

WASHINGTON SENTINEL.

VOL. XXVII.

WASHINGTON CITY, D. C., SATURDAY, MAY 5, 1900

NO 45

Washington Sentinel,

Published and Edited by

LOUIS SCHADE.

APPEARS EVERY SATURDAY.

TERMS

\$3 per year for single copy sent by subscribers, payable in advance. Address LOUIS SCHADE, Washington, D. C.

Advertisements to insure insertion should be handed in not later than 12 o'clock noon on Thursday.

Office: No. 600 F Street, N. W., Washington, D. C.

Sample copies mailed upon application. Address LOUIS SCHADE, Washington, D. C.

Attention, Brewers!

We publish below a bill introduced by Congressman Brosius, a Republican from Pennsylvania, and so far as we know a prohibitionist.

This bill has been called a Pure Food and also a Pure Beer bill. The United States Brewers' Association for the last three years has been urging its passage, and has appropriated several hundred dollars each year for the lobby which has the bill in charge. Mr. Gallus Thomann, the Secretary of the United States Brewers' Association, has attended every meeting of this lobby, and reported, at each annual convention of the Brewers' Association, the progress of the movement. It is but natural that the friends of the brewers in Congress (especially when this bill is on the House calendar and can be called up at any moment) should be anxious to know whether or not the measure will injure or benefit the brewing industry. Several members of Congress have asked us as to the working of the bill in relation to the brewers. Though we have read it carefully, and have even consulted the United States Internal Revenue Department, we have been unable to find anything in it favorable to beer, or anything referring to beer, except possibly in Section 5, which says, "The term 'food,' as used herein, shall include all articles used for food, drink, confectionery or condiment by men or domestic animals." This is the only allusion to beer that we can discover. For this reason, and also to answer the numerous queries from members of Congress regarding the measure, we have written to Mr. Thomann asking him to inform us how the bill touches the interests of the brewers of the United States. So far we have received no reply.

It was understood by some that the support of the Brosius bill by the United States Brewers' Association started at the time when some Republican lobbyists in the New York State Legislature introduced a so-called Pure Beer bill in order to blackmail the brewers. The brewers of that State have defeated this bill on two occasions. Since no attempt to defeat these lobbyists at the polls has been made by the brewers, there is no doubt about it that the lobby will repeat its annual effort to reintroduce bills of this kind, as long as they can make money out of it by squeezing the brewers. The claim that this is a movement for making rarer beer is a lame excuse for the bill.

The last measure introduced in New York was in more ways than one an ill-advised and vicious measure. It favored the New York State hop and barley farmers, as against those of other States, though the latter may furnish cheaper and better barley and hops. It aspersed the honesty of the entire brewing trade of the State by placing absurd restrictions upon it. Some wiseacre told the New York brewers that if they could pass a Pure Beer bill of a national character, they would no longer be pestered by the New York Republican lobbyists. For that reason the Brosius bill was supported and advocated by the Secretary of the Brewers' Association, and money furnished for the lobbyist who has this bill in charge.

Unfortunately, however, these legal advisers seem to have overlooked that it would be unconstitutional for Congress to pass any such a measure. The Brosius bill, even should it pass, would only affect the breweries in the District of Columbia, and the Territories.

We can't comprehend why the brewers of New York should be spending money to defeat such bills in their own State, and on the

other hand aiding to keep alive a lobby which is advocating a pure beer bill, as they call it, for the brewers of the District of Columbia. We know that the beer brewed in this city is as good as any brewed in the United States. The largest of those breweries, that of Mr. Christian Heurich, has more than a local reputation for its purity, and even the beer brewed by the smallest and youngest firm, namely, that of Abner & Drury, is praised for the purity and excellence of its products. We have so far never heard any citizen in this town clamor to establish a Chemical Division in the Agricultural Department to examine and pass upon the purity of the beer brewed in the District of Columbia.

Now this is exactly what the Brosius bill (if we are to accept the explanation of the lobbyist who wrote it) calls for. A leading prohibitionist told us the other day that he was in favor of a Pure Beer bill in every State. Pure beer in his opinion was beer that contained absolutely no alcohol and did not intoxicate. He furthermore said that he favored a temperance standard to be set up which the brewers would have to live up to, and that he and his party (the prohibitionists) would see to it that whenever a pure beer bill was introduced in the Legislature of a State, they would do all they could to bring about such restrictions as would in a short time destroy all the brewers in those States.

