

resource and bold of initiative, might well have aspired to years of political honor no one can doubt; but he deliberately limited his public career and when his service as governor ended he permanently retired from the field. The hosts who eagerly followed him in a momentous campaign, in which history was indelibly written, were intensely loyal to his fortunes; his signal achievements in Texas were so far-reaching, of such overshadowing importance, as all the nation so keenly realizes at this very moment that his friends believed he could appeal to the conscience of the republic as he had appealed to the conscience of the state; they had faith in his destiny and were sure the people of all the states would rally to his standard if he would but lead the way; and even after years of retirement, there were men who hoped with a hope that ended only yesterday when the final summons came that he would yet triumph in his long, pathetic struggle for life and once again blaze the way to victory over the insidious forces now audaciously assailing the bulwarks of popular government.

"It is needless to speak at length here of his political triumphs, of the days when he stirred the people as they had never been stirred in times of peace, of his power as an orator, of his magnetism which drew and held the love of the common people, of his exalted patriotism, or of his statesmanship which gave to Texas policies that made for the permanent weal of the state and which are destined to exercise a profound influence in the settlement of some of the greatest problems which have arisen in our national life.

"It is enough to say that he lived to see the day when tens of thousands who had bitterly contested the great reforms for which he struggled conceded that he had grappled and overcame changes which they themselves had failed to discern; that he had stood for principles vital to the perpetuity of the republic; that what they had characterized as self-seeking and demagoguery was but the earnestness born of presence which penetrated further into the future than it is given ordinary mortals to see; that what they had denounced as selfish ambition was merely a sense of duty illumined by patriotic inspiration."

"PLAYING WITH FIRE"

Commenting on Joseph Medill Patterson's declaration in favor of socialism, the Philadelphia Public Ledger says:

"A large number of well-to-do young men like Mr. Patterson—philanthropists, college professors, educated and cultivated men and women who are not disturbers of the peace and have no political or other axes to grind—are playing with the socialistic firebrand, and are quite willing to leap without taking the precaution to look."

The Public Ledger must not overlook the fact that a large number of well-to-do young men and well-to-do old men, also a large number of newspaper editors and men who pose as statesmen, are playing with the plutocratic firebrand. The offenses committed in plutocracy's name have done more to encourage socialism than all the literature that has been printed upon that subject. Indeed, we believe that at the time of the coal strike some such statement was made by the Chicago Record-Herald, a republican paper, but warnings such as these have had no effect upon greedy men, and they seem willing to pile exaction upon exaction, regardless of consequences.

As has often been said in these columns, democrats are the conservatives, standing as they do between the radicalism of plutocracy as represented by the republican party on the one hand and the radicalism of socialism on the other. Republican papers have frequently told us that these vast combinations of capital, as represented by conspiracies in restraint of trade, are part of the evolution. If they persuade men that "the corner" on property has come to stay, with what reason do they object when their students insist that the people as a whole, rather than a coterie of men, shall exercise control over that "corner." Even J. Pierpont Morgan once said that men who, like himself, were engaged in effecting these great combinations of capital were merely the precursors of socialism.

The republican party's doctrines inevitably lead to socialism; but the doctrines of democracy will preserve this government in the spirit in which it was founded, placing no restraint upon the industry and ingenuity of men, exercised within honest limits, but withdrawing all special privileges.

The republican editors are just now having a great deal to say concerning "young Mr. Patterson." They can not ride down his arguments by sneers. He has doubtless given more patriotic and intelligent thought to public questions than

has been given by his distinguished father to whom as a republican editor politicians point with pride.

The Commoner believes that "young Mr. Patterson" could be of more service to his countrymen if he joined the forces of democracy and gave the benefit of his unquestioned ability and integrity to that political organization upon which the American people must depend for the salvation of popular government. But Mr. Patterson prefers to join the socialists, and republican editors need not condemn him. As a republican he learned, even from his present day critics, that the law is not strong enough to cope with its creatures, and that the men who have grown fat on special favors are superior to the government granting those favors.

It is not altogether strange that Mr. Patterson, honestly concerned for the public welfare, should conclude to go from one extreme to the other and should transfer his affections from a party that believes the government should be administered at the expense of the many for the benefit of a few, to a party that believes in what we regard as an impossible, although attractive, form.

IS IT SURRENDER?

Can it be that Senator Clapp of Minnesota gives a fair illustration of what has often been referred to as "the determined spirit among republican leaders" on railway rate legislation? Many people thought Mr. Clapp was uncompromising on this question, and it will be remembered that he left the committee room because he claimed that Senator Aldrich, an opponent of rate legislation, was inclined to treat the subject with levity. But in his speech before the senate, March 7, Mr. Clapp showed that on the vital point there was no great difference between himself and those who oppose rate legislation altogether. In reply to a question by Mr. Tillman, Mr. Clapp expressed doubt as to the power of congress to legislate so as to enforce penalties proposed by the bill pending a review by the courts of any given finding.

