

are referred to the Supreme Court. It is proposed at first to make this tribunal simply an Anglo-American one, but the promoters of this movement hope that the time will come when other nations will enter into such fraternal relations with England and America that the tribunal will grow to be one of Christendom. The present time is seized to press this movement upon the people and upon the Government because recent events have forced upon the attention of both the perils which come from even rumors of war. Correspondence may be addressed to the Hon. C. P. Daly, care American Geographical Society, 11 West Twenty-ninth Street, New York City.



The Cuban insurrection is illustrating theoretically and practically not a few important principles of international law. When, for instance, one read last week that the vessel *Bermuda* sailed from New York with a cargo of arms intended for the insurgents, and that the United States authorities offered no opposition, and when it was also remembered that a week ago or more this same ship was seized by the United States for attempting to carry arms and men to the aid of the Cubans, there was an evident necessity of finding a principle to account for the two apparently inconsistent acts. The principle is really simple. It is perfectly lawful in times of peace to send or carry arms or ammunition anywhere, and it is likewise lawful for unarmed men to embark for any country. What is unlawful is to fit out or convey a military expedition aimed against a country with which the United States is at peace. This principle was settled some years ago in the case of the *Itata*, when an opinion of the United States Attorney-General was given that "no law or regulation forbids any person or government from purchasing arms from the citizens of the United States and shipping them at the risk of the purchaser." In the case of the *Horsa*, whose officers have just been convicted in Philadelphia, the charge was that a military expedition was being conveyed to Spain. The debate on the Cuban question has continued in the Senate in a desultory way; on Monday of this week Senator Sherman moved to send the whole subject back again to a conference committee of the two Houses, and that action was taken. The supposed object is to eliminate the third of the original House resolutions which were agreed upon by the former conference—namely, the resolution threatening intervention.



The Senate Committee on Privileges and Elections—Senators Chandler and Gray alone dissenting—has reported favorably on the proposed Constitutional amendment providing for the election of United States Senators by a direct vote of the people. The Committee naturally defends the present representative character of the Senate, but recognizes and urges that the growing disposition to deny the body this character would be greatly lessened if the Senators were elected by the voters instead of the legislators. The Committee realizes that it is an anomaly for Senators still to be chosen by the legislators when all the Governors and the President are now chosen by the people; and it believes that conformity with the democratic principle will not only be far more satisfactory to the voters, but add to the authority of the Senate. It does not review the legislative scandals that have been the outcome of the purchase of Senatorships, nor does it intimate that the prestige of legislatures has suffered since the adoption of the Constitution, but it shows clearly how much the business of electing Senators interferes with the regular work of legislative assemblies. In this connection it refers to the recent protracted contests in Delaware, Oregon, Wash-

ington, Montana, Idaho, Wyoming, and Kentucky. It also calls attention to the difficulties occasioned in the selection of State legislators through the frequent necessity of dismissing every consideration except that of how the candidate will vote on the question of the Senatorship. "The candidate's qualifications for the business of general legislation, or the views he entertains with reference to the great material interests of the State, are lost sight of." To our minds, this last reason for the proposed change is perhaps the most important of all.



We have already expressed the opinion that Mr. Bayard committed a serious mistake in attacking before an English audience the policy of protection, believed in and defended by a large portion of the American people. The Ambassador of a country is the representative of the country, not of the party which happens to be in power, and it is a diplomatic blunder for him to criticise before a foreign audience the policy of the party to which he does not belong. But, for a similar reason, it was inexpedient and undiplomatic for the House of Representatives to pass a resolution censuring him for his utterance. In its dealings with other nationalities America should be one. Within its own boundaries criticism may be freely indulged in, so long as it is just and not venomous. It is, for example, perfectly legitimate for the press to criticise the President's Venezuelan message and the action of Congress thereon; but it would be quite a different matter for any American, and still more for one acting in a representative capacity, to criticise that action in a speech to an English audience; and it is for the same reason malapropos for the country to issue a public criticism upon the action of its Ambassador abroad—a criticism which, though not in form, is in effect addressed to, or at least uttered in the hearing of, that country. If we may be allowed a familiar illustration borrowed from the household, no lady will criticise her servants before her guests. If Congressmen thought, as we think, that the utterance of Mr. Bayard was malapropos, their proper course would have been to urge their views privately upon the Secretary of State, and urge him quietly to counsel the Ambassador to refrain from such utterances in the future. Our domestic differences ought not to be projected into the horizon of other nationalities.



On April 21 Louisiana will hold its quadrennial State election, and the campaign now going on is a most exciting one. In its strange confusion of issues it is typical of the political situation throughout the country. Three-fourths or perhaps five-sixths of the Democrats of Louisiana are reported to be in favor of the free coinage of silver. In the Fourth Congressional District, where a direct vote on this question was taken at the Democratic primaries, the majority in favor of free silver stood ten to one. Only the city of New Orleans and the French parishes are indifferent or hostile to silver. Nevertheless Governor Foster, who, as an opponent of the Lottery, was elected to his office by the votes of the free-coinage parishes, is himself a resident of one of the French parishes and opposes free coinage. His administration has been so satisfactory that a renomination could not be refused him. Thus it has come about that the free-coinage Democratic party has an anti-silver candidate. The Republican party, on the other hand, has been hostile to free coinage, but this year the white Republicans, including the great sugar-planters who left the Democratic party on the tariff issue, have formed an alliance with the Populists. They have nominated for Governor a prominent Prohibitionist who is an ardent advocate of the free coinage of silver. Some of the Populists, however, have refused to

support the fusion ticket and have nominated a straight ticket of their own. The negro Republicans may support the fusion ticket, and may not. The white Republicans, especially the aristocratic element composed of the sugar-planters, are as disdainful of the negroes as are the Democrats. Captain Pharr, the fusion candidate for Governor, has recently denounced in public a most influential manager of the old negro Republican machine, and it is believed that the machine will retaliate. The Democrats, feeling that the election is in danger, have in one parish after another thrown overboard the constitutional amendment proposed by their Legislature disfranchising illiterates who do not pay taxes on three hundred dollars' worth of property. In the last Congressional election in North Louisiana, it was chiefly through negro votes that the Populist candidate was defeated. This year it is believed that negro votes throughout the State will be relied upon to secure the same result.