We now ask the brewers of the United States to read this bill carefully, and inform us whether they desire to have such a measure passed or not:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That for the purpose of protecting the commerce in food products and drugs between the several States and in the District of Columbia and the Territories of the United States and foreign countries, the Secretary of Agriculture shall organize the Chemical Division of the Department of Agriculture into a bureau of chemistry, which shall have the direction of the chemical work of the present Division of Chemistry and of the chemical work of the other Executive Departments whose respective heads may apply to the Secretary of Agriculture for such collaboration, and which shall also be charged with the inspection of food and drug products, as hereinafter provided in this act. The Secretary of Agriculture shall make necessary rules and regulations for carrying out the provisions of this act, under which the director of the bureau of chemistry shall procure from time to time, or cause to be procured, and analyze or cause to be analyzed or examined, chemically, microscopically or otherwise, samples of foods and drugs offered for sale in original unbroken packages in the District of Columbia, in any Territory, or in any State other than that in which they shall have been respectively manufactured or produced, or from a foreign country, or intended for export to a foreign country. The Secretary of Agriculture is hereby authorized to employ such chemists, inspectors, clerks, laborers and other employes as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this act and to make such publication of the results of examination and analyses as he may deem proper.

Sec. 2. That the introduction into any State or Territory or the District of Columbia from any other State or Territory or the District, or from any foreign country, or shipment to any foreign country of any article of food or drugs which is adulterated or misbranded, within the meaning of this act, is hereby prohibited; and any person who shall ship or deliver for shipment from any State or Territory or the District of Columbia to any other State or Territory or the District of Columbia, or to a foreign country, or who shall receive in any State or Territory or the District of Columbia from any other State or Territory or the District of Columbia or foreign country, or who, having received, shall deliver, in original unbroken packages, for pay or otherwise, or offer to deliver to any other person, any such article so adulterated or misbranded within the meaning of this act, or any person who shall sell or offer for sale in the District of Columbia or the Territories of the United States such adulterated, misbranded or imitated foods or drugs, or export or offer to export the same to any foreign country, shall be guilty of a misdemeanor, and for such offense be fined not exceeding two hundred dollars for the first offense and for each subsequent offense not exceeding three hundred dollars or be imprisoned not exceeding one year, or both, in the discretion of the court.

Sec. 3. That the director of the bureau of chemistry shall make, or cause to be made, under rules and regulations to be prescribed by the Secretary of Agriculture, examinations of specimens of foods and drugs offered for sale in original unbroken packages in the District of Columbia, in any Territory, or in any State other than that in which they shall have been respectively manufactured or produced, or from any foreign country, or intended for shipment to any foreign country, which may be collected from time to time in various parts of the country, if it shall appear from any such examination that any of the provisions of this act have been violated, the Secretary of Agriculture shall at once certify the facts to the proper United States district attorney, with a copy of the result of the analysis, duly authenticated by the analyst under oath.

Sec. 4. That it shall be the duty of

every district attorney to whom the Secretary of Agriculture shall report any violation of this act to cause proceedings to be commenced and prosecuted without delay for the fines and penalties in such case provided.

DEFINITIONS.

Sec. 5. That the term "drug," as used in this act, shall include all medicines and preparations recognized in the United States Pharmacopoeia for internal or external use. The term "food," as used herein shall include all articles used for food, drink, confectionery or condiment by man or domestic animals, whether simple, mixed or compound. The term "misbranded," as used herein, shall apply to all drugs, or articles of food, or articles which enter into the composition of food, the package or label of which shall bear any statement regarding the ingredients or substances contained in such article, which statement shall be false or misleading in any particular, and to any food or drug product which is falsely branded as to the State, Territory, or country in which it is manufactured or produced.

ADULTERATIONS.

Sec. 6. That for the purpose of this act: an article shall be deemed to be adulterated—

In case of drugs: First, if, when a drug is sold under or by a name recognized in the United States Pharmacopoeia, it differs from the standard of strength, quality or purity, as determined by the test laid down in the United States Pharmacopoeia, official at the time of the investigation.

Second, if its strength or purity fall below the professed standard under which it is sold.

Third, if it be an imitation of or offered for sale under the name of another article.

In case of confectionery: If it contain terra alba, barytes, talc, chrome yellow, or other mineral substances or poisonous colors or flavors, or other ingredients deleterious or detrimental to health.

