

# The Nation.

NEW YORK, THURSDAY, MARCH 6, 1902.

## The Week.

Whatever discredit—and it is undeniably great—attaches to the continued playing fast and loose with Cuba, must be, so far, charged up to the Republican party and its leaders in Washington. They have ostentatiously made it their own affair. It is the Republican members only of the Ways and Means Committee who meet to frame the bill which remains so distressingly unframed. The “continuous performance” of a caucus to settle the matter is wholly a Republican show. The Democrats, in fact, stand ready to do more than Cuba asks. They would vote for absolute free trade with the island. It is the Republican party which has, in all this Cuban quandary, got on a conspicuous stage to exhibit to the country a disheartening spectacle of vacillation, divided counsels, and feeble-minded leadership facing both ways. Could the immense talent for blundering which the Democratic party possesses have surpassed this display? We doubt it. Republican jeers used to be addressed, and with much reason, to the distracted Democracy, when it was wrestling with the Wilson tariff or the silver question. “Why don’t the two wings of your party flap together?” That was a common taunt. But what are the Republican wings just now, and how are they flapping? How high can a party soar when one of its wings has beets in the place of feathers, and, even so, flaps hopelessly at variance with the other? These are the questions which political observers are beginning to ask, as they see the Republicans marking time at Washington while the country is crying out for action.

Unpleasant stories come from Havana of planters being forced to sell out to American capitalists, and of the agents of the latter boasting that they are “working” Congress so as to delay relief for Cuba and still further depress real estate in the island. It is not necessary to credit all these tales, yet they undoubtedly represent to the Cubans a very sinister side of the American occupation. Bargains in land secured by ruining the owners are not agreeable to think of, and we cannot wonder that the Cubans are angry and suspicious at the unaccountable procrastination of the House Republicans, or that they are almost inclined to despair of anything being done for them at all. But there is no real reason for them to despond utterly. The delay is vexatious, it is disgraceful to the House leaders responsible for it, but it will be ended,

sooner or later. The President is firm, the Senate is ready to act. In the end, the reluctant and squabbling Republicans of the House will fall into line, hating to do so as they will. We only trust that deferred hope will not make the Cubans sick at heart, and that the bankers and merchants of Havana will have faith enough in the honesty of the American people to extend credits, and so avert that bankruptcy and misery which the dilatory House is doing its best to bring upon the island.

Express authority is by the Constitution given to each house of Congress to “punish its members for disorderly behavior, and, with the concurrence of two-thirds, expel a member.” Immediately after the controversy of Saturday week two-thirds of the Senators present (if a quorum) might have turned Tillman and McLaurin out of their seats, and the same proportion of the body may do this to-day or at any other time. That would end the service of each under his present commission. But the Constitution says nothing about suspending a Senator—that is, debarring him from service for a longer or shorter period. It is argued that suspension may be considered one form of that punishment for disorderly behavior which can be inflicted, and the contention seems a strong one at first thought; but it soon appears that the other party in issue—the State from which the Senator comes—has rights in the matter, which are denied by suspension. Mr. Bailey of Texas, on Monday, made an argument against the claim that the Senate may suspend its members, which not only demonstrated his ability as a reasoner, but also impressed the majority so strongly that Mr. Frye the next day ordered the names of Tillman and McLaurin restored to the roll, and it is evident that many Republicans now doubt whether the Senate, as a body, can legitimately exercise this power. Mr. Bailey stands upon the provision of the Constitution that “no State, without its consent, shall be deprived of its equal suffrage in the Senate.” If Tillman and McLaurin are prevented by a majority of their colleagues from acting as Senators, South Carolina is obviously denied its proper share in the action of the upper branch.