The friends of school reform in the State of New York were greatly encouraged by the message of Governor Morton to the Senate, on March 20, urging the passage of the compromise bill for the reform of the school administration in the city of New York. This bill is the culmination of years of effort to eliminate politics from the public schools of the city, and the reconstruction of the school system along the lines of educational progress. The need of reform in the school system is conceded even by the opponents of the bill. The radical feature of the bill, as already reported in these columns, is the abolition of the trustee system, and the appointment of a superintendent and assistant superintendents, who are to have entire charge of the teachers and of the system of studies. That is, the measure provides that the system of education in the city of New York shall be in charge of a board of paid experts. The construction and care of the buildings are also to be under the care of a recognized expert and assistants. The bill provides for the division of the city into fifteen districts, "as nearly as may be of equal population." In each of these districts five inspectors are to be appointed by the Mayor. These inspectors, who serve without pay, are to examine into the record of attendance of teachers and pupils, the cleanliness and safety of the buildings, the studies and progress and discipline of the pupils, the fidelity and competence of the teachers. The bill protects the teachers fully. No teacher can be discharged without a majority vote of the board of superintendents and of the school inspectors of the district in which the teacher is serving. The Board of Education is appointed, as at present, by the Mayor. It is in this bill given absolute control over the school property, and the right of selection of site and decision on construction and alteration of buildings, and is authorized to employ an expert and such assistants as are necessary. The bill gives authority to the Board to redistrict the city when the change in population demands it; and authorizes the appointment by the Mayor of the inspectors in such new districts. The superintendents of schools serve for six years; inspectors for five years. Politics has such a hold on the public-school system of New York City that this measure aroused the petty politicians to a state of rage that manifested itself at the hearings of the bill. The independence of Governor Morton in sending a message to the Senate urging the passage of the bill has aroused the admiration and gratitude of the friends of reform.



For some time there has been a systematic attempt on the part of some of the less reputable New York newspapers

to induce the belief that crime has been on the increase in this city under the present police administration. This has been done by sensational treatment of the crimes which have actually taken place, by innuendo, and by direct assertion. In point of fact, the records show that while under the old administration (from December 1, 1894, to January 20, 1895) there were 1,083 felonies committed and 732 arrests made, under the present administration (December 1, 1895, to January 20, 1896) there were only 911 felonies reported and 847 arrests were made. These facts—which amount to a decrease of 16 per cent. in serious crimes and an increase of 15 per cent. in arrests—are pointed out by President Theodore Roosevelt, of the Police Commissioners, in an open letter. So long as only general assertions were made, the false and slanderous imputation could be met only by appealing to the recorded facts; but Mr. Roosevelt has found in the columns of the New York "World" attempts to sustain the slander with proof, and he has thought it worth while to call the attention of the public to the way in which these "catalogues of crime" have been manufactured. Taking up one by one forty-five cases which had been put forward as proving the prevalence of unpunished crime, Mr. Roosevelt shows that exactly four were genuine—"a little less than nine per cent. of truth." Even this percentage of truth, however, is large compared with that of another sensational article in the same paper which gave an account of "twenty-six great criminals now at large in this city." Of these Mr. Roosevelt tells us eight were dead, one was dying, seven were in jail in Europe, three had reformed and were leading reputable lives, and of the remaining seven not a single one, so far as could be found out, was in New York. It is not surprising that the Police Commissioners say, "We shall not hereafter take the trouble to deny any unsupported statement whatever that may appear in the 'World.'" In thus calling attention to these disgraceful and mendacious newspaper methods Mr. Roosevelt has performed a public service of importance.



In "Tom Brown at Rugby" there is a beautiful description of the feeling of Tom when the news of the death of Dr. Arnold reached him in Scotland. Some such feeling came to thousands of men when they read the announcement on Monday of this week that Thomas Hughes, the author of "Tom Brown," had gone to his rest. The vitality and manliness of that book made its author seem perpetually young in the thought of those who loved it, but he had reached, after a very busy and useful life, the ripe age of seventy-three. Entering Rugby in 1833, under Dr. Arnold, he took his degree of B.A. at Oriel College, Oxford, in 1845. Three years later he was called to the bar at Lincoln's Inn. In 1865 he entered Parliament. He was appointed Queen's Counsel in 1869, and in 1882 Judge of one of the County Courts, a position which he held at the time of his death. His interest in the welfare of the working classes, his strong advocacy of co-operation, his attempt to realize a better order of things in the Rugby Colony, are all well known. To the English working people he was a consistent and life-long friend; for this country also his friendship had been persistent and hearty. During the days of the Civil War he did much to enlighten England as to the real significance of that great struggle and to change English opinion. He had a thorough knowledge of American literature, and was especially a lover of Lowell, whose "Bigelow Papers" he knew by heart. It is, however, as the author of "Tom Brown at Rugby" and "Tom Brown at Oxford" that Mr. Hughes will be long remembered. These books belong to the classics of young manhood; they combine in the most