In case of food: First, if any substance or substances has or have been mixed and packed with it so as to reduce or lower or injuriously affect its quality or strength, so that such product, when offered for sale, shall deceive or tend to deceive the purchaser.

Second, if any substance or substances has or have been substituted wholly or in part for the article, so that the product when sold shall deceive or tend to deceive the purchaser.

Third, if any valuable constituent of the article has been wholly or in part abstracted, so that the product, when sold, shall deceive or tend to deceive the purchaser.

Fourth, if it be an imitation of or offered for sale under the specific name of another article.

Fifth, if it be mixed, colored, powdered or stained in a manner whereby damage or inferiority is concealed, so that such product, when sold, shall deceive or tend to deceive the purchaser.

Sixth, if it contain any added poisonous ingredient or any ingredient which may render such article injurious to the health of the person consuming it.

Seventh, if it be labeled or branded so as to deceive or mislead the purchaser, or purport to be a foreign product when not so, or is an imitation, either in package or label, of another substance of a previously established name, or which has been trademarked or patented.

Eighth, if it contains a whole or any part of a diseased, filthy, decomposed or putrid animal or vegetable substance, or any portion of an animal unfit for food, whether manufactured or not, or if it is the product of a diseased animal, or one that has died otherwise than by slaughter; provided, That an article of food which does not contain any added poisonous or deleterious ingredients shall not be deemed to be adulterated in the following cases:

First, in the case of mixtures or compounds which may be now or from time to time hereafter known as articles of food, under their own distinctive names, and not included in definition fourth of this section. Second, in the case of articles labeled, branded, or tagged so as to plainly indicate that they are mixtures, compounds, combinations, imitations, or blends. Provided, That if it be labeled, branded, or tagged, as prescribed by the Secretary of Agriculture, so as to show the exact character thereof: And provided further, That nothing in this Act shall be construed as requiring or compelling proprietors or manufacturers of proprietary foods which contain no unwholesome added ingredient to disclose their trade formulas, except in so far as the provisions of this Act may require to secure freedom from adulteration or imitation: Provided further, That no dealer shall be convicted under the provisions of this act when he is able to prove a written guaranty of purity, in a form approved by the Secretary of Agriculture, as published in his rules and regulations, signed by the manufacturer, or the party or parties from whom he purchased said articles: Provided also, That said guarantor or guarantors reside in the United States. Said guaranty shall contain the full name and address of the party or parties making this sale to the dealer, and said party or parties shall be amenable to the prosecutions, fines, and other penalties which would attach in due course to the dealer under the provisions of this act.

Sec. 7. That it shall be the duty of the Secretary of Agriculture to fix standards of food products when advisable and to determine the wholesomeness or unwholesomeness of preservatives and other substances which are or may be added to foods, and to aid him in reaching just decisions in such matters he is authorized to call upon the Director of the Bureau of Chemistry and the chairman of the committee on food standards of the Association of Official Agricultural Chemists, and such physicians, not less than five, as the President of the United States shall select, three of whom shall be from the Medical Departments of the army, the navy, and

the marine hospital service, and not less than five experts, to be selected by the Secretary of Agriculture by reason of their attainments in physiological chemistry, hygiene, commerce and manufactures, to consider jointly the standards of all food products (within the meaning of this act), and to study the effect of the preservatives and other substances added to food products on the health of the consumer; and when so determined and approved by the Secretary of Agriculture such standards shall guide the chemists of the Department of Agriculture in the performance of the duties imposed upon them by this act and shall remain the standards before all the United States courts. It shall be the duty of the Secretary of Agriculture, either directly or through the director of the bureau of chemistry and the chairman of the committee on food standards of the Association of Official Agricultural Chemists and the medical officers and experts before mentioned, to confer with and consult, when so requested, the duly accredited representatives of all industries producing articles for which standards shall be established under the provisions of this act.

