

tioned, or 4,325 trains of forty cars each. The estimate for corn is 796,000 car loads or 19,900 train loads of forty cars each. On top of this then probably will be 17,000 car loads of flaxseed to be hauled from the northwest. To haul the 1,500,000 cars estimated for all kinds of grain, there would be a movement of a hundred trains of forty cars each for every day of the year.

REPRESENTATIVES of the Santa Fe railroad announce that they have made a canvas in the west and southwest states and territories with reference to the proposed rate legislation, for the purpose of ascertaining the sentiments of shippers and business men generally. They declare that while the canvass is still in progress, "remarkable results" have been secured and that fully 70 per cent of the shippers interviewed have declared themselves to be opposed to the proposed railroad legislation.

THE question propounded by the Santa Fe is in form as follows: "Do you favor giving the interstate commerce commission the absolute power to fix all interstate rates and to establish the relation of rates between all localities?" Referring to the Santa Fe's canvas, the Chicago Record-Herald says: "We do not wonder at the fact that 70 per cent of the interviewed men of affairs gave an emphatic 'No' as their answer. The wonder is rather that the other 30 per cent answered 'Yes.' No one wants to grant the commission 'absolute power' to fix 'all' interstate rates and to establish rate relations between localities. No one favors anything so drastic, sweeping and radical. It is merely proposed to give the commission power to prescribe a reasonable rate for future observance where a certain rate complained of specifically has been carefully inquired into and found excessive. The decision, moreover, is not to be final. An appeal to the courts is provided for in the proposal before the country."

REFERRING to an editorial recently printed in The Commoner, a Minneapolis, Minn., reader, writes: "Upon taking up our copy of your paper today, I saw and read your article with the title 'Enough.' You close with the hope that 'an increasing number of the well-to-do will say 'enough,' and then devote themselves to altruistic effort.' A few years ago, Mr. Otto Young gave \$75,000 for building an addition to the Chicago home for incurables for the use of those inmates afflicted with tuberculosis. It is my understanding that this fine building is intended as a memorial to a son who died of that disease. I think you will agree with me that a fitter one could hardly be devised. At Christmas of each year each inmate of the entire institution receives a \$5 gold piece from Mr. Young. You may not know of these facts, which seem to indicate that Mr. Young is devoting himself to 'altruistic effort.' I might not know them myself, were I not intimately related to an inmate and therefore an occasional visitor to the home."

MOVEMENT has been set on foot by the commissioners of the District of Columbia for the purpose of changing inauguration day from March 4 to April 30. Forty-one governors of states and territories have agreed to serve on the committee to advocate the passage and the adoption of a constitutional amendment, providing for the change referred to and it is said that it may be possible to secure the adoption of this amendment so that the 1909 inauguration will occur on the new date. Commenting on this proposition, the Pittsburg Dispatch says: "The large number of state executives who have by their consent approved the change indicates the general and probably unanimous assent to the idea and shows that the only reason why it has not been already carried out is simply the difficulty of amending an established custom. The machinery of constitutional amendment is cumbersome and is required only to remove all doubts. There is no more than an inference of constitutional requirement that the inauguration shall be on March 4, but the provision that the president shall serve for four years raises a doubt as to the validity of executive acts during the fifty-seven days that would intervene when the change was made. If the four-year rule had been strictly adhered to from the first the change would not be needed, since Washington's first inauguration was on April 30. But his second term appropriated those fifty-seven days from his first, so that all subsequent terms began and ended on March 4. If the amendment is not secured it is pertinent to note that the purpose could be partially attained by omitting the public ad-

dress of the new president from the steps of the capitol. There is absolutely no legal requirement that the president after taking the oath of office shall go into the open air and, generally in inclement weather, deliver a long address on public questions. But as custom has ordained this function it is likely that it will be continued, which makes the necessity of a more propitious season additionally strong. While congress is about the amendment it should see to it that another clause is framed providing how the government shall be conducted in case of the death of both president and vice president-elect in the interval between their formal election and their inauguration. That is one of the contingencies now wholly unprovided for."

WHILE giving to President Roosevelt all due credit for successfully inducing the late belligerents to make peace, the Pittsburg Dispatch says that enthusiasm must not be "overdone." Some have suggested that Mr. Roosevelt's success as a peacemaker may make it impossible for him to avoid a third term in the White House, but the Dispatch says that considerations which govern the popular choice will be those which directly affect the people of the United States rather than foreign lands, adding: "The achievements which may make President Roosevelt so essential to the welfare of the people of the United States that they will be unwilling to accept any substitute are likely to be more difficult than securing peace between Japan and Russia. It has been shown that he was able to induce those foreign governments, already feeling the strain of a vast and costly war, to accede to the unanimous wish of the world and come to terms. But so far he has been unable to secure measures needed for the welfare of the people against the interests of corporate combination and the inertia of senatorial privilege. He has striven with energy and generally with good faith, saving such lapses as in the Morton case. Perhaps his prestige as an international statesman may enable him to renew the attack on trusts, railroad abuses and political jobbery with greater force than ever. But it is not to be ignored that the crucial and most trying test of his statesmanship in that struggle is still pending. The president who can bring corporate privilege and political corruption into subordination to the law will win a greater and more vital victory than when he induces two foreign powers to cease bloodshed. It is not befitting the credit due a successful intermediary to recognize the probability that the criterion in 1908 is more likely to be what the candidates have done or will do for the United States than what they have done or will do for foreign nations."

