

civil service the appointees in that department should be made to represent the voting strength of the various parties as shown by the last election. This would not prevent selection by examination. Persons passing a satisfactory examination could be put on the eligible list and appointments could be made from the party having less than its quota. As long as an attempt is made to conceal the politics of an applicant the party in power will find a way to fill the offices with its friends, and then the incoming party will feel justified by precedent in putting the opposition out and its friends in. If each applicant is certified to by his party organization and each appointee is charged up to his party the law can be enforced and the service put on a satisfactory basis.

The plan can be applied to the state and to the nation as well as to a city. It rests upon a just principle and is practical in operation.

Democratic Idea of Government

The Saturday Evening Post is the latest recruit to democracy. It is not a partisan sheet of the "thick and thin" variety, but it occasionally has an editorial which indicates its democratic tendency. The following, for instance:

German newspapers are always sighing because the Monroe doctrine prevents Germany from acquiring the South American lands settled by German immigrants and so from becoming a "world power."

What a pitiful and perverted notion of the object of government this involves. Yet it is one that has not a few adherents in our own country, where there is no excuse for such ignorance. For we ought all to know that government is made for man, not man for government. According to our theory, and let us hope, practice, government is not a power but a servant, an instrument to enable the common man to develop his faculties to their fullest. And the conditions under which those faculties can best develop are freedom and peace—neither of them consistent with the imperial notion.

How slowly the world develops! How hard it is for man to grasp the great, broad, high truths of democracy, mere common-sense though they are! How many men who ought to know better secretly share the benighted "patriotism" of the peasant who glories in the spendthrift splendor of the aristocracy that grinds him into the dust.

The above does not present an argument in favor of any surface policy but it touches a fundamental principle. The democratic idea is that the government is a thing made by the people for themselves, or rather it is the people acting together for the protection of their own rights and for the advancement of their own interests. The imperialistic idea of government—and it is also the monarchical and aristocratic idea—is that a government is a thing entirely separate and apart from the people. According to the imperialistic idea the people may have nothing whatever to do with their own government except to obey it under fear of death and to support it by taxation levied upon them without representation. According to this theory a government can be carried in a ship and thrown like a net over helpless people. According to this theory a few men can land upon a shore, before unknown to them, coerce the natives into submission and do with them as they see fit. If the invaders gather up all the property in sight and then sail away leaving the people free, it is usually called piracy, but if the invaders remain, set up a "government" and extend their pillage over a period of years it is some times called "benevolent assimilation," but a colonial system rests upon the same foundation as piracy, namely, force. Piracy is condensed colonialism; colonialism is piracy extended and reduced to a system. The democratic theory of self-government is and must be eternally at war with the doctrine of imperialism. The Post is right; the government is not the master but the servant of the people. This is the rock upon which democracy is built, and democracy can not rest securely on any other foundation.

Those "Useless" Silver Dollars

Mr. John Landis, superintendent of the Philadelphia mint, says that unless something is done to authorize the purchase of silver for subsidiary coinage, commerce will be greatly hampered, and then he adds that the silver bullion has been exhausted "because of the the coining of our use-

less hoard of 558,000,000 standard dollars, for which there has never been any real popular demand."

Superintendent Landis is guilty of astonishing ignorance upon this subject. We have no "useless hoard" of silver dollars. The silver dollars stored in the treasury are really in circulation, for they represent money actually doing service among the people. But for that "useless hoard" we would have \$558,000,000 less of standard money than we have today. It is a very common mistake for the advocates of the gold standard to speak contemptuously of the silver in the treasury, while they handle the paper representatives of that silver every day. Why not speak of the "useless hoard" of gold dollars held for the redemption of gold certificates?

According to the circulation statement of January 1, 1905, the money in circulation includes:

\$649,548,528 in gold (including bullion in treasury).

\$466,739,689 gold certificates.

\$80,039,395 standard silver dollars.

\$468,017,227 silver certificates.

\$102,891,327 subsidiary silver.

\$10,940,054 treasury notes.

\$342,287,627 United States notes.

\$449,157,278 national bank notes.

The gold certificates include all certificates issued, although some have doubtless been lost or destroyed. The same is true of silver certificates, treasury notes, United States notes, and bank notes, so that the estimate of paper money is necessarily an over-estimate. It will be seen, however, that the silver certificates and gold certificates are practically the same in amount, and yet the gold standard advocates never speak of a "useless hoard" of gold, while they constantly speak of the silver in the treasury as being useless. Is this discrimination due to prejudice or to ignorance, or to both?