Sec. 8. That every person who manufactures or produces: for shipment and delivers for transportation within the District of Columbia or any Territory, or who manufactures or produces for shipment or delivers for transportation from any State, Territory, or the District of Columbia, or to any foreign country, any drug or article of food, and every person who exposes for sale or delivers to a purchaser in the District of Columbia or any Territory any drug or article of food manufactured or produced within said District of Columbia or said Territory, or who exposes for sale or delivers for shipment any drug or article of food received from a State, Territory, or the District of Columbia other than the State, Territory, or the District of Columbia in which he exposes for sale or delivers such drug or article of food, or from any foreign country, shall furnish within business hours, and upon tender and full payment of the selling price, a sample of such drugs or articles of food to any person duly authorized by the Secretary of Agriculture to receive the same, and who shall apply to such manufacturer, producer, or vendor, or person delivering to a purchaser such drug or article of food, for such sample for such use, in sufficient quantity for the analysis of any such article or articles in his possession. And in the presence of such dealer and an agent of the Department of Agriculture, if so desired by either party, said sample shall be divided into three parts, and each part shall be sealed by the seal of the Department of Agriculture. One part shall be left with the dealer, one delivered to the director of the bureau of chemistry of the Department of Agriculture, and one deposited with the United States district attorney for the district in which the sample is taken. Said manufacturer, producer, or dealer may have the sample left with him analyzed at his own expense, and if the results of such analysis differ from those shown in the hands of the district attorney may be analyzed at the expense of the said manufacturer or dealer by a third chemist, who shall be appointed by the president of the Association of Official Agricultural Chemists of the United States; and the analysis shall be conducted, if so desired, in the presence of a chemist of the Department of Agriculture and a chemist representing the dealer, and the whole data obtained shall be laid before the court.

Sec. 9. That any manufacturer, producer, or dealer who refuses to comply, upon demand, with the requirements of section eight of this act shall be guilty of misdemeanor, and upon conviction shall be fined not exceeding one hundred dollars, or imprisoned not exceeding ninety days, or both. And any person found guilty of manufacturing or offering for sale, or selling, an adulterated, impure, or misbranded article of food or drug in violation of the provisions of this act shall be adjudged to pay, in addition to the penalties herebefore provided for, all the necessary costs and expenses incurred in inspecting and analyzing such adulterated articles which said person may have been found guilty of manufacturing, selling, or offering for sale.

Sec. 10. That this act shall not be construed to interfere with commerce wholly internal in any State, nor with the exercise of their police powers by the several States.

Sec. 11. That any article of food or drug that is adulterated or misbranded within the meaning of this act, and is transported or being transported from one State to another for sale, or if it be sold or offered for sale in the District of Columbia and the Territories of the United States, or if it be imported from a foreign country for sale, or if intended for export to a foreign country, shall be liable to be proceeded against in any district court of the United States, within the district where the same is found and seized for confiscation, by a process of libel or condemnation, and if such article is condemned as being adulterated the same shall be disposed of as the said court may direct, and the proceeds thereof, if sold, less the legal costs and charges, shall be paid into the Treasury of the United States, but such goods shall not be sold in any State contrary to the laws of that State. The proceedings of such libel cases shall conform, as near as may be, to proceedings in admiralty, except that either party may demand trial by jury of any issue of fact joined in such case; and all such proceedings shall be at the suit of and in the name of the United States.

It is written that ex-Queen Liliuokalani has a private fortune which yields her an income of \$25,000 a year, besides a fine estate and country palace. And still she has been trying to get the United States to pension her. She has about given that hope up, and will return to the Hawaiian Islands to live in obscurity.

Great Precedents for Liberty.

Republican organs are actually apologizing to Great Britain for the twenty United States Senators who voted to take up the resolution expressing sympathy with the Boers. But the votes of these twenty Senators need no apology. They are in line with great precedents set by American Presidents and Congresses on similar occasions all through our history.

George Washington made the first precedent when he said, referring to the men who had overthrown monarchy and established a republic in France:

Born in a land of liberty my anxious recollections, my sympathetic feelings and my best wishes are irresistibly excited whenever in any country I see an oppressed nation unfurl the banners of freedom.

James Monroe follows in a message which, as President, he sent to Congress in December, 1822. He said:

It was natural, therefore, that the reappearance of those people (the Greeks) in their original character, contending in favor of their liberties should produce that great excitement and sympathy in their favor which have been so signally displayed throughout the United States. A strong hope is entertained that these people will recover their independence.

Webster and Clay vied with each other in impassioned speeches in favor of Greek independence. The South American Republics struggling against Spain had our official recognition and encouragement. Our Monroe Doctrine was proclaimed for their benefit.

Kossuth, the champion of Hungarian independence, was officially welcomed when he visited this country on the formal invitation of Congress in 1851, and our Government went as far as it possibly could go within the bounds of peaceful diplomacy, to encourage him and his cause.

More recently our Senate passed resolutions of sympathy with the people of Brazil in their revolt against the Emperor Dom Pedro, and also with the Armenians in their struggle with the Turks.