But would not the expulsion of one or both also deprive their State of its equal suffrage in the Senate? Only until a successor or successors could be elected by the Legislature, or named by the Governor, if the Legislature were not in session. Moreover, expulsion is expressly authorized by the Constitution, and, therefore, the temporary loss of rep-

resentation for the State which it may involve cannot be regarded as conflicting with the provision that it shall not be deprived of its equal suffrage in the Senate. Suspension, however, would prevent representation of the State by the member suspended, while the State would be denied an opportunity to send somebody else in his stead, as in the case of expulsion. The power of suspension, if it exists, is obviously unlimited. The practice of college faculties might be imitated—suspension for a fortnight, in case of a minor offence; for six weeks, if more serious; for the remainder of a long session of Congress, if the misdemeanor were especially flagrant. Meanwhile, the State would lie helpless at the mercy of a mere majority of the Senate—unable to speak or vote through the man of its original choice, and prevented from making a new choice. It is plain that this principle cannot be admitted. It would be very perilous in the quietest of times. In a period when party passion might run high, and when the dominant organization, perhaps with a bare majority by the Vice-President’s casting vote, might be tempted to strengthen its forces in order to push through doubtful measures, it would be intolerable that it might suspend one, two, or, for that matter, any number of members, indefinitely “for disorderly behavior.” There was nothing left for the Senate to do except what it did on Friday—censure both of the offenders, as the wiser members of the Committee on Privileges and Elections recommended.

For the first time since the construction of our modern naval vessels was undertaken, a table has been published showing the original cost of each vessel and the amount of the repairs upon it. The compilation, which is the work of Paymaster-General Kenny, is interesting, primarily, as showing the exact cost of the finished vessel—not the sum paid to the builder, but the total expenditure necessary to put the ship into commission as an armed and equipped vessel of war. From this it appears that the battle-ship *Oregon* cost the enormous sum of \$6,575,032.76, which is half a million more than the price of the *Massachusetts* and *Indiana*, vessels of a similar type and size. But the *Oregon* has cost thus far only \$70,000 in repairs, exclusive of those now going on, while the *Indiana* has had \$282,000 spent upon her since completion, and the *Massachusetts* \$223,000. The cruiser *Philadelphia* cost less than two millions, but the enormous sum of \$514,000, or more than 25 per cent. of her original value, has been lavished upon her to make her serviceable, and this in about twelve years. Repairs to the *Olympia*

now amount to about \$500,000, and the *Cincinnati*, a cruiser built by the Government for \$2,371,904.52, has charged against it repairs costing \$457,000. The little torpedo-boat *Ericsson*, built for \$144,142.08, has actually needed \$48,749.99, or one-third her cost, to keep her in service. Altogether, \$9,346,235.16 has been expended on repairs since 1888, according to Paymaster-General Kenny's tables. When a prominent Senator was recently taken through the wonderful new Library of Congress, he could hardly express his astonishment on learning that it had cost only the price of one battle-ship. Beside the great civilizing and uplifting work the library is doing, the wasting of millions on ships of war is like throwing money into the sea. What humanitarian work could not have been accomplished with the one hundred and ten millions the navy has cost in construction and repairs alone since 1885!

The dignified protest of a group of well-known painters against the tariff on works of art should carry weight with Congress, as it certainly will with the more intelligent portion of the public. These gentlemen recall that this "tariff on civilization" was actually removed without any of the dire consequences which are supposed to attend upon tinkering with the tariff. The tax was once cut in two, and once, in the Wilson Law, actually done away with. It remained for the framers of the Dingley Law to reimpose the tax, and to apply it not only to modern works of art, but also to antiquities, which were formerly exempt. The artists who protest against this ignorant policy show a patience in the matter which we find it difficult to observe. If the tax on works of art is unnecessary for the purpose of raising revenue—and everybody knows that it is unnecessary; if the duty serves no protective purpose—and everybody knows that artists believe it does not; then there was never any reason for passing such a law, or for retaining it upon the statute-book if by any unhappy accident it had been passed. It will be difficult to make a protection-ridden Congress see so obvious a fact, and the painters who plead for a more hospitable attitude towards art see clearly that they have a long campaign of education before them. We believe that the time is opportune for such a movement, and that by skilful organization and agitation it may be possible to secure at least free entry for antiquities.

