THE DAILY JOURNAL

THURSDAY, APRIL 9, 1903.

Telephone Calls (Old and New).

Business Office....238 | Editorial Rooms....86

TERMS OF SUBSCRIPTION.

BY CARRIER—INDIANAPOLIS and SUBURBS.
Daily, Sunday included, 50 cents per month.
Daily, without Sunday, 40 cents per month.
Sunday, without daily, $2.50 per year.
Single copies: Daily, 2 cents; Sunday, 5 cents.

BY AGENTS EVERYWHERE.

Daily, per week, 10 cents.
Daily, Sunday included, per week, 15 cents.
Sunday, per issue, 5 cents.

BY MAIL PREPAID.

Daily edition, one year.....$5.00
Daily and Sunday, one year.....7.50
Sunday only, one year.....2.50

REDUCED RATES TO CLUBS.

Weekly Edition.

One copy, one year.....$1.00
One copy, six months.....50 cents
One copy, three months.....25 cents
No subscription taken for less than three months.

REDUCED RATES TO AGENTS.

Subscribe with any of our numerous agents or send subscription to

JOURNAL NEWSPAPER COMPANY
Indianapolis, Ind.

Persons sending the Journal through the mails in the United States should put on an eight-page or a twelve-page paper a 1-cent stamp; on a sixteen, twenty or twenty-four-page paper, a 2-cent stamp. Foreign postage is usually double these rates.

All communications intended for publication in this paper must, in order to receive attention, be accompanied by the name and address of the writer.

Rejected manuscripts will not be returned unless postage is inclosed for that purpose.

Entered as second-class matter at Indianapolis, Ind., postoffice.

THE INDIANAPOLIS JOURNAL

Can be found at the following places:

NEW YORK—Astor House.

CHICAGO—Palmer House, P. O. News Co., 217 Dearborn street; Auditorium Annex Hotel, Dearborn Station News Stand.

CINCINNATI—J. R. Hawley & Co., Arcade.

LOUISVILLE—C. T. Deering, northwest corner of Third and Jefferson streets; Louisville Book Co., 264 Fourth avenue, and Bluefield Bros., 442 West Market street.

ST. LOUIS—Union News Company, Union Depot.

WASHINGTON, D. C.—Riggs House, Ebbitt House, Fairfax Hotel, Willard Hotel.

DENVER, Col.—Louthain & Jackson, Fifteenth and Lawrence streets.

DAYTON, O.—J. V. Wilkie, 39 South Jefferson street.

COLUMBUS, O.—Viaduct News Stand, 384 High street.

Carter H. Harrison's majorities in Chicago have dwindled from 79,169 in 1897, to 41,059 in 1899, to 28,343 in 1901, and to 7,838 on Tuesday. He announces that he will not run again.

Out of thirty-five members-elect of the Chicago City Council only four were stamped by the Municipal Voters' League as undesirable. The result is a decided victory for good government as far as the legislative branch is concerned.

Mr. Bryan is going into "the enemy's country," that is, he is going to make political addresses in New York, Connecticut, Rhode Island, Massachusetts, New Jersey and Maryland, all of which goes to show that the former "peerless leader" is going to have a little fun.

The Consul Campbell who was forced to contribute $100,000 to the Honduras war fund turns out to be a British official. In addition to the forced tribute he is said to have been subjected to other gross outrages which will doubtless call for action by the British government.

The cause of the Southern Confederacy went down in defeat at Appomattox thirty-eight years ago to-day. Still, there are a few men in the country who do not realize that the war is over and would not make the Gettysburg battlefield entirely historic by setting up a statue of General Lee.

Years ago the cotton factories in Lowell and Lawrence, Mass., were worked by natives. The English and the Irish succeeded. Later the Canadian French crowded the English and Irish to the wall. Now it appears that a large number of Greeks, Syrians and Portuguese are employed.

Mayor Harrison, of Chicago, says his election was "a victory for municipal ownership—a victory which should lead to the development of public national as well as municipal utilities." This is notice that the mayor thinks he is identified with a great national issue that leads towards the White House.

The Shaffer who is anxious to fuse all the working people in the country into one organization is the Shaffer who made such a miserable failure of the strike of the Amalgamated Iron Workers two years ago. Then he charged Mr. Gompers with treachery. Now he proposes to get even by breaking up Mr. Gompers's organization.

The strike which has begun in Holland is in part a protest, if not a revolt, against repressive legislation, and may extend to every branch of industry, becoming so formidable that the government may not be able to suppress it. It is said that Germany has tendered military aid. In view of the fact that Germany is anxious to annex Holland this tender of armed support may be the first step to enable the Emperor to carry out his designs toward the home of the Dutch. The German press has been showing that annexation would greatly benefit the people of both countries. Thirty years ago, at the close of the Franco-Prussian war, a British writer accused Germany of designs upon Holland, but probably the occasion has not presented itself to make that historic country a part of Germany. It is just the country Germany needs in order to get out to the world by a shorter route, but the acquisition would frighten the Briton, who seems to have a mortal fear lest Germany may seize England.

