redeemed. There is little evidence, however, that any one was duped in this way who was not willing to be. When the repeal of the State bank tax was before the last Congress, about one-half of the Democratic members opposed it, and the adoption of the remarkable plank at Chicago seems to have been mainly a campaign device to side-track the silver issue. What was most noticeable about last week's repudiation of the platform pledge was that it attracted so little notice.

❀

Republican State Conventions were held last week in Maine, Ohio, and Kansas. The Kansas Convention significantly refused to indorse either prohibition or woman's suffrage. In each of these conventions, however, the most noteworthy thing was the disposition of the silver question. The Maine Convention pronounced against "monometallism, either of gold or silver," and declared in favor of "international bimetallism, to be secured by all suitable means and the most strenuous efforts of National power." Ohio went further yet in demanding the restoration of silver to the currency. The plank adopted read as follows: "We favor bimetallism. Silver as well as gold is one of the great products of the United States. Its coinage and use as a circulating medium should be steadily maintained and constantly encouraged by the National Government; and we advocate such a policy as will, by discriminating legislation or otherwise, most speedily restore silver to its rightful place as a money metal." The Kansas declaration, though confused in statement, seems to favor the free coinage of the American product. Its wording is: "The interests of the producers of the country, its farmers and its workingmen, demand that the mints be opened to the coinage of silver of the mines of the United States, and that Congress should enact a law levying a tax on importation of foreign silver sufficient to fully protect the products of our own mines."

❀

These declarations in favor of a return to bimetallism—so remarkable as coming from the party whose representatives in Congress last fall voted 123 to 31 for the unconditional repeal of its own silver coinage law—are not the only recent indications of a disposition on the part of the Republicans to oppose the monometallist policy of the Democratic Administration. Several weeks ago Senator Lodge, of Massachusetts, offered a resolution that discriminating duties be levied against the products of all nations which refuse to enter into an international agreement for the free coinage of silver. Last week Representative Blair, of New Hampshire (ex-Senator), introduced into the House a resolution in favor of another international conference, to be held with the understanding that if international action is not agreed upon, national action shall be taken to restore silver to the currency. But more important than either of these resolutions is the interview with ex-Speaker Reed published in London. Without question—one might almost say, without a second—Mr. Reed is the Republican leader in the House of Representatives. He is also something more than a Presidential possibility. In this interview he takes the position that silver and the tariff must be regarded "not as two issues, but as one." His reasoning is somewhat difficult to follow, but his main idea is that the cheapness of silver makes it easier for Europe to buy from silver-using countries, and so stimulates exports from Asia while retarding exports from our own country. To check this tendency he urges that protectionists should direct the tariff policy so as to injure those nations whose hostility to silver lessens its price, and so increases Indian exports while decreasing American. The political economy of this statement may be foggy, but the politics of it is clear enough. The fall in the price of products since the establishment of international gold-monometallism has strengthened bimetallism all over the country.

❀

The testimony before the Lexow Committee as to the corruption of the New York police is rapidly becoming overwhelming in quantity and in its substantial agreement with well-known facts. Witness after witness has sworn directly to paying money for "protection" to the captains and "ward-men," giving names and dates and identifying the men accused. Other witnesses have, when on the stand, refused to testify to what they had already privately told the Committee's counsel; the fear thus displayed and the reckless stultification they have been driven to are in themselves negative evidence of a forcible kind. It may now be regarded as established by a great body of proof that for years the captains of police districts have dealt with the owners of disreputable houses and unlicensed saloons through their familiar official agents, the ward-men, and sometimes even face to face with the blackmailed persons; that it has been a regular and understood thing that these criminals might secure immunity on payment of, usually, $500 "initiation fee" and $50 a month. The ward-men are permitted to accompany the captains when the latter are removed from one district to another, and while the captains have seemed to think they possessed a vested interest in crime—"vested," probably, because they have paid round sums to corrupt Commissioners to get their offices—the ward-men have been the farmers of the vile revenue and the universal go-betweens for official corruption and blackmailed vice. Some of the more ignorant victim-criminals testified that they considered it a regular and semi-legal thing to pay for a "permit;" and the whole traffic has been so systematized, its channels so well known, that only almost incredible moral blindness or indifference on the part of the public can account for its long continuance.

❀

Much of the evidence before the Committee is even more convincing by its side-lights and necessary implications than by its main facts. Nothing has been more striking, for instance, than the tacit admissions of State Senator and Civil Justice Roesch, who went on the stand to deny imputations on his conduct, and ended by unconsciously giving a typical picture of the Tammany district leader, office-holder, and lawyer, who deals with politics and crime combined. Thus, he indignantly denied that he took $100 from a keeper of a disreputable house to procure immunity from the police, but admitted that he took the money as a "general retainer," that he never drew papers, or appeared in court, or had anything to do with any specific case for his client, but that he did give the client a card which would enable her, in case her inmates were arrested, to get them out on bail. And he stoutly maintained that he could always distinguish in his actions between his capacities as lawyer, Tammany district leader, Civil Justice, and so on. Perhaps his "clients," however, do not understand the Pooh-Bah theory, and paid the lawyer for the district leader's "influence." Dr. Parkhurst's manly appeal to the honest patrolmen to help bring to justice the "thieves and blackmailers" who disgrace the force ought to bear fruit in breaking the "vicious despotism" of the system. The talked-of investigation by the Police Commissioners has been postponed, at the request of the Lexow Committee. The Board of Commissioners, in the general public opinion, is too much tainted itself by these charges to be a proper judicial body to examine them. Mr. Croker's sudden departure for Europe in the

midst of this investigation has created something of a sensation.

