

The Buffalo Times suggests that the reorganizers who have been crowing over the defeat of Senator Jones will find that Governor Clark, who defeated Senator Jones, is anything but a reorganizer. The contest between Senator Jones and Governor Clark did not involve the question of organization, because Governor Clark is the Arkansas member of the national committee, of which Senator Jones is chairman. There is every reason to believe that the corporation democrats who are seeking to reorganize the party will find Governor Clark as hostile to their plans as they always found Senator Jones.

They are
Crowing
Too Soon.

A Copenhagen cablegram says that a reliable canvass of the Landsting indicates that that body will vote for the ratification of the Danish West Indian islands treaty with the provision that the ratification shall be operative only after the people of the West Indies have voted in favor of the sale of their islands to the United States. If the Danish government, however, should order a plebiscite, the fact would provide an interesting object lesson, in that a kingdom recognized, at least in this respect, the consent principle, where the administration and senate of the greatest republic failed to give recognition to that principle in the preparation of the treaty.

An Interesting
Object
Lesson.

It is to be regretted that Senator Pettus in a letter to a constituent has expressed himself as inclined to oppose the election of senators by the people. His opposition to the change is founded upon his fear that it is in the direction of centralization. The senator is not only in error as to the tendency of this change, but he can satisfy himself upon investigation that those senators who are most in favor of centralization are opposed to the popular election of senators. The advocates of centralization want to take the government as far as possible from the people; the advocates of local self-government believe in bringing the government as close to the people as possible. The rights of a state will be better protected by senators selected by the people than by men chosen by the corporations.

It Means
Local
Self-Government.

In his speech at Charleston Mr. Roosevelt said that he considered there was "far more warfare about the Philippines in this country than there was warfare in the Philippines themselves." If this be true, then why is it necessary for this government to expend such enormous sums of money in order to establish United States authority in the Philippine islands? If this be true, why does the national administration not permit all of the facts concerning conditions in the Philippines to become known? Before the senate committee April 7th Senator Culbertson of Texas called attention to the fact that the report of the civil governor of one of the Philippine provinces had been omitted from the records of Governor Taft's testimony. Senator Culbertson intimated that the war department had taken pains to conceal some of these reports, and he insisted upon their production. He said that he understood that these reports had been withheld for the purpose of procuring statements to be presented at the same time and "calculated to parry" the reports. Senator Rawlins of Utah also insisted upon the production of the reports in question and Senator Carmack of Tennessee expressed the opinion that the war department "had come into possession of information that did not suit its views and is trying to suppress it until it can cook up some-

Then Why
all This
Secrecy.

thing to break the force of it." The committee then agreed to call upon the secretary of war for all information within his possession relating to Philippine affairs. If Mr. Roosevelt has reached a correct conclusion, then why is it necessary for these reports to be dragged out of the war department? Why does he not require his subordinates to promptly and fully supply the congress with information concerning the conduct of affairs in the Philippine islands?

In his testimony before the senate committee General MacArthur said that the Filipinos like the American ideas of personal liberty as embodied in our institutions. "This," said General MacArthur, "realizes an ideal of their own." Senator Carmack observed, "Then they have an ideal." "They have most decidedly," replied Gen. MacArthur. "You do not then regard them as 'a miserable, corrupted, cruel, and degenerate race,'" asked Senator Carmack. "By no means," replied Gen. MacArthur. "Such a view, to my mind, is a mistaken view." This estimate of the Filipinos by Gen. MacArthur is hardly in keeping with the estimate by General Funston, the man who would have everyone hanged who does not happen to agree with Funston's ideas of government. It also suggests an explanation to those who permit themselves to wonder why the Filipinos insist upon continuing their struggle for independence. It is not strange that people who "like the American ideas of personal liberty" as embodied in American institutions because these ideas "realize an ideal of their own," should be willing to fight, and even to die, in defense of their ideal.

MacArthur
on Filipino
Character.