The appointment of Mr. Hugh H. Hanna as a member of the international monetary commission provided for by the last Congress is a deserved recognition of his efficient and disinterested service in the cause of sound money. The creation of the commission was the result of a joint request made by the governments of Mexico and China for the United States to take the initiative in devising some plan to relieve those two countries from the drawbacks and losses involved in adherence to the silver standard. The appeal was based mainly on the prospect of a great increase of trade between the United States and the two countries named if a stable standard and rate of exchange could be adopted. To this end it was proposed that the United States, Mexico and China should each appoint three commissioners whose duty it should be to consider the economic problems in relation to establishing a new monetary system in the silver-using countries of the world. If a plan is agreed upon and accepted by the silver-using countries it would then probably be presented to Great Britain, Germany, France, Russia and other countries having interests in the East, and an effort be made to secure their approval. This is a large undertaking, and will require considerable diplomacy, labor and time. Mr. Hanna is exceedingly well qualified for the work, and his appointment is a complimentary recognition of his public-spirited service in behalf of the gold standard.

LESSON OF THREE ELECTIONS.

The city elections in Cincinnati, Cleveland and Chicago seem to contain some suggestions worthy of consideration. With so excellent a candidate as President Ingalls the Democrats and citizens might have reasonably expected to carry the election after an unbroken Republican control of several years. The supporters of Mr. Ingalls complain of fraud in registration, but if there was something of that nature it could not have affected the Republican plurality of over 16,000. Only four years ago last November the Democratic candidate for Governor, Mr. McLean, practically carried Hamilton county. Last fall, however, Tom L. Johnson's man was buried out of sight, but not so deeply covered as was Mr. Ingalls on Monday. What is the significance of this? President Ingalls has been an outspoken anti-Bryan Democrat, taking an active part against his candidacy in 1896 and 1900. The chances are that Mr. Ingalls did not vote the Tom L. Johnson ticket last fall. To get even with the anti-Bryan element of the party the Tom L. Johnson Democrats either voted for the Socialist candidate or with the Republicans. Mr. Bryan was in Cincinnati just before the election.

Tom L. Johnson succeeded in Cleveland, which now has what may be called a large recently naturalized vote, of which the socialistic element is a very considerable factor. As a rule it holds no taxable property and would vote for the candidate who would use the most money to employ labor on public works. Doubtless his 3-cent fare scheme, impracticable as it is, gave him the votes of thousands of ignorant men. Mr. Johnson received the entire Democratic vote. The anti-Bryan Democrats voted for him, as did the Bryan Democrats and the bulk of the Socialists, and he was elected. If Mr. Johnson had been a conservative anti-Bryan Democrat, like President Ingalls, he would have been defeated.

Carter H. Harrison has been notoriously the worst mayor Chicago has ever had. Every branch of the public service is honey-combed with corruption. The police is inefficient to the extent that life and property are not safe. The city is at the mercy of mobs of strikers whenever they see fit to override law and order. The criminal classes are so secure that they have made Chicago a city of refuge and hail Mayor Harrison as their protector. Thousands of crooks make that city their home, and these thousands furnished Harrison many more votes on Tuesday than his plurality. Moreover, Mayor Harrison was opposed by the better element of his party. The Democratic Chronicle denounced him as few other papers did. Leading Democrats made speeches against him. He had no support from leading Democrats who organize Tilden clubs and extol Mr. Cleveland. Such Democrats have no faith in him. Many of them may have voted for him, but it was not because they believe in him. Mr. Harrison has stood by Mr. Bryan and all the Bryan Democrats supported him. If Mr. Harrison had been a conservative anti-Bryan Democrat, open in his opposition in 1896, he would have been defeated, as was Mr. Ingalls in Cincinnati. The Socialist vote would have been tens of thousands, while the army of crooks would have had no interest in his election.

Those three instances point to an inference, and that is that no Democratic presidential candidate who was openly hostile to Mr. Bryan in 1896 and 1900, and who has not sufficient socialistic tendencies to draw that vote in the large cities, will receive in 1904 the vote which Tom L. Johnson and Harrison received in their respective cities. The logical Democratic ticket in the light of the recent municipal elections is Johnson and Harrison.

PRESIDENT ROOSEVELT ON THE PHILIPPINES.

The President's speech at Fargo, N. D., was the last of the six prepared speeches he set out to make on the present tour, and, like the others, it dealt with topics of national interest. Nothing in the recent history of the United States reflects greater credit on the Nation or is likely to be more favorably judged by posterity than our record in the Philippines. If it were not that our war with Spain and the years immediately following were so crowded with great events and achievements it might almost be said that our record in the Philippines is the greatest of all. This was the theme of the President's last set speech, and he handled it well.