The plain truth is that the Boers are the one people and the only people (excepting the Filipinos, of course), fighting to maintain a free and independent Republic, who, from 1776 to 1900, have failed to receive the officially outspoken sympathy and encouragement of this great Republic of the West.

This is a part of the price we are paying for British sympathy and "moral support" in our new policy of Asiatic adventure.

Chadwick's Attack on Schley.

The partisan attacks upon Rear Admiral Schley have culminated with the bitter and senseless invective used by Captain Chadwick in a recent interview. When Captain Chadwick states that he would not shake hands with Schley he exercises a personal prerogative.

But when he assumes that nobody else in the navy would shake hands with Schley, his animosity becomes idiotic. This is the silly feature of Chadwick's criticism and may be overlooked.

But Chadwick, throwing caution to the winds, and relying upon Administration backing, deliberately sets himself up as a candidate for court martial.

He says: "Every one of us feels the disgrace that Schley put upon us." The large "Us" with which Captain Chadwick brings in the entire navy would be impressive coming from another source. He doubtless forgets that Rear Admiral Schley was complimented by the President and was proposed for promotion for conspicuous good conduct in battle.

Since fighting the battle of Santiago Rear Admiral Schley has been promoted to a position next to that of Admiral Dewey. This only intensifies the bitterness of Captain Chadwick's gall. He speaks of Schley as having been "guilty of a disgraceful exhibition of pettiness."

These are words for which Chadwick should be summarily court-martialed. He should not forget that Rear Admiral Schley is his superior officer. And if he does, Secretary Long, as the defender and conservator of naval ethics and discipline, should remind him.

The department's action in the case, taken since the above was written, is a severe reprimand, and it is noteworthy that its letter has been made public, a fact which in itself adds to the weight of the punishment administered.



Is this War, or only Plain Killing?

It cannot have escaped notice that recently the despatches cabled from the Philippines, whether press dispatches or "official" communications from the "military recluses of Manila," as Gen. Otis has been happily styled, have been less in the nature of reports of fighting done by our troops than simple records of the number of Filipinos killed by them from day to day or week to week.

Thus on April 24 and 25 we had detailed accounts furnished of the number of killed during the week, including April 16, which seems to have been a regular field day for that sort of thing. On that day General Otis reports 334 natives killed at Batoc, in northern Luzon, by the troops operating under General Young, our loss at the same time being 2 killed and 4 wounded. A press correspondent, referring to the same affair, says that to the number of killed by actual count there should be added at least an equal number of natives who died from their wounds owing to the lack of surgeons and hospital appliances among the Filipinos, their wounded dying uncaared for in the jungle. One thousand, according to this correspondent, was a reasonable estimate of the total of the Filipino losses in killed, wounded and prisoners, as against the 2 killed and 4 wounded on our side. Officers arriving at Manila from Nueva Carceres, province of Camarines, in southern Luzon, give details of a "fight" stated to have occurred there also on the 16th of April, in which 80 Filipinos were killed by a detachment of the Forty-fifth Infantry, with 2 Maxim guns, operating under orders from General Bell. The Filipinos are described as being armed only with bolos, or long knives, and equipped with helmets, coats and shields made of buffalo hides. It is naively added that the bolo men never got near enough to the Americans, provided with Krag-Jorgensen rifles and Maxim guns, to inflict any damage. "Therefore," proceeds the account, "none of the Americans were even wounded." It is added that, "General Bell's two regiments are hard-worked clearing up the country. They meet many small squads of bolomen. Last week they killed a total of 125."

In another "fight" a lieutenant whose name is given, it is stated, "with 20 cavalrymen cornered 50 bolomen in a river and shot every one, the bodies floating away." Further, on the same lucky day—April 15—in the province of Albay three companies of the Forty-Seventh Infantry are reported as having routed a large force of natives, "mostly bolomen, killing 53." No mention is made of any "casualties" upon our side nor of any prisoners being taken. The nature of the "clearing up" operations in which our troops are engaged, as well as of the sort of "fighting" encountered, may be easily inferred from these occurrences of a single week. The bolomen appear to be easy game—almost too easy to afford very exciting sport to our soldiers. The meager details furnished in official reports and press despatches serve, however, to recall the statements

contained in soldiers' letters, published earlier in the "war," about the fun to be derived from "potting niggers."