❀

In the New York State Constitutional Convention the two most prominent features of last week were the hearing on the suffrage question of women representing the State outside of New York City, and the beginning of the discussion on State appropriations to sectarian objects. At the first hearing the attendance was large, the interest great, and the petitions presented numerously signed; but the addresses, though almost universally able, brought forward little if anything that was new. Only the pro-woman-suffrage side was presented. The argument on the sectarian school question was also from one side only—that which favors Mr. Holl's proposed amendment that

"No law shall be passed respecting an establishment of religion or prohibiting the free exercise thereof, nor shall the State, or any county, city, town, village, or other civil division, use its property or credit, or any money raised by taxation or otherwise, or authorize either to be used, for the purpose of founding, maintaining, or aiding, by appropriation, payment for services, expenses, or in any other manner, any church, religious denomination, or religious society, or any institution, society, or undertaking, which is wholly or in part under sectarian or ecclesiastical control."

Mr. William Allen Butler, Bishop Doane, of Albany, the Rev. Dr. James M. King, and others, argued forcibly for the adoption of the principles involved in this amendment —principles which The Outlook, we need hardly say, fully accepts and deems essential to the true interests of both Church and State. The appropriation of public money for sectarian purposes is wholly indefensible; the question of taxing church property is a separate one, on both sides of which much may be said, and into which we need not here enter. Dr. King pointed out that in twenty-three States there are now laws against the appropriation of public-school money for sectarian schools, and that in this State, in seventeen towns and cities, the school fund is now being divided between public and sectarian schools. "Such a compromise," he added, "means a surrender of principles on both sides." Mr. George Bliss and Mr. Frederic Coudert are to be heard for the other side next week. The Committee on Cities listened to President Seth Low, of Columbia, on the "Home Rule" question. Mr. Low urged that the Constitution should define closely the matters in regard to which the cities should and should not be subject to the Legislature. He made three formal propositions, the last of which we give entire, for it has a good deal more than local importance:

"In the matter of public franchises, at the present time a city can only say 'yes' or 'no' to what somebody wants to do. Its situation ought to be exactly reversed. It ought to be able to say: 'We want such and such a thing done. What will you do it for?' The Constitution should declare that every privilege covering the right to use the streets, either on, above, or below ground, whether crossing them or passing along them, should be the property of the city. The Constitution should forbid any city to part with the fee of such a franchise, and should limit to a moderate term of years, say twenty or thirty, the time within which such a franchise should run without re-adjustment of terms. The well-known principles of the ground lease, as exemplified in New York City's dealings with its ferry franchises, indicates clearly the method. A city should be permitted, by a vote of its people, to do for itself anything that requires a public franchise in order to be done."

❀

The Constitutional Commission in Louisiana has reported to the Legislature the amendments it has agreed upon. Several of these are of National interest. Among the judicial reforms proposed is the authorization of the Legislature to provide that less than twelve members of a jury may bring in a verdict. This change, so far, at least, as it relates to civil suits, has for a long time been growing in favor in all parts of the country. That it should be recommended by the Constitutional Commission in so conservative a State as Louisiana indicates that it will be widely adopted in the near future. The property involved in a civil suit is as likely to be the due of the plaintiff as of the defendant, and it is manifestly unjust that the plaintiff should be deprived of rights which nine, ten, and even eleven men upon the jury believe to be his. Another proposed constitutional amendment of much importance permits school districts to increase their taxation for school purposes by a majority vote of their property-holders. The exclusion of non-property-holders from the right to vote at such elections introduces the third important amendment offered by the Commission. This changes the electoral qualifications, and requires every voter to have prepaid a poll tax and to be able to read and write, or to possess property assessed at more than $200. In California a somewhat similar Constitutional amendment is one of the nine to be submitted to the voters of that State at the coming election. The California amendment, however, proposes no property qualification, and permits all present voters to retain the suffrage. Such a provision seems to be much more in accord with the spirit of democracy, which demands that questions affecting the whole public should be submitted to the whole public, and that citizens should not be disfranchised except through some fault of their own. The requirement that no new citizens, whether alien or native, should be enfranchised unless able to read and write the English language, seems to us eminently reasonable. But the proposal that a large and helpless class of present citizens should be deprived of what little political protection they now possess seems to us a step backward rather than a step forward.

❀

A correspondent calls our attention to the fact that the Massachusetts bill permitting the introduction of the Norwegian system does not permit the proposed companies to use their surplus profits for the enrichment of the stockholders. The surplus is merely to protect the stockholders against loss in case the system is abandoned. The bill has been modified by reducing the rate of interest from 5 to 4 per cent. This change removes the objection that the investment offered is "attractive" to private capitalists. The question is, therefore, narrowed down to this: Will public sentiment more quickly suppress dram-shops if the profits therefrom are used to support public charities? The experience of the past with systems of licensing admitted evils seems to us to indicate that to whatever extent they yield profit, to that extent they impede reform. At the same time, this Norwegian bill must be regarded, not as an independent measure, but as part of a comprehensive system to deal with the liquor business; the other, and an essential part of the scheme, is local option, by which, in any community, the traffic can be absolutely prohibited if there is sufficient public sentiment to carry prohibition. In short, the scheme is, first, local prohibition; second, no large private profits in localities where prohibition is impossible.

❀

We have received at this office a third package of lottery tickets forwarded us by some subscriber asked to act as agent. Each package has come from a different lottery company. The last package comes from New Orleans, the company sending it calling itself the "Louisiana Grand Lottery Company." The circulars closely resemble those sent out from Kansas City, Kan. Agents are, of course, instructed to forward money by express. In Kansas City,