There was a time when our policy in the Philippines was misjudged and misrepresented by a considerable number of Americans and distrusted by foreigners. Americans who called themselves anti-imperialists, and the Democratic party, represented the administration policy in the islands as one of oppression and tyranny, while foreigners refused to believe that the United States had any other intention than to subjugate the people and exploit the islands for commercial purposes. They could not see or would not believe that the government had undertaken a work of stupendous difficulty from a sense of duty and in a spirit of high resolve to write a new page in American history that should rank among the brightest. Although the work is still far from completion it has passed the doubtful stage and a point has been reached from which we can look back and recall promises and prophecies made at the beginning. The President did this when he quoted from a speech made by President McKinley at Minneapolis Oct. 12, 1899. The audience at that time was composed in part of members of a Minnesota regiment recently returned from the Philippines. Mr. McKinley showed the absurdity of the then prevalent doctrine of "anti-imperialism," which demanded that we abandon the Philippines, and closed by saying:

> That Congress will provide for the islands a government which will bring them blessings, which will promote their material interests as well as advance their people in the path of civilization and intelligence, I confidently believe. They will not be governed as vassals, or serfs, or slaves. They will be given a government of liberty, regulated by law, honestly administered, without oppressing exactions, taxation without tyranny, justice without bribe, education without distinction of social condition, freedom of religious worship and protection in "life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness."

"What President McKinley said then," said President Roosevelt, "lay in the realm of promise. Now it lies in the realm of positive performances." The President then gave a running sketch and review of what has been accomplished in the Philippines during the last four years. President McKinley did not live to see the end of the insurrection and the restoration of peace in the islands, but he knew that would come in good time, and he saw with the eye of faith what would follow. His successor is able to cite as already accomplished facts all that President McKinley predicted. He said:

> At the present time the civil government is supreme and the army in the Philippines has been reduced until it is sufficient merely to provide against the recurrence of trouble. In Governor Taft and his associates we sent to the Filipinos as upright, as conscientious and as able a group of administrators as ever any country has been blessed with having. With them and under them we have associated the best men among the Filipinos, so that the great majority of the officials, including many of the highest rank, are themselves natives of the islands. The administration is incorruptibly honest; justice is as jealously safeguarded as here at home. The government is conducted purely in the interests of the people of the islands; they are protected in their religious and civil rights; they have been given an excellent and well-administered school system, and each of them now enjoys rights to "life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness" such as were never before known in all the history of the islands.

In the Minneapolis speech from which President Roosevelt quoted the other day, President McKinley, after giving a brief review of our territorial expansion, said: "The increase of our territory has added vastly to our strength and prosperity without changing our republican character. It has given wider scope to democratic principles and enlarged the area for republican institutions. I sometimes think we do not realize what we have and the solemn trust we have committed to our keeping." If this was true of former acquisitions of territory it is equally true of the Philippines, for President Roosevelt showed that the principles of republican government are being extended, established and popularized there as they have been wherever the American flag has gone. His speech was a timely reminder to the American people that great things are being done in the American name and great honor reflected upon it in the far-away islands of the Pacific.

AUTOMOBILES IN THE STREETS.

During the present week the sharp "toot, toot" of the automobile has been heard on our streets oftener than usual, and the number of the vehicles in use is plainly increasing. The warning sound is not a pleasant one to pedestrians crossing a street, but it is less alarming than to look over one's shoulder and see an automobile only a few yards distant and speeding straight towards one. The vehicle is a valuable contribution to modern life, and it has come not only to stay but to increase and multiply. Like all other modern improvements it involves some dangers, and measures should be adopted to minimize them. The rate of speed at which the vehicles may be run in city streets should be regulated by law, and those who operate them should be made to understand that pedestrians have rights which they are bound to respect. A short time ago an automobilist who was arrested in New York for running over a woman and her child pleaded in defense that he had blown his horn twice, giving the double "toot, toot." As he admitted that he had not slackened speed the court held that the defense was not good. There is too much reckless driving and riding of bicycles in the streets already, and the idea that pedestrians must look out for themselves seems to be growing. The theory of the law is that pedestrians have the right of way, and no amount of bell-ringing or tooting will excuse an accident due to the reckless speed of a bicyclist or automobilist. In most European countries, where human life is rated of more value than with us, automobilists have to conform to certain legal requirements. Consular reports recently received at the State Department furnish the following information on the subject:

> No one in France can operate an automobile without having obtained a "certificate of capacity" from the government engineers. In Havre all automobiles must bear a registered number, painted in white upon a black background.
>
> In Austria the rules governing the automobile are very stringent. Only such machines may be driven in public streets as have been officially inspected and approved as to their motor system and steering apparatus. This approbation may be withdrawn. The inspection is made by a commission of experts appointed by local authorities. In Belgium automobilists are not permitted to drive their machines at a greater speed than that of the ordinary trot of a horse. Lights must be carried after nightfall, indicating clearly in red or black letters the number of the machine's license.
>
> In France the decree compels an automobile operator to slow up or stop whenever the car could possibly cause an accident, create a disturbance, or interfere with traffic. It also provides that an operator shall never leave his carriage without having taken all precautions to prevent unlooked-for starting of the machine, and he also must suppress all noise of the motor.
>
> In Germany all excessive smoke, steam and odors connected with motor cars are prohibited. This regulation will tend to prevent the use of certain types of gasoline motors, which cause a strong vibration and leave behind a trail of offensive odor from the imperfectly consumed gasoline. The maximum speed allowed in Berlin is nine miles an hour. All machines are numbered in Germany. Certificates vised by German police officials are requisite to enable a foreigner to use his automobile in Berlin. The requirements of each driver are that he must be more than eighteen years of age and must carry a certificate of competency. In Frankfort the left side of every automobile must bear the Christian name and surname of the owner where it can be plainly seen and in clear, ineffaceable letters. In Saxony automobiles are inspected by designated authorities before being permitted to run upon public highways. Racing on public roads is absolutely prohibited. Throughout The Netherlands automobiles must carry in black or white Arabic figures, five inches high, the license number, and at night the number must be clearly shown by means of a light.

Some of these regulations are suggestive of arbitrary government, but they recognize the theory that people on foot have rights as well as people in automobiles. The subject is one that sooner or later will call for regulation by law.

The decision of the Supreme Court holding unconstitutional the law of 1899 providing for the weekly payment of wages due employes is probably good law, but it will work hardship on a great many wage earners. The law provides that "every person, company, corporation or association employing any person to labor, or in any other service for him, shall make weekly payments for the full amount due for such labor or service, in lawful money of the United States, to within six days or less of the time of such payment." The plain intent of the law was to insure to workingmen the payment of wages earned at least as often as weekly. This is right in principle and just. The man who lives by his daily labor is, in equity, entitled to his pay as soon as he has earned it. If he works by the day he should, in strict justice, be paid at the end of every day, but as that might not be practicable he should be paid at least as often as once a week. No fair employer should object to paying employes weekly, but the court holds that the law is unconstitutional because it interferes with the freedom of contract between individuals. If employes choose to enter into a contract to accept payment of wages less often than once a week they certainly should have a right to do so, though only extraordinary circumstances would justify an employer in imposing such terms. The defect of the law seems to be in not making an exception in favor of the right of individual contract, and in giving the state factory inspector the right to bring suit for its enforcement. As it stands, the law savors too much of paternalism and belongs to a class of labor legislation of which there has been too much.

The announcement of the Liquor Dealers' Association in New York that they will punish the farmers of that State by boycotting the products of their farms because the Legislature increased the liquor license fee proves how absurd angry men can make themselves when they part company with discretion. Other men than liquor dealers buy farm products. In New York it was a question between increasing the tax on the liquor business and the tax on homes and farms, and the Legislature seems to have wisely chosen the former.

THE HUMORISTS.

Precocious.

Atlanta Constitution.

"Why, judge," said the colored witness, "though dat boy ain't three foot high, he kin cuss jest ez good ez you kin!"

Not Chronic.

Cleveland Plain Dealer.

"Yes, he had a bad case of writer's cramp."

"I didn't know he ever wrote."

"He only gets it when his wife asks him to sign a check for household expenses."

Quite So.

If all the bad folks who compose
The human race,
Should die at once, the world would be
A lonesome place.
—Comfort.

In Lent.

The girls give up for Lenten time
This thing and that—
And father gives up later on
The Easter hat.
—Washington Post.

The Other Way Around.

Washington Star.

"Do you think that cigarette smoking causes a deterioration of mentality?"

"I am not clear on that point," said the man who makes a specialty of profound opinions. "The impression to that effect may be due to the fact that people with brains naturally avoid them."

The Way He Felt.

Philadelphia Press.

Timmid—That boss of yours is so pompous, he always makes me feel ill at ease.

Clark—Strange; I felt out of place when he was talking to me to-day.

Timmid—That so?

Clark—Yes, he was telling me I needn't come back after Saturday.

Same Old Signs.

The festive goat is dining
On the tin can in the lane;
And the organ grinder's grinding
Once more his tuneless strain.
One day we wear an ulster thick
And the next day a duster thin—
All of which denotes that spring
Is beginning to begin.
—Chicago News.

Regard for His Reputation.

Chicago Tribune.

Seeing an enemy approaching, the ostrich took to his heels and was soon out of danger.

"What did you run for?" asked the hippopotamus, in talking of the matter afterward.

"Did you think," said the noble bird, proudly, "I would violate the traditions by staying there to be killed like any ordinary game, when there wasn't a particle of sand in sight for me to stick my head into?"

MEN OF WORRY.

Newspaper Workers and Statesmen Live in an Atmosphere of Unrest.

Hartford Courant.

Newspaper men and statesmen live amid worry about all the time. It is their business—or, at any rate, it is the substance of their work. Things are not going right with public opinion—inevitably the newspaper man worries about it and puts his worry into words and prints them, and there you have the substance of the denunciatory, the expostulatory and the hortatory editorial articles of the country. The statesman judges that the country is not going in the right direction, or, if by chance it is on the right road, that it is not going fast enough; and inevitably he worries about the public situation and thinks up new measures to mend it or improve it, and tries to have these measures made law. If the statesman belongs to the minority party very nearly all his public life is worry; and if he belongs to the majority party then he is loaded down with all the worries of his opponents in addition to his own.