A London cablegram to the New York Journal announces that the Prince of Wales, heir to the throne of Great Britain, will soon visit the United States. The occasion of the prince's visit will be an acceptance of an invitation to attend the dedication of the new Chamber of Commerce in New York City. It is also announced that a special proposal from Washington relating to this trip has been laid before King Edward, and it is added that "counselors of the king are said to have urged upon him this visit as a matter of state policy. The welcome extended Prince Henry of Prussia has been a forceful factor in instigating this proposition." To be sure the people of the United States will give cordial welcome to any representative man who will visit this country, but while we are taking such unusual pains to encourage the visit of the representatives of monarchy, why may we not do something to encourage a visit from one or two representatives of republics? How would it do, for instance, to push in the house the resolution introduced by Mr. Cochran of Missouri providing for an invitation to President Kruger? Would it not be of some advantage to public sentiment in this country, after having had visits from a pair of crowned heads, to receive a visit from the president of one of the little republics struggling for existence in South Africa?

And Now
the Prince
of Wales.

The New York legislature sought to persuade all citizens to go to the polls by the passage of a law providing that a list be prepared containing the names of all the citizens of New York City who do not register and that this list shall serve as a preferred jury list. Until the names of this special list have been exhausted no registered voter can be called on for jury duty. The motive of the authors of this measure is indeed a good one, because nothing is so important to a government, whether municipal, state, or national, as that

Coaxing
Men to
the Polls.

every citizen go to the polls, and not only go to the polls, but manifest some interest in the selection of public officers and the solution of public problems. And yet, may it not be that in seeking to cure a defect in one place, the New York legislature has aggravated a defect in another place? There is, even now, complaint concerning the personnel of juries. Is it to be expected that a man who is not a good enough citizen to go to the trouble of casting a vote would make a good juror? The New York experiment will, however, be watched with considerable interest. If it shall demonstrate that men who are so indifferent to the character of public policies and public servants that they will not take the trouble to go to the polls, would prefer voting to a term of service on the jury, then some good will have been accomplished.

Walter Wellman, the Washington correspondent of the Chicago Record-Herald, under date of Washington, April 9th, wired his republican newspaper as follows:

A
Fair
Warning.

The shipping subsidy bill will not become a law during this session of congress. It has been definitely abandoned by its friends. Senators Hanna and Frye, its champions, now make no secret of the fact that they have given up hope of passing the measure this spring.

Behind this fact lies a most interesting story. The true cause of the abandonment of the bill for this session is the fear that its passage would make it more difficult for republicans to hold the house of representatives. The leaders of that party are already frightened over the outlook, and they are convinced that the addition of the subsidy to the winter's work of the party in power would have disastrous effect upon the elections of next fall.

Many republicans admit that it was a mistake not to do something toward revising the tariff schedules this session, especially those involving trust-made goods, and they have decided not to pile on the subsidy legislation, which is far more unpopular in the middle west.

Senator Hanna and his associates, in pushing the subsidy bill, had it in their power to pass the measure at this session. They could secure a favorable report on it from the house committee, and notwithstanding the lukewarmness of Speaker Henderson they had means of getting it before the house and of passing it by cracking the party whip. They feel very sure of their strength, despite a good deal of republican opposition.

But Mr. Hanna is chairman of the republican national committee. He feels a certain responsibility for party success. He is more or less directly interested in future events. So many of his party associates have begged him not to force them to face the subsidy issue on the eve of the congressional elections, and have painted such dark pictures of what will happen to them and to the party if he does, that he has decided to let the bill go over to next winter. There is an implied contract that after the congressional elections are out of the way it shall pass the house.

It will be well for the American voter to keep this statement in mind. This is not the prediction of a democrat; it is the solemn declaration of a very partisan correspondent of a very partisan republican newspaper.

In this the American voter finds a frank confession that the failure of the ship subsidy bill to pass the house is due wholly to the fear that the voter might rebuke the act at the polls next November.

"There is," confesses Mr. Wellman, "an implied contract that after the congressional elections are out of the way it (the ship subsidy bill) shall pass the house."

How much in the way of warning do the American voters need to protect themselves against greed, the iniquity, and the impudence of republican policies and republican endeavor?