One Idea of Liberty

President Tuttle of the Boston & Maine railroad, in a recent speech before the Newton club at Boston, said:

When the United States government or a state government undertakes the supervision of the private business of a corporation or an individual, to the extent of saying what price they shall charge for their product in the open market, then I say in the most temperate manner that I fear we have entered upon a course which is against the fundamental principle upon which this government is founded, individual liberty, and I don't want to live to see the end of it.

This is the idea of "individual liberty" which some of the railroad magnates have. They call it individual liberty for a man at the head of a railroad to arbitrarily fix rates and discriminate in favor of one patron and against another. President Tuttle ought to learn at once, and not hereafter forget, that a corporation has no natural rights. It is a creature of law and deriving its existence from an act of the legislature it must live always under government regulation. A railroad is under a double control. It is not only under control because it is a corporation, but because it is a quasi public corporation. Because of its public functions it enjoys the right of eminent domain and otherwise exercises privileges denied to the individual.

It is just such talk as that which comes from President Tuttle that is awakening the public to the necessity of stricter regulation of the railroads, and when this stricter regulation is found impossible or not wholly effective, the demand for public ownership will increase.

After The Horse Has Been Stolen

In lieu of tariff revision, Secretary of the Treasury Shaw has suggested a revision of the drawback law. The Shaw plan will enable manufacturers who use certain imported dutiable raw materials to enlarge their sales in foreign markets.

The Chicago Tribune, referring to the Shaw plan, says:

As the law stands the man who can show to the satisfaction of treasury officials the quantity of foreign dutiable materials used by him in goods he exports gets a drawback of 99 per cent of the duty. That is a simple matter in the case of a tanner who buys Argentine hides and converts them into leather which he exports. It is not a simple matter with the

shoemaker who may use in each pair of shoes he exports a little of the leather made out of those hides. The process of "identification" of that leather is not an easy one.

But the Tribune demands to know why the duty on hides should not be repealed altogether, thus cheapening leather for Americans as well as foreigners. The Tribune says: "The only beneficiaries of the duty are the great packers. It was imposed to please the cattle raisers; they thought it would help them. They sowed and others reap." The Tribune points out that the consumers are the ones who need the relief and it declares that the liberalization of the drawback provisions will not be striking at the trusts and pools which sell cheap abroad and sell high at home, while the tariff is unrevised. The rail pool which the Tribune says is glad to sell steel rails abroad at from \$16 to \$21 per ton, charges \$28 per ton for them at home and the Tribune says that this is "because there is a duty of \$7.48 per ton," adding, "whatever amount is taken off the duty will be taken off the price asked for rails."

The Tribune concludes its remarkable confession in this way:

The question of drawback revision is merely throwing a tub to the whale. It is an effort to get the popular mind away from tariff revision. It will not work. The consumers are thinking of their own grievous burdens due to certain monstrous features of the tariff rather than of the restrictions it imposes on some men who use imported materials in making goods for export.

Those men who would be pleased to see tariff revision confined to them. The manufacturers who use alcohol are anxious to have the tax taken off it when employed for their purposes. They would be content to have tariff revision stop there. What is demanded, and must be had, is revision for the benefit of the whole people and not of a few manufacturers.

It is strange that republican papers like the Tribune do not think of these things prior to election day. The democratic party demanded revision for the benefit of the whole people and not for a few monopolies. According to republican argument the verdict returned at the polls provides justification for the tariff barons to demand new and enlarged opportunities for plundering the consumers.

"A Played Out Old Tune"

The following letter, which appeared in the New York Herald's Paris edition, December 28th, is interesting reading:

To the Editor of the Herald:—

I was very much amused to read in your paper the letter from Sir Howard Vincent complaining about the "Star-Spangled Banner."

I am surprised, Sir, that a titled Englishman should not know that in America no one but our tradespeople ever sings that horribly grotesque song. Our best class considers it inexpressibly vulgar.

Let me assure Sir Howard that, except among very ordinary persons in America, the words of the song are not known. I daresay not one of my friends could repeat more than two lines of it from memory.

Only those assertive, patriotic bourgeois persons in America who so justly excite the ridicule of Englishmen and travelled gentlemen of whatever nationality, rise and uncover when the national anthem is played. The cultured class does not even know any national anthem except "My Country 'tis of Thee," which was so shamelessly stolen from Great Britain.

Sir Howard can rest undisturbed in his very kind desire to promote Anglo-American amity. Our better classes are heartily ashamed of the anti-British sentiment expressed in the words of which he complains.

CLARENCE ROSEBERRY JONES.

In the "old days" when, as Minister Barrett said during the campaign, "the flag stood for nothing," the Star Spangled Banner was considered quite a hymn, but now that the nation has become a "world power," and is associating with the land-grabbing nations of Europe, the sentiment may seem a little old foggy. But had we not better get back to the flag as it was, and be again "the land of the free, and the home of the brave"?