Thus, so far as public affairs are in question, there are two considerable bodies of unusually competent men who devote their best efforts to worrying them through. It is their business; and in a country like ours, where public opinion and men in official station work out between them the actual government that we have, from mending a road to establishing a common measure for all values, these two bodies of worrying men are a necessity. It may be said that often their worries would be reduced in number and poignancy if their fellow-citizens in private life should acquire the habit of worrying more in regard to the same matters. It is not fair, as a matter of equity, that the men who make newspapers or laws should have to worry alone over an election or an act of needed or dreaded legislation for a whole State. However, it is not necessary to worry about this here—it may be left to its proper place and season.

It is evident, in short, that worry in regard to public matters is a very good thing, particularly in a land where the people govern themselves. Civic worry is a part of the force that makes the great machine go. But in private and personal affairs worry is very generally not so necessary; and the line between what may be called useful private worry and that which merely frets and exhausts and disables is most easily crossed. It is the prerogative of reason to worry—one of the advantages or disadvantages, according to our control of it or its control of us, of having a mind. So far as we can comprehend, there is no worry among the trees and the plants, or among the dogs and cats and horses and other dumb creatures. The horse may seem to worry a bit when he is hungry and the oats are slow in coming, but he certainly gives no sign of worrying to-day about the oats for to-morrow. Whatever worrying he does is confined to the occasion and the time being. The animal rule appears to be that each day has its worry, as well as its satisfaction; but so far as known the animals do not overload themselves by adding to to-day's worry for to-morrow or next week.

It is the privilege of man alone to gorge himself with private worry. The reason that enables him to worry usefully and with a certain invigorating effect enables him also to worry unreasonably. Most people know that if they do not get the happiness that goes with to-day out of to-day they will never get it at all. It may not be just the happiness that they most prefer; it may not be the happiness that they hope to possess next month or next year; in itself it may be a very little and obscure happiness. But it is always here, with each day, and it is always possible to find it and to enjoy it now during the fleeting hours that both bring it and carry it away forever. It is that little bit of to-day happiness, to be had by every one who looks for it with a sympathetic spirit, that corrects the worry habit, and makes it a helpful spring to our daily life, and not a crushing load, under which some of us bend and stagger and groan through forty or fifty years of responsible life.

Provincial Complacency.

New York Commercial.

The man who has attained the age of 101 years in New York is the envy of the world—not because he is a centenarian, but because he has been permitted to live so long in such a delightful place.

JEWS IN CONGRESS.

Characteristics of Those Who Have Been Members of that Body.

Washington Letter in Chicago Post.

The bitter criticism passed on President Roosevelt by ex-Senator Joseph Simon, of Oregon, in which Simon virtually accuses the President of working to prevent his return to the United States Senate because he is a Jew, brings up a question frequently asked in Washington: Why are there so few Jews in Congress and public office?

The answer that instantly occurs to the mind is that Jews are intrinsically money-makers and traders, and that their energies find such opportunities in the ever-widening circles of American commerce and industry that they have no inclination to turn to public affairs. This, however, is only partly true. Jews do turn to public affairs, especially in the larger cities, and prove as capable politicians as business men. They have thoroughness, energy, tact, imagination and eloquence. The honors of fame appear to be as alluring to them as to any other people. Why, then, are they not in Congress?

In the last Congress there were four Jews—three congressmen and one senator. The representatives were Julius Kahn of California, Adolph Meyer of Louisiana and Henry M. Goldfogle of New York. The senator was Joseph Simon of Oregon. Messrs. Goldfogle and Meyer were re-elected to the Fifty-eighth Congress. Mr. Kahn was defeated, but by irregular ballots, and he will contest the election with good prospects of being seated. Mr. Simon was defeated for senator after a bitter fight, and is succeeded by Charles W. Fulton. Messrs. Meyer and Goldfogle are Democrats, and Messrs. Simon and Kahn are Republicans.

Joseph Simon in the United States Senate was like a cat in a strange garret. He made few friends, never made a speech, had no confidants and took no steps to mingle with the crowd. He was on several important committees, namely, that on judiciary, and discharged his duties with faithfulness—remarkable fidelity and application, in fact—and with ability. He was treated with respect by other senators, as a matter of course, but his own distant and even cold manner forbade advances. He preferred a mere nodding acquaintance, even with his near neighbors on the floor, like Depew, of New York, and Penrose, of Pennsylvania, to closer companionship.

It may be misjudging him, but his actions appeared to have been inspired by the consciousness that he was a Jew and a super-sensitiveness as to the feelings entertained toward him by his colleagues. Certainly nothing ever was revealed to the public, which watches the Senate closely, to indicate that Senator Simon was persona non grata in the tribunal that is sometimes likened to a club. If he felt out of place the feeling was caused by his own sensitiveness and consequent reserve.

