the committee from further consideration of the subject. It is probable that if this resolution is adopted the Democrats will seek to defeat Mr. Depew's amendment, failing in which they will be forced to abandon their efforts to secure favorable action upon the original proposition; for they will never agree to the federal supervision over elections which is authorized in Mr. Depew's amendment.

The suppression of the negro vote in the South has also come before the House in a resolution, offered by Representative Crumpacker, of Indiana, providing for the appointment of a committee of thirteen

whose duty it shall be, and who shall have full and ample power, to investigate and inquire into the validity of the election laws of the several States and the manner of their enforcement, and whether the right to vote at any election for the choice of electors for President and Vice-President of the United States, Representatives in Congress, the executive and judicial officers of any of the States or the members of the Legislature thereof is denied to any of the male inhabitants of any of the States, being twenty-one years of age and citizens of the United States, or in any way abridged, except for crime.

The introduction of this resolution led to a caucus of the Republican members of the House, an indorsement of the proposed investigation being agreed upon after some discussion. The Committee on Rules was asked to bring the resolution before the House, and semi-official announcement was made that such action would be taken by the Committee. Up to the present time, however, the Committee has been quiescent, and it is generally believed that the inquiry has been abandoned. The action on the part of the Republicans afforded the Democrats a rallying cry, and solidified their party in the South. There is little doubt that if the investigation had been ordered it would only have resulted in eliciting facts already known regarding conditions in the South, without securing any remedy therefor. It would also have aroused sectional feeling, and would have retarded to a very considerable degree the progress which the Republican party is said to be making in the Southern States.

The relations between the President and Congress continue amicable. The predictions freely made when Mr. Roosevelt entered upon the duties of his office, that he would speedily become involved in controversies with one or the other branch of Congress, have not been realized, nor are there underneath the surface any indications of disagreement. His political appointments have been satisfactory to the Senate, except in a few minor instances.



The fact that the President desires the honor of a renomination at the hands of his party is no secret. With his customary frankness he has avowed his ambition in that direction. It is of interest, therefore, to note that the recent Republican State Convention of Kansas took the initiative in formally indorsing him as the party candidate in 1904. The commendatory plank in the platform was as follows:

He has so discharged his duties as to win the respect and affection of the people. We are proud of his ability, his courage, and his sturdy Americanism, and we pledge him the cordial and earnest support of Kansas Republicans. Kansas looks forward to the glorious time, but two years distant, when the victorious Republican party will march under banners bearing this inscription: "For President, Theodore Roosevelt."

And the Ohio Republican State Convention had this to say of the President:

We cordially sustain President Roosevelt in his pledge to carry forward the great work which came to him as a sacred legacy. We recognize his earnest and conscientious devotion to the welfare of the people, and approve the high aims and character of his Administration. He faithfully maintains the plighted faith of the nation, upholds the best standard of the public service, and stands by the policies which assure stability and confidence. He represents a civic patriotism of the highest type, and the destinies of the country are safe in his hands. In his frank, able, and courageous efforts to protect the public interests he is entitled to full and unreserved support.

This eulogy from a convention absolutely dominated by Senator Hanna is significant. It shows that Mr. Hanna is as loyal to the present President as he was to President McKinley. There may come a time in the future when the Ohio Republicans will take occasion to present Mr. Hanna's name as a candidate for the Presidency; but he has said, over his own signature, that he is not an aspirant for Presidential honors. He has made the same statement in private conversation. He is entitled to be taken at his word; and I do not believe that the praise accorded by him to the President in the Ohio declaration is insincere. At any rate, up to the present time, the President has had smooth sailing in the waters of his party. There have been no storms, not even a roughing of the sea. To this extent, at least, the political pessimists have been disappointed.

HENRY LITCHFIELD WEST.



## FOREIGN AFFAIRS.

THE last half of the last three months has witnessed many important international events. The world has taken part in the coronation of two kings. It has seen a new republic come into being. It has seen France pass safely through the throes of a national election; and a national election in France is always a political manifestation to be regarded with concern by the world, so fickle are the French and so uncertain their politics. It has seen the only war waged under modern conditions and with modern implements of warfare, brought to a termination, and peace, after having been broken for three years, reigning over the entire world with the exception of the guerilla struggle carried on in the Philippines. It has seen one of the most picturesque islands of the Antilles ruined, and its people wiped out of existence in the twinkling of an eye. It has deplored the death of an ambassador who, loyal to his sovereign, was no less loyal to the country to which he was accredited and for which he had such a sincere affection.

The coronation of King Edward VII affords an opportunity for the British Empire to take stock of itself and find out whether, as so many of its detractors assert and hope, it is ready to apply for a receiver and go out of business, or whether despite the stress of the last three years it is still solvent, still able to continue in business, still one of the world's greatest commercial and political forces. Envy, malice, and prejudice to the contrary notwithstanding, the impartial observer of events, who reads the future of nations by the light of their past and who draws on history for the causes that bring about the decline of empires, must agree that, although England has been humiliated, has lost some of her prestige, and has exhibited to the world crass incompetence in many ways, she is still very powerful, very prosperous, and very rich; she is still feared as much as she is admired; she is still, in some respects, the wonder of the world. For what country except England could have carried on this war in South Africa with such slight disturbance to her domestic affairs? What other country could have stood