

makes him feel the penalty of the law; why does he hesitate to prosecute the big men who trample upon the statutes and the orders of the courts? The president has used a good deal of high sounding language about the enforcement of the law, and no one doubts that he means it when he applies the language to small offenders, but does he mean it when the offenders are prominent and when millions instead of hundreds are involved? He seems inclined to so amend the commandment as to make it read: "Thou shalt not steal"—on a small scale.

The president errs when he justifies a refusal to prosecute the Santa Fe officials because other corporate officials have escaped punishment. He cites the case of the Harvester trust, but why has he not prosecuted that trust if it is guilty? If it is not guilty, then the illustration loses its force; if it is guilty it ought to be punished. It is absurd to first overlook its violations and then use the immunity granted to it as a reason for granting immunity to the Santa Fe. But the president, apparently conscious that his excuses are weak, piles one upon another in a vain effort to fortify his position. He not only lays down a dangerous principle when he says that after proving the corporation guilty the government must not prosecute until it shows guilty knowledge in the officers in charge; and he not only submits a palpably absurd defense when he pleads failure to prosecute one corporation to justify a failure to prosecute another, but he singles Secretary Morton out for eulogy and declares that if he was going to prosecute corporate officials he would not begin with him. The president's statement bears evidence of being prepared for the sole purpose of shielding a friend.

Many well-wishers of the president have felt that Mr. Morton's appointment was a mistake and that his presence in the cabinet was a bar to any effective punishment of railroad officials, but the full extent of Mr. Morton's evil influence was not understood until the president's letter appeared. It seems now that leniency must be shown all corporate officials in order to prevent the establishment of a principle which, if enforced, would bring punishment upon the secretary of the navy. It would have been better for the country if the president had announced his determination to shield his friend, because a friend, than to paralyze the enforcement of the criminal law in order to save a congenial spirit from fine or imprisonment. Mr. Morton assures the president that he is not guilty, but it is no reflection on Mr. Morton's veracity to say that the penitentiaries are full of men who have made that same plea in open courts. It is not a question of opinion, but a question of proof, and the president is prosecutor, not judge.

If Mr. Morton is not guilty, a vindication in court would be worth much more to him than a vindication from the president, and such a vindication would leave the criminal law still in force. The president has blundered and it is impossible to calculate with any accuracy the far reaching influence of the blunder.

PUNISHING THE WRONG MAN

The president, after investigating the Bowen-Loomis controversy, dismisses Mr. Bowen with a savage reprimand and promotes Mr. Loomis. This is a strange precedent to establish. Secretary Taft admits that Mr. Loomis was "indiscreet." He even expresses regret that the "great satisfaction" which the administration finds in his "complete exculpation from all charges of dishonesty" is offset by the fact that he has failed "to hold himself utterly aloof from any personal participation in plans for investments and exploitation of the countries to which he was accredited and from allowing himself to take personal interest in transactions in which he or his legation might also have to act in a trust capacity."

Secretary Taft regards it as merely an indiscretion for Mr. Loomis to be personally interested in the Mercado claims, but admits that Mr. Loomis was "certainly treading on dangerous ground in bringing his official life so close to a transaction in which he must have expected to have a large personal interest."

After admitting enough to justify Mr. Loomis' removal from the service the secretary rejoices in his "exculpation" and scores Mr. Bowen for making the matter public. A calm and disinterested perusal of the records in the case will lead most people to believe that the administration has punished the wrong man. Mr. Bowen is not accused of "treading on dangerous ground" or of "personally interesting himself" in the exploitation of Venezuela and yet he is discharged

in disgrace, while the exploiter is exculpated and promoted.

The position of ambassador or minister requires a high code of honor. To become personally interested in the exploitation of the country to which he is accredited is the gravest offense of which a diplomatic representative can be guilty. If an American representative at any European court of the first grade should buy a claim against the country to which he was accredited his recall would be demanded and no one would question the propriety of the demand; why should we not require as scrupulous integrity on the part of our representatives in the smaller capitols? If there is any difference we should enforce a higher standard when our officials deal with the smaller countries, because the temptations are greater.

The president and Secretary Taft will not raise the United States in the esteem of the South American republics by their promotion of a diplomat who so clearly violated the well settled rules governing his position.

TAFT ON CHINESE IMMIGRATION

Secretary Taft has recently delivered an important opinion on the question of immigration. He says:

Is it just that for the purpose of excluding or preventing perhaps 100 Chinese coolies from slipping into this country against the law, we should subject an equal number of Chinese merchants and students of high character to an examination of such an inquisitorial, humiliating, insulting and physically uncomfortable character as to discourage altogether the coming of merchants and students?

One of the great commercial prizes of the world is the trade with the 400,000,000 Chinese. Ought we to throw away the advantage which we have by reason of Chinese natural friendship for us, and continue to enforce an unjustly severe law, and thus create in the Chinese mind a disposition to boycott the American trade and to drive our merchants from Chinese shores, simply because we are afraid that we may for the time lose the approval of certain unreasonable and extreme popular leaders of California and other coast states?