Quite a different character was that of rotund Julius Kahn, of San Francisco. Kahn was hail-fellow-well-met with every man in Congress, popular with the President and acquainted with every senator. He had great gifts as a public speaker, rendered more attractive by a self-possession born of his former profession—he was an actor who trod the boards with Booth, Jefferson, Salvini, W. J. Florence and others famous in their day. Kahn is still a young man—round, jolly, dimpled, smooth-shaven, with curly hair just beginning to be streaked with gray. He is a good story-teller and often drew a crowd around him in the cloakroom with his stories of old actor days or of his experiences in the Orient—for he was a traveler, too. A good "mixer," with imperturbable spirits and zest for public life, Kahn made hosts of friends in both parties. His career seemed to be broadening into one of solid attainment, ending, perhaps, in the United States Senate or on the bench. It was with genuine regret that the news of his defeat was received. If he should be seated over his contestant there is no apparent reason why he should not renew his interrupted career and rise to high places of honor.

The brief service of Julius Kahn in public life showed conclusively that there is no prejudice in Congress against the Jew as a Jew. Kahn seldom referred to his race or religion, but no more seldom than do other men. When the subject arose he spoke with candor and pride, neither giving nor taking offense. His religious belief and his race were things apart from his duty as a legislator and were not dragged in, either by himself or by his associates. They accepted him as he was—an American citizen, brilliant, witty, ambitious and industrious. There was as much difference between Kahn and Simon as between laughter and gloom.

Kahn was often at the White House, where both McKinley and Roosevelt received him with cordiality. He dined occasionally at the President's table and furnished his share of the diversion. If Mr. Roosevelt is an enemy of the Jews in public life, as the saturnine Simon suggests, he concealed his dislike cleverly in the case of Julius Kahn, with whom the President seldom failed to crack a joke and pass a jolly half-hour when the Californian called at the White House.

Messrs. Meyer and Goldfogle are not the conspicuous makers of friends that Kahn was, but they have high places in Congress, won by sterling qualities. Mr. Meyer, especially, is an important factor in legislation by reason of his place on the committee on naval affairs. He is at the head of the minority and serves on the conference committee, where his views have weight in the final shaping of the legislation pertaining to the navy. Not in the slightest degree has his race or religious belief hindered him in public life.

Judging by the career of Julius Kahn and that of other Jews in previous congresses, it would be a shrewd guess to answer the question, "Why are so few Jews in Congress?" by asking if there is not a sensitiveness among the Jews regarding their race or religion which impels them to shun public life. It cannot be that among the millions of that race there are not those ambitious for public honors and fully capable of winning them. The race that has given lawmakers and lawgivers to the world from the time of Joseph, the prime minister of Pharaoh, down past the time of Disraeli, the prime minister of Victoria, is not destitute of the mettle and matter that make great statesmen. Why, then, are there only two Jews in the Fifty-eighth Congress?

Copyrighting Questionable Plays.

Washington Star.

A federal judge in New York has just decided that plays which deal with "questionable" situations cannot properly be copyrighted, and that even though their producers may bear certificates of copyright from the librarian of Congress, those documents do not confer exclusive ownership such as to render infringements punishable by the law. This is a most important ruling, and should be tested by the final processes of appeal. For if the law decisions that a line can be drawn between proper and improper plays in the matter of ownership, opportunity is opened for unending trouble and ultimately the breakdown of the entire copyright system. If a play can be copied with impunity on the score of its impropriety, then undoubtedly a book can be so copied. Thus the decision is far-reaching. If there were a fixed standard of propriety in books and plays the situation would not be so difficult. But it is notorious that what one man regards as a highly moral play, conveying a powerful lesson and preventing crime and sin by the force of awful example, another considers as a decidedly unwholesome production, catering to a prurient taste And so with novels dealing with so-called social problems.

Kansas Man's Unusual Lunch.

Atchison Globe.

A North Atchison man's wife is a health food fanatic, and knows what per cent. of this and what per cent. of that is in everything that goes on the table. When the man of the house sits down at the table he never knows but that his coffee is made of buckwheat, and that the little balls before him are condensed beefsteak. If his wife should give him two or three little tablets, and tell him it was a big meal in compressed form and constructed on scientific lines to nourish the whole body, he would not be surprised. Therefore, when he went home late from a lodge meeting a few nights ago and found a curious package on the dining table, he concluded it was a new kind of health food set out as his lunch. "It's a little gritty and rough," he said to himself; "must be a bone builder." The next morning his wife discovered that he had eaten a package of bird seed.

Reaction of High Prices.

Nebraska State Journal.