AMERICAN newspapers have made comparisons on the number of deaths by railroad accident in the United States and Great Britain. A writer in the Minneapolis Tribune says that the figures are often given without official authority for them and that they have frequently been challenged by railroad managers who "are often able to furnish statistics—equally without official authority—which show that the cases of American over British railroads deaths is much less than the popular notion."

ADMITTING that statistics of this character should not be given without sufficient official authority for them, the Providence Rhode Island Telegram says: "We find in several papers a report to the state department from the American consul at Nottingham, an English railroad center, giving from official sources the deaths caused in the year 1904 on the British railroads. Comparison is easy between these and the official statistics of American casualties published by the interstate commerce commission. Let us give the bare figures. In Great Britain one passenger in nearly 200,000,000 was killed; in America one out of every 1,600,000, about 125 times as many. The relative proportion of injured is only half as many for the United States. This looks better, unless we consider that the British only injure in many cases where we kill outright. The proportion against us is lower in the case of employees, but bad enough. We killed 632 against 7 in Great Britain, and injured 67,067 against 114 in Great Britain. We have seventeen times as many employees as they, but we killed six hundred times as many. We killed nearly 6,000 and injured nearly 8,000, neither passengers nor employees, on tracks and grade crossings. The British have no statistics for accidents of this class, having all but abolished them. Probably the direct causes of the lower British death rate are universal absence of grade crossings and exclusion of trespassers from tracks, uni-

versal use of the block system, larger use of double tracks and safety appliances, more efficient patrolling of tracks and greater care in operating trains. With far less mileage, a denser population and higher average rates, it is much easier for the British roads to take these precautions than the Americans. But every one of them will come into universal use in the United States when we shall have learned to value human life, in comparison with dividends and accumulated capital of money, as highly as it is valued in Great Britain."

STRANGELY in contrast with Mr. Root's opinion of Mr. Roosevelt, as described by Henry Loomis Nelson, is Mr. Roosevelt's opinion of Mr. Root, as expressed by the president in a speech delivered nearly two years ago. On that occasion Mr. Roosevelt said: "In John Hay I have a great secretary of state. In Philander Knox I have a great attorney general. In other cabinet posts I have great men. Elihu Root could take any of these places and fill it as well as the man who is now there. And, in addition, he is what probably none of these gentlemen could be, a great secretary of war. Elihu Root is the ablest man I have known in our government service. I will go further. He is the greatest man that has appeared in the public life of any country, in any position, on either side of the ocean, in my time."

BISMARCK and Gladstone lived during Mr. Roosevelt's time, and on our own side of the ocean were a few men who were regarded as "great," according to the old-fashioned notion. Lincoln lived during Mr. Roosevelt's time, and our country's history tells of many other men with whom the ordinary man would hardly think of comparing Mr. Roosevelt's present secretary of state.

ONE of Secretary Bonaparte's first official acts was to undo some work done by his predecessor, Paul Morton, in the matter of what is known as "the Charleston navy scandal." A writer in The Nation says: "The facts are perfectly clear. Two young civil engineers, W. G. Walker and F. R. Harris, made it very uncomfortable for the New York Continental Jewel Filtration company by insisting that its work at the navy yard be up to the contract standard. Secretary Bonaparte is satisfied that the company finally went to work to secure the removal, through political influence, of these vigilant inspectors, apparently taking the ground—with many another contractor—that government work may be just what you please to make it. When the political influence reached that master of railroad rebates, Paul Morton, he at once acquiesced in the company's wishes and issued an order removing Lieutenants Harris and Walker from their posts and transferring them elsewhere. Mr. Morton thus served notice on the entire navy that when it came to standing by honest inspectors or easy-going contractors the latter had the support of the department. Secretary Bonaparte at once perceived what a demoralizing effect upon the whole navy this action would have, and has now promptly reversed it in an opinion which should make Paul Morton hang his head, and President Roosevelt wish that he had not been so hasty in adjusting wings and a halo to his beloved, but not regretted, ex-secretary of the navy."

THE NUMBER of railway passengers killed in accidents in 1904 was 441; in 1903, 321; in 1902, 303; in 1901, 282; in 1900, 249. Referring to these figures, the Chicago Record Herald says. "The increase in 1904 over 1903 was 37 per cent. The increase in 1903 over 1900 was only 29 per cent all told. For casualties to passengers that did not result in death the rate of increase last year was not so alarming, but still it was very high. The figures are 9,111 casualties for 1904, 6,973 for 1903, 6,089 for 1902, 4,988 for 1901 and 4,128 for 1900. This shows an increase of 331 per cent for 1904 over 1903, as against an increase of 69 per cent for 1903 over 1900. The increase in the number of passengers carried by the roads is trivial as compared with the increase in accidents. For 1904 over 1903 the increase in passengers was less than 3 per cent. Comparisons between American railroads and foreign railroads are very unfavorable to the former, and many explanations are offered by railroad managers. The general explanations are not in point, however, in view of the figures above given. What is needed is an explanation of the rapid rate of increase in the death list last year. The best way for the railroads to give such an explanation is by practical measures for putting an end to the slaughter."