Collector Ivey of Sitka has been removed from office, but with him goes an Americanism of the elder, robust type. His clarion defiance of Great Britain, with his open refusal to obey the orders of a subservient and cowardly law-abiding Secretary of the Treasury, would

have stirred all hearts a few years ago. To-day it passes unnoticed, or else is laughed at. The heroic Ivey had issued an eminently patriotic order closing the port of Unalaska to Canadian sealing vessels. From timid Washington came a telegram directing him to revoke his order. But little did the authorities know Ivey. He promptly replied, "My Americanism will not allow me to rescind the order." As for the British treaty rights which his superior officer had referred to, Ivey punctured that pretence finely by showing that the treaty was, in any case, "ancient," and by maintaining that "the sooner it is abrogated the better"—the readiest road to abrogation being, of course, a refusal to be bound by it. Nor did he let the frightened Secretary off on the score of possible trouble resulting. "You," he wrote scornfully, "may fear the shadow of international complications and rescind this order, but a Reed, an Olney, or a Blaine would not." That has the true ring, and once would have roused the country. In happier days Ivey's splendid defiance of treaties, in the name of Americanism, would have brought him a nomination for some good office within a week. Now he is put out of office, and none so poor to do him reverence. His official head is off, but his Americanism goes marching on.

The testimony given last week by Gen. Hughes, before the Committee on the Philippines, in reference to our hospital for lewd women in Manila, was to the effect that he was solely responsible for it, and that he did not regret his act, for "if the evil had not been checked, fully two regiments would have been disabled." He did not say how many men had been disabled, in spite of these admirable precautions. We do not join with those who consider Gen. Hughes's action censurable. On the contrary, we think that, considered merely as an act of humanity to the miserable women, it was praiseworthy. No doubt some of our soldiers were kept out of the hospital because the women were kept in it. But the affair has a wider aspect. It recalls the somewhat famous Atkinson pamphlet, which the wise men in Washington excluded from the mails to Manila, some two years ago. Among other things deemed important by Mr. Atkinson were sundry tables of statistics drawn from the medical records of the British army in tropical countries, showing the proportion of soldiers under treatment for the very same disease which Gen. Hughes was trying to ward off in Manila, and showing also how impossible it is, by the best sanitary arrangements, to do more than curtail in some small degree its ravages. Treatment, after the disease is contracted, is of great importance and has been increasingly successful, but attempts at

prevention have been of only doubtful utility. If Mr. Atkinson's warning had been heeded, there would have been no American soldiers in the Philippines to contract and to convey these loathsome diseases. But what a flood of light Gen. Hughes has thrown upon the desirability of army service in the tropics as a career for young men!

After taking a second, but not a sober, thought on the proposition for a modified system of popular representation in the Connecticut House, the small-town delegates in the Constitutional Convention have rejected it, and the utter failure of this attempt at representative reform is probable. The little towns have nothing to lose by the failure, and, through their command of the Legislature, they can defeat any new attempt at reform through Constitutional methods. That they realize, however, the gathering political storm, is evidenced by their suggestion to make the Senate a larger and a popular body. This inversion of the natural order of legislative construction is offered as a sop to the aggrieved cities, but they are not likely to accept it. The demand for popularity in representation which forced the calling of the Convention, looked solely to a reconstruction of the House. Popularity in the make-up of the Senate was recognized in an amendment to the Constitution adopted last November, and there is no concession, therefore, in the present offer. But even were the cities disposed to exchange half their present membership in the House for a larger Senate, they would justly demand a Senate whose size would balance that of the House, and thus give effect to the popular will in the choice of United States Senators, or in the determination of important legislative questions. To that end a Senate of the size suggested by the rural delegates would be much too small.

Criticism of the Davis bill, which provides for an eligible list of city architects, takes the ground that the list is unduly small, or else that the Fine Arts Federation, whose nomination must in every case precede the Mayor's appointment to the list, is not the proper body to exercise that function. As for the length of the list, the Fine Arts Federation is to present before the 1st of June a list of not less than one hundred names of architects who in their judgment are competent to do work for the city. From this list the Mayor must appoint at least fifty architects, and may appoint up to a hundred. If, however, he appoints less than one hundred, he may increase the list by only five a year until the hundred is complete. Beyond one hundred he may appoint freely upon the nomination of the Fine Arts Federation. To recapitulate—the Mayor may fill the list gradually to a hundred or appoint a hun-

dred architects immediately, and enlarge the list as fast as the Fine Arts Federation sends him names. The Federation consists of eleven art societies, three of which are architectural. Its standing committee on city architects would presumably act more impartially than a committee from any one of the architectural societies. No committee chosen from the profession generally would command higher respect. Finally, the Federation, by the new charter, already nominates members for the Municipal Art Commission, and might very appropriately assume the cognate duty of selecting architects for the city. Any discrimination of this sort is bound to be the occasion of endless heartburnings. But somebody must assume this delicate task, or the way remains open for the Horgans and Slatterys.