The manner in which high prices will react upon deserving people is illustrated in the case of cotton, which has advanced in price 1 cent in the last year and 2 cents in two years. This has helped to give the business of the South a great impetus, as is represents an enormous increase in the selling value of the staple crop of the entire region. But the advance that blesses the South is a curse to the operatives in the Northern cotton mills, for the price of the manufactured product has not gone up with the cost of the raw material. The operatives at Lowell are out of work today because the mill owners have preferred to cease producing goods rather than to grant the rate of wages that their employes feel that they ought to have to meet the increased cost of living.

INDIANA'S LAWS.

Paper of This City Rebuked for Slandering the State.

Washington Post.

The following paragraph, entitled as above, and credited to the Indianapolis Sentinel, the leading Democratic paper in the State, is having wide circulation:

> "We of Indiana are confronted by the knowledge that while Connecticut cannot point the finger of scorn at any of these sister States, she still is entitled to express contempt for Indiana, and so are all the rest. They, at least, have laws for the punishment of the votebuyer, and their officials are under oath to enforce those laws, but Indiana alone makes vote-buying legal. Indiana alone allows the votebuyer to proceed with his disgraceful work without fear of punishment. To-day Indiana remains the only civilized State in the world in which vote-buying is a lawful occupation."

If Indiana's reputation as a great, prosperous, progressive commonwealth were not firmly established, such an advertisement as that might do for her what Alexander, the coppersmith, did for St. Paul, to wit, "much harm." It is literally true that Indiana has no law for the punishment of the votebuyer. It may be equally true that in this respect she is a solitary exception not only among the States of our Union, but among all the civilized states in the world, but no correct view of the character of a State, or of its election laws, or the political morals of its people can be conveyed by the statement of a single defect in its statutes. Indiana penalizes the selling and not the buying of a vote—punishes the bribed and not the briber. We believe this to be a serious mistake. Of the two, the briber is the more dangerous, the greater scoundrel; and to let him go unscathed while the pitiful wretch whose manhood he has bought is sent to jail is a travesty of justice. Both should be punished as dangerous criminals. Public sentiment ought to make decent society as intolerant of election corruptionists as of horse thieves. Rightly viewed, the offense of votebuying or vote-selling, or of corrupting the ballot box, would be more abhorred than robbery or burglary. It strikes at the very foundation of government, and the men who practice it, whatever may be their social or political standing, come nearer being Anarchists than decent citizens.

But aside from this defect the election laws of Indiana are admirable. No other State in the Union has a better registry law or more strict provisions for a fair election and an honest count. Instead of being a laggard Indiana has led in progressive legislation. We know of no State in which it would be more difficult to get fraudulent votes into the ballot boxes or perpetrate a fraud in the returns. The capital of Indiana has long been one of the centers of civil-service reform, and for a generation that State led all of her neighbors—and may be still ahead of them—in constitutional and statutory recognition of the rights of married women.

As to "pointing the finger of scorn" at or "expressing contempt for" Indiana, we do not know of any State that is entitled to do so. Her laws as a whole compare favorably with those of the most progressive and enlightened of the New England or the middle groups. If she had such an out-of-date, anti-democratic, unequal and altogether unfair and indefensible Constitution as Connecticut or Rhode Island her sons might well blush for her, although it might not occur to them that duty required them to invoke for her the contempt of any or all the other States. But looking at her as she stands in the family of States, debiting her with her faults and giving her due credit for her good achievements her absent sons may well feel that they have no cause for shame and much reason for honest, modest pride.

TO KEEP OUT ANARCHISTS.

Special Agent Sent Abroad to Report on the Gentry.

Washington Letter in Chicago Post.

The Anarchist is to be hunted in his lair, branded and tagged with the red badge and excluded from the United States and all places subject to its jurisdiction. Although the anarchy bill proposed by Senator Hoar for the protection of the President and Vice President did not pass, there is enough authority in the immigration bill approved March 3 to prevent in great measure the entrance of Anarchists, to expel them when caught here or to put them behind the bars.

The bill also authorizes the commissioner general of immigration to send special agents abroad whenever in his judgment such action shall be necessary to accomplish the objects of the act. Such an agent has been appointed and is on his way to Europe to seek and forward information at first hand for the use of the inspectors at the various ports of entry. This special agent is Marcus Braun, recently editor of the Austro-Hungarian Gazette, of New York. He is a man of high attainments and character, personally known to President Roosevelt, who appointed him. Braun speaks half a dozen languages and is familiar with the duties he has entered upon and the character of the people he is to watch.

The immigraion act excludes the following from admission to the United States, among others: "Anarchists, or persons who believe in or advocate the overthrow by force or violence of the government of the United States or of all governments or of all forms of law, or the assassination of public officials." It is provided that if any of these persons are detected within the United States they shall be deported at the expense of the person or company bringing them, or at the expense of the "immigration fund." Section 38 of the act gives the secretary of the treasury full authority to exclude Anarchists, the language being broad enough to describe any person popularly termed an "Anarchist:"

> "That no person who disbelieves in or who is opposed to all organized government, or who is a member of or affiliated with any organization entertaining and teaching such disbelief in or opposition to all organized government, or who advocates or teaches the duty, necessity or propriety of the unlawful assaulting or killing of any officer or officers, either specific individuals or of officers generally, of the government of the United States or of any other organized government, because of his or their official character, shall be permitted to enter the United States or any territory or place subject to the jurisdiction thereof."

