

ties set forth in his address on land and its cultivation. Few of us, probably, were conscious of the impairment of the crop value of our soil. I am sure that a clear understanding of this subject will lead to a still further enlargement of the work of the department of agriculture and to still closer co-operation between the department of agriculture and the states in teaching economical methods of agriculture. Already the rapid growth of the agricultural college offers encouragement and I am glad to express my appreciation of the valuable work done by Secretary Wilson and his associates in bringing to our country fruits, plants and grasses suited to the different parts of our country. As the farmer pays more than his share of the taxes and receives less than his share of the direct benefits which flow from national appropriations, it is only justice to him that we shall be liberal in the support of every effort put forth for the improvement of agriculture.

Irrigation has justified the arguments which led to the inauguration of the work. No one who has witnessed the transformation of the desert into field and garden can doubt the wisdom of the steps that have been taken. Here, as elsewhere, both the nation and the state can find a field for legitimate activity, and I am sure that there will be a continuation of this work until all of the waters which can be utilized for that purpose have been appropriated.

The same principle which was invoked in support of irrigation can be invoked in support of drainage. The question is not whether the water should be brought upon the land or taken off the land; it is whether the land shall be made tillable and its wealth producing qualities utilized. Drainage of the swamps is, therefore, as legitimate a work as the reclamation of arid wastes.

No subject has been brought out more prominently at this conference than the subject of forestry, and it justifies the time devoted to it, for our timber lands touch our national interests at several points. Our use of lumber is enormous, but immense as would be the inconvenience and loss caused by the absence of lumber, the consequence of the destruction of our forests would be still more disastrous to the nation. As has been shown, the timber on our mountain ranges protects our water supply. Not to speak of changes in our climate which might follow the denuding of our mountains, the loss to the irrigated country could not be remedied and the damage to the streams could not be calculated. And if this is not enough to arouse the interest of all, I may add that the destruction of the forests on the mountain ranges would in time impair the underflow upon which we rely for our well water.

The good effects of this conference are already apparent in the determination expressed by several governors to at once appoint forestry commissions and begin such work as the state can do. In this case action is so urgent and the field to be covered so large that both the nation and the several states can exercise themselves to the full without danger of doing too much. The national reservations already made in the west and the new reservations that ought to be made, and are likely to be made, in the White mountains and in the Appalachian range can doubtless be so administered as to protect national interests without unduly burdening the states in which the reservations are located, or needlessly interfering with the development of the states. No national policy need retard the development of the western states and their own interests would restrain them from sacrificing future wealth and protection for temporary advantage.

Lastly, I come to our interior waterways. I shall not defend the improvement of these waterways on the ground that such improvement would help to regulate the railroad rates, although it would aid regulation, whenever the people are ready to exercise the power which they have. But water traffic is less expensive than traffic by rail and there are many commodities which can be transported much more cheaply by water than they possibly could be carried on land. I believe it has been estimated that an expenditure of \$500,000,000 on interior waterways would result in a saving of nearly \$200,000,000 annually.

If this saving were equally divided between the producers and the consumers it would be an enormous profit to both, and Mr. Carnegie has pointed out that water transportation, by requiring less iron and less coal in proportion to the freight carried, would enable us to postpone the exhaustion of our iron mines and our coal beds.

The development of water transportation is essentially a national project because the water

courses run by and through many states. And yet, as has been pointed out, it would be possible for the states to do a certain amount of developing along this line if they were permitted to avail themselves of the use of the water power that could be developed.

Just a word in conclusion about an investment in permanent improvements. Money spent in care for the life and health of the people, in protecting the soil from erosion and from exhaustion, in preventing waste in the use of minerals of limited supply, in the reclamation of deserts and of swamps, and in the preservation of forests still remaining and the replanting of denuded tracts—money invested in these and in the development of waterways and in the deepening of harbors is an investment yielding an annual return. If any of these expenditures fail to bring a return at once the money expended is like a bequest to those who come after it. And as the parent lives for his child as well as for himself, so the citizen provides for the future as well as for the present. This gathering will be remembered by future generations, because they as well as ourselves will be the recipients of the benefits which will flow from this conference. We have all been strengthened by communion together; our vision has been enlarged and the enthusiasm here aroused will permeate every state and every community.



NO PERPETUAL FRANCHISES

Mr. Pinchot, of the forestry department, has been making a fight—and thus far a successful one—against the granting of perpetual franchises to water power companies which are seeking to utilize the streams in the forest reserves. He is right; a perpetual franchise is an unspeakable menace. No one can see far enough into the future to define the terms and conditions of a perpetual franchise. No one can estimate the value of such a franchise a thousand years hence, or even a hundred years hence. No franchise should be granted for more than twenty or twenty-five years and then the government should reserve the right to regulate prices charged for power and should also reserve the right to take over the plant at any time upon payment of actual value, EXCLUSIVE OF THE VALUE OF THE FRANCHISES.