Few men in the American financial world will be missed more genuinely, as time goes on, than Frederick D. Tappen, who died last week at Lakewood. It can be said of Mr. Tappen, as of very few other men in the walks of trade, that a grave financial crisis is the hour when the loss will be most strongly felt. Other men have done much more than he to direct the course of American finance in times of prosperous industrial progress and in times of gradual reconstruction after collapse. It is the peculiar fact of Mr. Tappen's history that he was called invariably to the wheel, by the unanimous voice of his colleagues, when the storm was at its worst and the ship showed signs of foundering. In the panic of 1893 Mr. Tappen was not even a member of the Clearing-house Committee, in whose hands control of the New York banking situation rested. Yet, without a dissenting word, he was placed at the head of a new emergency committee which virtually superseded all others. The banking community made no mistake; its assurance came, in fact, from abundant experience. With Wall Street as a whole completely bewildered, confounded, and, disheartened, the protective and remedial powers of practically the entire American banking system, committed really to the hands of this one man, were applied with a promptness, decision, and courage whose results were instantaneous. This occurred not once, but on at least five separate occasions. More remarkable still than this invariable success in mastering the crisis was the quiet and unassuming modesty with which Mr. Tappen, the emergency work once done, stepped back to his every-day duties in Wall Street. The personal notoriety and éclat which have often been made to follow such achievement were as distasteful to him as secret and underground banking practices would have been. The career of such a man means more to his generation, in our judgment, than the most

dazzling achievement of mere financial wealth or power. It stands as an example of what is best in American citizenship—complete and unhesitating devotion to the public welfare, without asking other return than the consciousness of duty well done.

President Wheeler of the University of California deals football the wounds of a friend when he says that the game is becoming more and more restricted to the specialist, that it tends to exclude even the average healthy man, and that it, on the whole, encourages "rooting" rather than physical development. It is worth the while of college faculties and graduate committees on athletics to consider these things, with a view to possible reform of the playing rules. When a game becomes so complicated that the mastery of its elements requires long study and training, its general utility immediately decreases. No college, for example, would spend tens of thousands of dollars a year and send excited throngs to encourage its fencing team. And quite aside from the danger of the game, the growing complexity of signals and "formations" makes the game, year by year, more difficult even to follow intelligently, still more to play. We may yet come to the pass where up-to-date colleges will offer compulsory courses in the strategies of football, just as already the students in certain colleges rehearse the college yell before a great game. Every man can pull an oar in some fashion, and every man handle a bat and ball, but an uninitiated man in a football game is out of the question. Here the English Rugby game, with its open play, is far more available than the *Kriegsspiel* which we Americans have evolved therefrom.

Application by Europe of a "commercial Monroe Doctrine" against invasion by American merchandise is the latest suggestion, anent the American peril. We suppose the Hungarian Premier, in making this suggestion on Thursday to his Parliament, was inspired by indignation at America's growing exports to countries which have heretofore been Europe's particular commercial preserves. Introduction of an "American system" of low-price necessities of life would presumably be pronounced intolerable, under the plan suggested. Europe, if the analogy were pursued, should warn the United States of its purpose to resist, by every means in its power, as a wilful aggression upon its rights and interests, all further expansion of American trade in such directions. But what would happen next? The Hungarian Premier appeared to have some misgiving on that point. Each of the European nations, too, he admitted, is fighting against the commercial interests of the others. What would be the use of a

"commercial Monroe Doctrine," applied by Austria, for instance, against the United States, if Germany were straightway to rush into places left vacant by the retreating American manufacturer, and Austria were to be shut out precisely as before? We fear M. de Szell has been led astray by an alluring metaphor.