The section also provides for a maximum fine of $5,000 and imprisonment for five years of any person who conspires to procure any such person to enter the United States or who aids or assists any such person to enter. It is also provided in the act that naturalization shall be refused to any person in the United States who is thus described, and certificates of naturalization of persons discovered to be Anarchists may be annulled, while persons aiding in the naturalization of Anarchists, by giving false testimony or otherwise, are liable to a fine of $5,000 and imprisonment for ten years.

The duties of Special Agent Braun will take him into the Anarchist hotbeds of Italy, Germany and Russia. He is traveling, naturally, without any parade or brass band announcements. Although he will look into the general workings of the immigration system abroad, gathering information of the methods whereby the hordes of Europe are collected for shipment to America, his principal duty, it is said, will be to gain advance information of the movements of Anarchists designing to enter the United States and to provide for their exclusion when they knock at the gate of Ellis island.

Sensible Strikers.

Boston Advertiser.

The Pittsfield strike at the Tillotson's mills has already caved in. The men found the mills could run and might employ outsiders, and they were wise enough to go back before others got their jobs. They did not believe in losing their bread and butter to oblige others.

It Sunk a "Pirate Ship."

Memphis Commercial Appeal.

The American navy is not an infant affair. Look at its splendid victories in the Revolution, the war of 1812 and the Spanish-American war. By the way, has the German navy ever been in a sea fight? If so, when?

THE PROHIBITION PROBLEM.

Testimony as to the Value of the Law in Kansas.

Kansas City Journal.

Much discussion is being had over the repeal of their prohibitory liquor statutes by Vermont and New Hampshire. We find that some of the religious journals regard the repeal as a particularly damaging blow at the cause of temperance, in that "New England has always been the head center of moral reforms and a model of the Puritan virtues." However, this view seems to be based on the traditions of the past rather than on present conditions. It is the testimony of most investigators that New England is in a state of decadence; that she no longer is possessed of either the intellectual or moral energy which once gave her prominence. To-day the illiteracy of New England is greater than that of any Western State. Take Vermont for example. She has 108,356 people of voting age, and of these 8,544 are illiterates. Kansas has 413,247 of voting age, and of these only 14,686 are illiterates. The per cent. of illiteracy in Vermont is double that of Kansas, and it would be far more than this if we counted out the Kansas negro population. And to whatever state of facts we turn, it will be found that New England is falling short of the newer States of the country.

On the other hand, the repeal of prohibition has been made the occasion of bursts of rhetoric against "the hypocrisy inevitably and invariably induced by a nominal prohibition, which is not made effective." And to these there have been counter replies from the temperance journals, declaring that the laws against murder or larceny might as well be repealed on the ground that people disobey them.

And here we find opened a favorite matter of dispute between the Prohibitionists and their opponents. The Prohibitionist refuses to see any difference between a law, like the larceny law, which every one except the thief wants to see enforced, and the liquor law, which is objected to by a large section of the population. On the other hand, the opponents of prohibition are always citing exceptional cases of disobedience as evidence that the law is a complete failure. They never by any chance take up and consider the many communities in every prohibition State where the law is enforced effectively.

However, both sides to a controversy of this kind are dodging the main point at issue. As we conceive it, the greatest single moral question on earth is the question of temperance. It seems to be a question upon which all can agree, for there probably is not a distiller or whisky dealer alive who will not agree that the intemperate use of liquor is at the bottom of more of the crime and suffering of the world than all the other causes combined. Therefore, the main issue is as to which of the many ways of handling the liquor business most makes for temperance.

If it can be shown that prohibitory statutes are making for temperance in a higher degree than high license or local option, then all the small objections to prohibition ought to be swept from the board in consideration of the greater issue. If, on the other hand, it can be shown that prohibition does not make for temperance in as great degree as other ways of handling the liquor question, then prohibition ought to be swept from the board in deference to the same issue.

Here in the West we are neither well informed as to the results of New England prohibition, nor do we care much for the experiences of a State or a community which has been going backward in a period of moral and intellectual progress. What we do know is that an overwhelming majority of the Kansas people, after a prohibition experience lasting twenty-two years, are convinced that their way of handling the liquor question is a great power for temperance. It is the testimony of these Kansas people that even in communities where the law is not enforced, or, at least, not well enforced, prohibition has exercised a distinct influence against intemperance. This seeming anomaly is due to the different kinds of drinking places found under the two systems. The licensed saloon is an alluring place, filled with comfort and good cheer. The Kansas "joint," on the contrary, is usually a low doggery, unkempt and unattractive, and seldom patronized save by those who already have an appetite for liquor. In short, the influence of prohibition on the youth of Kansas has lessened the oncoming crop of drunkards in a marked degree, and it is the opinion of close observers that its influence in the future will