Does the question not answer itself? Is it not the duty of members of congress and of the executive to disregard the unreasonable demands of a part of the community deeply prejudiced upon this subject in the far west, and insist on extending justice and courtesy to a people from whom we are deriving and are likely to derive such immense benefit in the way of international trade?

It will be seen that "the \$400,000,000 commercial prize" is the thing that fills the secretary's eyes, and anything is regarded as unreasonable that stands in the way. He underestimates the number of Chinese who would come in as laborers and denounces as unreasonable the demands made by the laboring men of the country that they be protected from a horde of Chinese coolies who are not assimilated or brought to the American level of living, but simply displace American workmen. It is fortunate for the country that thus early in his presidential campaign Secretary Taft so clearly alligns himself with the capitalistic side. For forty years the manufacturers have taxed the whole country for the ostensible purpose of giving good wages to labor; but now when they begin to reach out for the markets of the world they are willing to sacrifice the wage earner to commercial advantages. They insist that the goods made by coolies shall be shut out, but they are willing that the coolies themselves shall come in. If the Chinese will come with a love for our institutions and for the purpose of identifying themselves with our future it would be a different question, but they preserve their Orientalism and form a permanently distinct class among us. Their presence is sure to breed race troubles that will be more hurtful to trade than any exclusion act can be.

Many of the republican leaders will be in sympathy with the policy that will flood the country with cheap Chinese labor, and an imperial policy tends to give encouragement to the cheap labor proposition.

The Chinese question is one that effects the entire country, not the Pacific coast alone or the laboring men alone. It is true that the Pacific coast would feel the evil effects of Chinese immigration first, and it is also true that the labor-

ing men would come into immediate contact with oriental labor, but in its ultimate influence the subject touches all parts of the country and reaches all classes. The question is whether we are going to build up a strong, independent, upright and patriotic people and develop a civilization that will exert a helpful influence on all the world, or whether we are going to be a greedy, grasping nation, forgetful of high ideals and concerned only in the making of money.

Chinese immigration is defended by two classes of people. First, by those, comparatively few in number, who believe that universal brotherhood requires us to welcome to our shores all people of all lands. This is the sentimental argument advanced in favor of Chinese immigration. There is no more reason why we should construe brotherhood to require the admission of all people to our country than there is that we should construe brotherhood to require the dissolution of family ties. The family is a unit; it is the place where character and virtue and usefulness are developed, and from the family a good or evil influence emanates. It is not necessary nor even wise that the family environment should be broken up or that all who desire entrance should be admitted to the family circle. In a larger sense a nation is a family. It is the center for the cultivation of national character, national virtue and national usefulness. A nation is under no obligation to the outside world to admit anybody or anything that would injuriously effect the national family; in fact it is under obligation to itself not to do so. The influence of the United States will be much more potent for good if we remain a homogeneous nation with all citizens in full sympathy with all other citizens. No distinct race like the Chinese can come into this country without exciting a friction and a race prejudice which will make it more difficult for us to exercise a wholesome influence upon the Chinese in China, not to speak of our influence on other nations.

The second, and by far the larger class, embraces those who advocate Chinese immigration on the ground that it will furnish cheap labor for household and factory work. There is no force in the argument that is made by some that it is difficult to secure girls to do housework. If domestic service is not popular as compared with other work, it is because the pay is not sufficient to make it attractive and the remedy lies in better wages. Labor can be secured for any and every honorable position when the price is sufficient to attract it, and the demand for Chinese servants comes with poor grace from those who often spend on a single social entertainment as much as a servant's wages would amount to in an entire year. At this time when skilled and intelligent American labor is able to compete in foreign markets with the cheapest labor in the world, it is absurd to talk about the necessity for cheap factory hands.

Secretary Taft's interview is significant as showing that his sympathies are with the manufacturers rather than with the masses.

HOW WILL HE MAKE THE PROFIT?

Mr. Ryan announces that he paid two and a half millions for a controlling interest in the stock of the Equitable Assurance company. As the interest allowed on the stock would be an insignificant income on the amount paid for the stock the inquiry arises, how does Mr. Ryan expect to get his money back? The only reasonable explanation is that he expects to make a profit out of the use of the assets of the company. But as these are trust funds he can not make a profit out of their use without trespassing upon the rights of the policy-holders.

What will it profit the policy-holders to escape the follies of young Hyde if they fall into the clutches of one of the shrewdest financiers Wall street has developed? Mr. Ryan is likely to slay his tens of thousands where Mr. Hyde slew his thousands.

REPRESENTATIVE GOVERNMENT PROMISED

The press dispatches report that the czar met the representatives of the zemstvos at the royal palace, received the radical petition presented and renewed his promise of an assembly. He is quoted as saying: "I thank you, gentlemen, for the sentiments expressed and I join in your desire to bring about a new order of things. My personal wish and my will as emperor to summon a national assembly is unshakable and I await with anxiety the carrying out of this my will. You can announce this to the towns and villages