Senators Tillman and Bailey took issue with Mr. Clapp. Senator Bailey contended that congress has the power to legislate so as to maintain the commission's rate until the final order of the court, and Senator Tillman, referring to the interpretation given by Senator Clapp said:

"The interpretation given by the senator from Minnesota is absolutely contrary to my understanding. This is a most important difference, to my mind it is the spinal cord of this whole question. If congress is to be hedged about by judicial decrees, we shall have to reform the supreme court, for the people are determined to have relief."

It is not encouraging when one who, like Senator Clapp, has seemed to favor rate legislation, yields on what Senator Tillman very properly calls the vital point. If Senator Clapp's republican associates agree with him on this proposition, all of this republican campaign in behalf of railroad reform will fail, so far as an effective measure is concerned.

THE LAFOLLETTE AMENDMENT

Senator LaFollette of Wisconsin pleased men generally when he broke down old-time senate precedents by making a speech on an important public question although he is a new member. Several senators have expressed themselves in favor of prohibiting railroads as common carriers from being directly interested in the commodities they carry, and it seems to be generally agreed among public men that the province of the common carrier should be restricted. It is agreed, for instance, that railroads must not own coal lands, but Senator LaFollette has gone a step farther and insisted that no stockholder in a railroad should be interested in coal lands. He declares in favor of forfeiture of acquired coal lands if owned by railroad stockholders. Senator LaFollette says: "I want to put on record the protest of one individual against the declaration that now or at any future time the railroads of this country can secure the mastery over any product which they handle as transportation companies. This government is stronger than any of its creatures. It is stronger than any aggregation of railroads, monopolies or trusts. Its centralization of power must be superior to all others. I want to write into the statute books the provision that railroads must be common carriers and nothing else."

We are just now passing through the period when it is to be determined whether "this government is stronger than any of its creatures." The Commoner takes Senator LaFollette's view of this question. It is generally admitted that

the common carrier must not be interested in any of the commodities it transports, and the United States supreme court has recently rendered a decision supporting this view. But it has often been found to be difficult in popular government to avoid the accomplishment of unholy ends by representatives of special interests. If we are content with the enactment of a law prohibiting a railroad company from being interested in the commodities it carries, there is nothing to hinder the managers of that common carrier from violating the principle in a round-about way. Senator LaFollette's plan to prohibit the stockholder as well as the corporation from being interested in a commodity to be transported would fill the bill. Some such amendment should be adopted. The American people are confronted with real evils and these evils must be met with real reforms.

One senator protesting against the LaFollette amendment said: "It is a rather ugly thing to say that stockholders in a railroad must not own any interest in a mine." The American people have commissioned certain corporations to discharge the duties of common carriers, and in order to protect themselves from imposition they have a right to say that neither the corporation nor any one holding stock therein shall be interested in a commodity subject to transportation. This decree is essential to the protection of public interests, and while some reforms may seem "ugly" or "drastic," we must not forget that we are confronted with a very serious situation and feather-duster blows will not bring relief to the public.

NOT INDORSED BY A CONVENTION

The Washington correspondent for the Lincoln (Nebraska) Journal, a republican paper, makes a long plea in behalf of the ship subsidy bill. According to this correspondent "the republican party in several national conventions has indorsed such legislation, and the bill having been drafted by a joint commission of the two houses, and being supported by the president, vice-president and cabinet, it would appear highly improbable that the house will fail to pass it."

This bill was not indorsed by a republican national convention, although we do not doubt that it has long been the intention of republican leaders to foist the ship subsidy upon the people.

The Record is filled with protests against this subsidy—protests made by republican newspapers. In December, 1900, the Chicago Tribune, replying to the suggestion that a ship subsidy bill be passed, said:

"It was not understood when the spellbinders were urging the people of the northwest to vote in favor of the re-election of President McKinley that one of the first items on the senatorial program when congress met would be the passage of a 'shipping subsidy' bill which contemplates annually expenditure for thirty years for the special benefit of a number of rich men residing in eastern cities. There is nothing whatever in this adroit resolution (the shipping plank of the republican national platform of 1900) about 'subsidies.' The word 'subsidies' was carefully omitted from the platform. Nor was anything said during the campaign in regard to the extension of our merchant marine by a scheme of public expenditure continuing for a generation. Nobody can recall an instance of a public meeting at which the shipping subsidy bill was made the subject of fair, candid argument or any argument at all; nor were the claims to public aid of the persons interested in such legislation ever explicitly set forth. * * * The republican party should not be in favor of one set of measures prior to November 6 and in favor of an entirely different kind of measures subsequent to November 6."

It is an old-time trick of the republican party to be in favor of one set of measures prior to election day and in favor of an entirely different kind of measure after the votes have been cast. In 1896 the republican party declared in favor of bimetalism through an international agreement, and then after the election it made no serious effort to bring about international agreement but proceeded to interpret the results of the election as an indorsement of the single gold standard. In its national platforms the republican party declared in favor of the merchant marine, but it did not dare to say that it intended to vote a subsidy into the pockets of rich shipowners. But now the very mild references made in republican platforms to this subject are described as declarations in favor of the subsidy, while repeated republican victories are interpreted as an indorsement of that subsidy.