The question may be asked, How long is this cruel and brutalizing sport to be kept up? Until after the election, it may be safely assumed. Already Republican politicians are quoting for McKinley's benefit the saying attributed to Abraham Lincoln about the folly of "swapping horses while crossing the stream." We all understand that Mr. McKinley is the steed that has dragged us into these turbulent waters and exposed the Republic to the imminent danger of being swamped or swept away by the stream. There are many who will fail to appreciate the wisdom of following such an unsafe guide into still deeper waters and greater perils, especially when there is yet time to escape from further danger by regaining the safe and familiar shore which we have been induced to quit. But for McKinley there would be no hazardous stream to cross. Still, in order to make Lincoln's advice about "swapping horses" applicable it is necessary to keep up the war, or at least the semblance of war, to say nothing of the army of officials and contractors who would be grievously disappointed if the war were to come too suddenly to an end.

So, if the Filipinos will not fight or cannot fight, having nothing but knives left to fight with, we can continue shooting and killing them all the same and report the result of each week's "bag" to Washington.

The remarkable thing is the little impression that all these horrors and this useless bloodshed seem to make upon the public mind. Even the religious conscience of the country seems to be asleep upon the subject of the wickedness of war—of such war as we are waging upon a helpless people 7,000 miles from our shores who never did us harm and whose only fault is that Mr. McKinley, for \$2,000,000, bought them, their country, their liberty and their independence from Spain. Senator Hoar has eloquently demonstrated not the wickedness of war in general, but of this particular war of conquest, and now, it seems, of extermination which we are waging against the Filipinos. We listen in vain, however, to hear even his voice raised in Congress in favor of stopping this cruel and, according to him, wholly unjustifiable slaughter of an innocent people—innocent, that is, of all cause of offense so far as we are concerned. That they should strive to defend themselves against the troops who are sent to "clear them up" that they should seek in their ignorance to interpose between their naked bodies and Krag-Jorgensen bullets the ineffectual protection of shields and helmets made of buffalo hide, and to oppose with knives the resistless fire of Maxim guns mowing them down like grain, is but the instinct of self preservation. Animals, even the most timorous, when "cornered" by the huntman, as our soldiers boast of "cornering" and shooting the bolomen and watching their bodies float down the stream—aye,

the poorest and meanest of God's creatures so hunted and beset—would seek some means of retaliation and defense. But even from the Ecumenical Conference—the great gathering of missionaries and of persons especially interested in the cause of missions lately assembled in New York—we have not heard one word of protest in the name of Christianity or humanity against the horrors of the wars which are being waged today by the two great branches of the English speaking race on both sides of the globe. Good men talk of establishing missions in the Philippines—creating dioceses and building cathedrals there—but meanwhile hold their peace while the wretched Filipinos are being slaughtered.

Tempery but Costly Trade.

The memorial which the Manila Chamber of Commerce lays before Congress is exceedingly interesting and clarifying. It adds to the proof already furnished by our treatment of Porto Rico that it we are a blessing to our new possessions the blessing is most completely disguised. As Grosvenor said, it is evident that the commercial friends and beneficiaries of the Republican party are going to "make all the money out of the transaction" that is possible. The oppressive tax on Porto Rico is by an act of Congress. The Executive has done quite as well in the Philippines. It is McKinley's tax there, and he is taxing trade out of existence.

Some one has estimated that the war, waged to preserve the trade we are killing by taxation, is costing the country \$1,000,000 a day. This may be an exaggeration, but the army in the Philippines alone is costing \$100,000,000 a year, and when to this are added the increased cost of the navy, the cost of the civil government and the increased cost of our home government on account of the Philippines, it will be seen that the exaggeration is not so great as at first sight it may appear.

At its best estate, what is this trade for which we are paying so much? How much are Mr. Grosvenor's friends to make out of the transaction? The Division of Customs and Insular Affairs of the War Department tells us in its last monthly bulletin. For four months ending October 31 last the total imports of the Philippines were \$8,912,531 and the total exports \$5,774,049. The whole foreign commerce of the Philippines at this rate would about equal that of the port of New York for one good shipping day.

Of this twopenny trade the United States in the four months exported and imported goods of the value of \$2,154,243, a commerce of about \$6,500,000 a year, on which the profit to the friends of McKinley, Hanna, Grosvenor & Co. would be at the outside \$650,000. If we continue to tax the trade too heavily of course the profit will be less.

How long will the country consent to pay even \$1,000,000 a year to protect this trampy commerce?