The truth is, the body of Europe's complaint lies undoubtedly against cheap merchandise in itself, and the interest of the situation is increased by the fact that these indignant statesmen are using against us the very protests employed by ourselves against them, only a decade ago. At present it is not our ox which is being gored; but if the average protectionist oracle had a sense of humor, he could not fail to enjoy the joke, even at his own expense. In the calendar year 1901 our merchants forced unhappy Europe to buy a million dollars more in wearing apparel than it took from us in 1899. Who cannot see beneath these cheap coats the cheap man that a protectionist Administration dreaded in 1888? We do not know that the ethical side of the campaign against American merchandise has yet been fully grasped by the foreign politician. The "British gold" argument, which did glorious service here in its time, has been used, with proper change of garments, by the foreigners, and American gold has been denounced and defied as it no doubt deserved. But the attack on cheapness itself was the more brilliant move of our own protectionists. Europe will find abundant material for the purpose in such standard works as the Home Market Club's occasional publications and the Republican campaign text-books of 1888 and 1892. It need only change the name of the hated adversary, corruptor, and oppressor from England to America.

If Lord Rosebery thought that his repudiation of Irish Home Rule would bring over to his standard the Liberal Unionists, he has already had a rude awakening. They are perfectly willing that he should come to them; they have not the slightest idea of going to him. This was made clear by the Duke of Devonshire's speech on Thursday. The case was forcibly put by the Duke of Leeds, immediately after Lord Rosebery's Liverpool speech in which he "wiped Home Rule off the slate." What did this show? Why, simply that Rosebery had taken sixteen years to discover what the Liberal Unionists perceived at once! "We know," said the Duke of Leeds, "that there is more joy over one sinner that repenteth, etc., but surely the ninety-and-nine did not immediately appoint their erring brother to be the one man to guide their destinies."

## FINDING OUT HOW IT IS OURSELVES.

Mr. James Bryce, in the course of a letter to the *Nation* in 1881, made a striking prediction which is now in process of fulfilment as striking. He was writing of Gladstone's policy of moderation towards the Boers, after Majuba, and of the fact that it could be carried out only as a moral obligation; and he said that a "painful lesson" of those South African complications was "the extreme difficulty which any state, and especially a free state, where power changes hands from one party to another, finds in governing distant dependencies." With the prescient forecast of the true philosophic temper, he added: "This lesson may become significant to you should the policy of annexation be ever resumed by the United States." And then he remarked, in the guise of moralist and historian combined: "We are beginning to judge the behavior of the Russians in Turkistan and of the French in Algeria—even, perhaps, the darker misdeeds of the Spanish conquerors of America—more leniently when we perceive from our own experience how hard it is to govern justly colonies of mixed population, even with the help of steam and the telegraph."

The past four years have made this a very sure word of prophecy for the United States. Our old easy condemnation of the blunders of other nations has expired on our lips as we have successively fallen into the same pitfalls. The vices of Spanish colonial policy which we used to hate on sight, we have, when seen too oft, grown unpleasantly familiar with, and have first endured, then pitied, then embraced. To exploit a dependency in the selfish interest of the home country; to ignore the urgent recommendations of our own governors of distant islands, and to shut our ears to the bitter cry of the natives whom we tax without representation—that policy, from being the object of our Fourth of July denunciations, has too nearly become an axiom of government with us. No more curious reversal of a nation's historic judgments was ever seen. To lift horrified cries against Gen. Weyler, only to have our own army officers admit a little later that "he knew his business"; and then to pay Spanish colonial methods the sincere compliment of imitation—truly we are bound, as Mr. Bryce said, to judge "more leniently" the nations which we rashly condemned before we found out how it is ourselves.

It is not necessary to do more than suggest the details. The present argument of the protectionists in Congress, who would squeeze the juice out of Cuba and the Philippines like an orange, and then fling the pulp away, declares its own origin: "Made in Spain," is stamped all over it. It is simply the old idea

of the *Conquistadores*, to bleed the colony for the sake of the *metrópoli*. No grandee of Spain ever demanded in Madrid a right to a monopoly of colonial trade with greater insolence or a more hateful disregard of the interests of the colonists than the beet-sugar magnates have shown at Washington in their cool assertion that the sole duty of Congress is to legislate for the advantage of "our own people," and let the Cubans and Filipinos stew in their own fat.