The government is not supposed to give away anything valuable and it ought never to have to buy back a franchise. A power company which wants to do an honest business will not object to strict regulations or to surrender to the government at the will of the government, and corporations which seek to get something for nothing and then employ the public grant to exploit the public have no claim to consideration.

Mr. Pinchot is right in insisting that there should be a TIME LIMIT on franchises—he ought to go a step farther and insist upon the government's right to protect the public by taking over the plant whenever public interest demands it. Each generation should be left free to make such use of the earth as times and conditions require. No generation has a right to fetter the future with perpetual franchises.



PENNSYLVANIA'S OBJECT LESSON

The democratic state convention recently held in Pennsylvania is heralded as a victory for the "conservative" element of the party, and yet it will only prove anew the old saying that "whom the gods would destroy they first make mad." Nothing but an insane contempt for every democratic principle could have led to the brazen disregard of the will of the rank and file of party unmistakably expressed at the polls manifested at Harrisburg.

The convention was an excellent illustration of the difference between conventions and the primary method of election, and just such conventions led to the adoption of the primary system. At the primary, where the voters had a chance to express themselves, more than two-thirds of the district delegates were instructed, and yet in the state convention the delegates elected at the same primaries joined in with a political boss to defeat instructions.

Take Philadelphia, for instance. Forty-one delegates, who were elected at the primaries where district delegates to Denver were instructed, voted in the state convention against instructions, and the forty-one votes from Philadelphia were enough to change the result in the state convention. There were a number of delegates from other counties who voted contrary to the wishes of voters as those wishes were expressed at the primaries. Democrats may

differ on economic questions and on platform utterances, but democrats can not differ as to the duty of representatives to represent their constituents. A delegate has no more right to turn to his private advantage the authority conferred upon him by voters than a trustee has to convert to his own use money deposited with him.

The action of the state convention was, in effect, an embezzlement of power and can be defended only by those who are ignorant of, or indifferent to, the democratic principle that conventions derive their just powers from the consent of the voters. The question as to what candidate the democrats of Pennsylvania favor is of little importance compared with the question, "Have the democrats of Pennsylvania a right to a voice in the selection of candidates?"

It seems that they have not, according to the opinion of those in charge of the Harrisburg convention. The fact that it was necessary to turn down men like Representative Creasey and ex-Treasurer Berry shows how desperate the men in control were. The action of the convention will have but little influence on the general result, because the convention only selected four delegates at large (sixty-four having been previously selected at primaries) but the object lesson which the convention furnished in boss-rule carried to the extreme will be valuable to the state, for it will hasten the regeneration of democratic politics in Pennsylvania, and regeneration is necessary, if the democratic party is to be more than an adjunct of the republican party. As it is now, the main purpose seems to be to prevent the democrats from taking advantage of the widespread opposition to republican corruption.

ONLY BY INSTRUCTING CAN THE VOTERS CONTROL; the uninstructed delegate is a guardian without bond.



THE TWILIGHT ZONE

At the governors' conference, called by the president, Mr. Bryan referred to the discussion about the relative spheres of the nation and the state and said that there is "no twilight zone between the nation and the state in which exploiting interests can take refuge from both." He had in mind the constant attempts of predatory corporations to avoid national laws by an appeal to states rights and to avoid state laws by an appeal to national supremacy. Every one who has tried to protect the public from the plundering that has been carried on by monopolies knows how the big corporations have played fast and loose with both nation and state. It was for this reason that the phrase, "twilight zone," struck such a responsive chord. The president immediately seized upon it and used it to explain his position. The president said: "Just a word of what has been called the 'twilight land' between the powers of the federal and state governments. My primary aim in the legislation that I have advocated for the regulation of the great corporations has been to provide some effective popular sovereign for each corporation. I do not wish to keep this twilight land one of large and vague boundaries, by judicial decision that in a given case the state can not act, and then a few years later by other decisions that in practically similar cases the nation can not act either. I am trying to find out where one or the other can act, so there shall always be some sovereign power that on behalf of the people can hold every big corporation, every big individual, to an accountability so that its or his acts shall be beneficial to the people as a whole."

However people may differ about the methods employed by the chief executive—and Mr. Bryan has dissented from some of them—no one can dispute the president's statement that EVERY CORPORATION MUST BE AMENABLE TO SOME SOVEREIGN. It is absurd to say that the laws can create a fictitious person, called a corporation, and that the creature can then defy its creator and oppress at will the people of the entire country.

These corporations have controlled national politics for years and resent any interference with their plans. They control politics in several states and are reaching out after more. They subsidize newspapers and these papers defame every servant of the people and eulogize every official who betrays his constituents. They contribute to the campaign funds to debauch politics; they corrupt business methods and when these corrupt methods are attacked they hide behind honest wealth and denounce all reform as an attack on legitimate accumulations.

It is time to eliminate the "twilight zone" and hold to strict accountability all the agencies