

business had not been changed, and its financial standing had at least not been impaired since the time when its methods and standing had been originally investigated by the government of Prussia and then found satisfactory, as evidenced by the original granting of the license or concession to it.

By way of specifications as to Prussia's unreasonableness the petition sets up the following:

And your petitioner respectfully begs to present, as a single example out of many of the disingenuousness and injustice of the treatment of your petitioner by the Prussian authorities, that the final pretext seized upon by the government of Prussia as a ground for expelling your petitioner was to declare that it was engaged in the business of what is known as tontine insurance, although the Prussian authorities knew, or ought to have known, and were given every opportunity by the officials of your petitioner for so ascertaining, before the decree of expulsion was promulgated, that the charge and objection were utterly without foundation; and although also, after its concession had been cancelled upon this pretext, it was demonstrated to the satisfaction of the Prussian authorities through their emissaries and representatives sent to the United States that the contention of the Prussian authorities in this regard was without foundation, yet, nevertheless, the Prussian government not only refused, and still refuses, to revoke the cancellation of your petitioner's license wrongfully decreed on this false issue, but also, abandoning this contention, thereupon proceeded to impose upon your petitioner conditions new and impossible of compliance as the price of its reinstatement which had never been suggested previously, and which the Prussian authorities knew could not be obeyed under your petitioner's charter, or with a proper regard to the interest of its policyholders.

In conclusion the petition says:

And although your petitioner is compelled to admit the physical power of the Prussian government to impose upon corporations or citizens of foreign states which it has invited into its boundaries such conditions and exactions as shall compel them to leave; and although it admits the technical authority of the Prussian government to expel your petitioner from the kingdom of Prussia upon a false pretext and then to impose upon it impossible new conditions as the price of righting the wrong done by its expulsion, it respectfully submits to the Congress of the United States that such treatment by a supposedly friendly state of a corporation of the United States, or of the citizens which compose it in its corporate capacity, is indefensible in the forum of international comity, not justified by the friendly relations existing between the United States and the kingdom of Prussia, unworthy of any enlightened and civilized state, and calls for inquiry and investigation by Congress.

Wherefore your petitioner respectfully prays for an inquiry into your petitioner's grievances by Congress, to the end that such steps may be taken as equity and international comity may require for the redress of such grievances.

The petition was presented by Representative James S. Sherman, of New York, and was referred to a committee on interstate and foreign commerce.

Resident managers of the Prussian fire companies are giving themselves no uneasiness over the petition. They take the position that the whole matter was fought out on its merits last year and settled to the entire satisfaction of both the New York state official and the Prussian authorities. Viewing the matter thus, they cannot conceive that Congress will attempt to open a question which for months has been considered closed by the officials of the Empire state.

MORAL VALUE OF BEING WATCHED.

Few men in positions of trust are consciously grateful for supervision. They may submit gracefully to the inevitable and recognize that so long as some men are dishonest, even such men as they are must put up with precautions against dishonesty. But they rarely feel that their honesty is due in any sense to the fact that they are watched; an intimation of that sort they would resent as if it were a charge of dishonesty; and of all the many thousands of men who have opportunities to steal, but are constantly watched, it is not likely that half a dozen ever gave thanks in their hearts for being watched.

But the Cuban postal scandal teaches a solemn

lesson of the moral value of being watched. The accused men have been honest hitherto. They have been tried in places where there was money to steal, and they never stole a cent. It is perfectly safe to say that not one of them ever was conscious of being tempted to steal a cent. But every one of them was watched. He never connected this fact with the other fact that he felt no disposition to steal. He attributed this latter to his integrity. In a sense he was right. But he was wrong when he failed to see that there was a discoverable connection between his integrity and the fact that he was watched.

These men had occupied responsible positions; they had proved themselves honest and of much more than the usual capacity, and they were honored with the appointment to places in the Cuban service where our Government was anxious to put its best foot forward and show how much better American administration was than Spanish. In Cuba they felt that they were not watched. They were taken out of the system in which they had served and with all the precautions of which they were familiar, they were outside of their own country, they were administering affairs for a different people, who had no share in the Government over them, and a fatal sense of immunity from detection came over these men.

Presently they were conscious of what we presume they had never experienced before, the desire for money that did not belong to them. It is not likely that they took some at once. But a man who believes he has immunity from detection is almost certain to harbor a dishonest thought, and he will not harbor a dishonest thought long before he puts it into action. If these men had remained in the postal service at home they would never have stolen, and they never would have been conscious of a temptation to steal. But the danger of detection was removed as they supposed; presently the temptation was felt, and before long they had yielded to it. Every man in a position of trust may learn a lesson from this incident and be thankful that he is watched.

Some years ago the weigher in the Philadelphia Mint was detected in stealing gold bars. He had been in the Mint since he was a boy, and he was then becoming an old man. His reputation for honesty was so well established that he was no longer watched. He knew it, and presently he felt a sensation which he had probably not felt in the forty or fifty years he had been in the Mint; it was the temptation to steal; after a little while he stole. The Secret Service officers, who studied him long before they felt justified in arresting him, said that he could have been trusted with notes and bonds with perfect safety; there was only one thing that he would steal, and that was gold in bars; that was the only thing he had become accustomed to handling without being watched. The temptation to steal gold bars crept upon him, though the temptation to steal anything else he was no more conscious of than other men.