Another graceful tribute to the more excellent way of Spain are we paying in our cynical disregard of the advice of our own colonial Governors. The Spanish Government was not without warnings from its local administrators. From Las Casas to Polavieja, it had men in its dependencies of intelligence enough and humanity enough to urge a policy of commercial justice and of consideration for the native. But selfish interests in the Peninsula usually were able to override all such recommendations. And our selfish interests are working for the same end. Congress passes a tariff bill for the Philippines in calm disregard of Gov. Taft's urgent advice. It stands facing both ways, as respects Cuba, though Gen. Wood is telegraphing that our indifference and delay are working havoc with the interests of the people under his rule. The Cortes of Spain ought to send Speaker Henderson and Chairman Payne a special vote of thanks for their delicate flattery in following its old and vicious example.

The disgraceful hesitation of Congress in coming to the relief of Cuba is all the more unaccountable in view of the fact that our Representatives have in Porto Rico a living object-lesson of what wise and healing legislation can accomplish. Healthy conditions of trade and industry are, after all, the main end of government. Oppressive taxation and strangled commerce are at the bottom of most revolutions; and the surest road to peace and contentment is to give trade a chance to expand freely. This has been done in Porto Rico, and the result is to remove that island from our list of vexed questions. Enabling the inhabitants to stand on their own feet has taken them off our corns. Impartial testimony to the present prosperity of Porto Rico is found in a recent issue of the Paris trade organ, the *Journal des Fabricants de Sucre*. It states that the situation of the island is greatly improved; that the sugar crop will reach 100,000 tons; that more money is in circulation; that new railroads and sugar factories are in course of construction, and that the development of Porto Rico is rapidly going on. And all is due to what? To "the establishment of free trade with the United States."

There stands the pertinent example for our timid and vacillating legislators at Washington. Like disease, like reme-

dy. Do they not remember how the fight for justice towards Porto Rico was won? In that case, too, selfishness and cowardice swayed Congress at first. It took the pressure of an indignant public opinion to force it to the final act, whose happy consequences we now see. Why go through the same weariful process with Cuba? Why be more stupid than the Spanish proverb says no man can be, and break our leg twice over the same stone? In the end, justice will be done. Eventually, as all admit, Cuban products must be given an entry into our market. The danger is that, while the House shivers on the brink, and fears to launch away, we shall poison Cuban public opinion, provoke those labor troubles in the island which Gen. Wood says he is afraid will soon break out, and make our abandonment of Spanish folly, which is bound to come at last, so slow and grudging as to rob it of all its grace and half of its conciliating effect.

## ABOLITION OF SUGAR BOUNTIES.

It appears certain that the international sugar conference has agreed to abolish all bounties, direct and indirect, and to reduce the customs surtax to a rate at which the so-called *Cartel*, or Sugar Trust, of Germany cannot exist. The execution of this agreement will be placed under international control, but it will not go into effect till September, 1903. It is reasonably clear that this decision was hastened by intimations from the British Government that, unless the bounties on exportation were abolished, a countervailing duty would be imposed upon the bounty-fed product. Such a duty levied in Great Britain would take the entire profit out of the exports from the Continent.

Hitherto Great Britain has refused to take this step. Her consumers have enjoyed a free breakfast-table at the expense of the Continental taxpayers, and British manufacturers of preserves, jams, marmalade, and confectionery have been able to distance competition by the help of the same generous donors. It is not the custom of the British public to fear Germans when bearing gifts, but the wail of the West Indian colonies has at last touched the heart of the mother country. The sugar-growers of the Lesser Antilles and of British Guiana have suffered from the competition of the bounty-fed product of Europe till they are at the last gasp. They must either adopt some other means of earning a living, or the competition in sugar-growing must be put upon the normal basis. If, as is supposed, Great Britain intimated her purpose to adopt countervailing duties, she did so in pity for her West Indian colonists.

The German Government, too, will be glad to be rid of the bounties, which