

general government where a power is neither granted nor denied.

The reservation of power to the state is all the stronger because it is specifically set forth in the amendment. Had the language of the amendment been inserted in the constitution itself, it would not have shone out so boldly. The constitution was ratified with the understanding that the amendments would be added at once, and they were, in fact, submitted by the first congress, and in a short time were ratified by the necessary number of states. There can be no doubt that those who lived at the time of the adoption of the constitution favored the dual form of government, and believed in the wisdom of and the necessity for this division of power. Those who held to the strict construction of the constitution on this subject obtained control of the government eleven years after the constitution was framed, and retained control for a quarter of a century.

But admitting that the framers of the constitution and those who lived in the early days were champions of the dual idea, an important question presents itself, viz.: Have time and events so altered conditions as to make it wise or necessary to disturb this equilibrium between the state and the nation? The framers of the constitution recognized the possibility of error in themselves and the possibility of change in conditions, and therefore provided a way of amending the constitution. If the time has come for obliterating state lines and consolidating all authority, legislative, judicial and executive, at Washington, it can be done by constitutional amendment whenever three-fourths of the states are willing to ratify such an amendment.

But is there any demand for a surrender by the states of the powers reserved to them? On the contrary, every reason which existed one hundred and eighteen years ago exists now, and those reasons are even stronger than they formerly were, because of the increase in the area and population of the nation. Then, there were a few million people scattered along the eastern coast. The thirteen states have grown to forty-six, and eighty millions of people are now governing themselves through the machinery set in motion by the constitutional convention of 1789.

The states are even more needed than they formerly were for the administration of domestic affairs. As a matter of theory, that government is best which is nearest to the people. If there is any soundness at all in the doctrine of self-government, the people can act most intelligently upon matters with which they are most familiar. There are a multitude of things which can be done better by the county than by state authority, and there are a multitude of things which can be done better by the state than by the federal government. An attempt to transfer to the national capital the business now conducted at the state capitals would be open to two objections, either of which would be fatal. First, congress could not transact the business. The work now devolving on the national legislature makes it difficult to secure consideration for any except the most important measures. The number of bills actually discussed in a deliberate way is small; most of the bills that pass are rushed through by unanimous consent, and a still larger number die on the calendar or in committee.

Second, the members of congress could not inform themselves about local needs. The interests and industries of the nation are so diversified and the various sections so different in their needs that the members of congress from one part of the country would be entirely ignorant of the conditions in other parts of the country. Whenever congress attempts legislation now for a particular section, the matter is usually left to the members from that section, but more often the matter is crowded out entirely by larger interests.

The farther the legislative body is from the community affected by the law, the easier it is for special interests to control. This has been illustrated in state legislatures when long-time charters have been granted to franchise corporations by the votes of members whose constituents, not being interested, do not hold them to strict account, and it would be worse if congress acted on the same subjects.

#### ◆◆◆◆ PANIC

The railroad speculators have been very busy of late predicting a panic and they say that the people will not invest in railroad stocks because of the "onslaught" against the railroads. If the investing public is alarmed, it is because the railroad managers have exaggerated the effect of rate reductions in a vain effort to terrorize the legislatures, and they have only themselves to blame if they have carried matters too far. If any other explanation is needed for the hesitancy on the part of investors, the investigations furnish it, for the inquiries have shown to what extent railroad stocks have been watered. But what is the alternative? Must the government refuse to investigate rotten management for fear the misman-

aged railroads no longer will be able to fool the public into buying inflated securities? The sooner the railroads are put on an honest basis the more secure will the investing public feel. A peculiarly interesting phase of the present situation is that the railroad managers are now clamoring for federal regulation as a substitute for state regulation, and this clamor answers the arguments recently advanced by the advocates of centralization. The latter have been asserting that the federal government is the only competent regulator of interstate corporations and that the predatory wealth of the country is shielding itself behind state legislation. The fact is that all of the great corporations would rather risk congressional legislation than state legislation because the state legislatures are closer to the people, and more clearly voice the sentiments of the people.

A great deal of noise has been made and a great deal has been said about regulating the big interstate monopolies, but little has been accomplished except to educate the people as a whole to the evils of the trust system. Very few of the big trusts have been interfered with. None of the trust magnates have yet been sent to jail. The laws against the trusts should be either repealed or enforced. The government cannot afford to retain useless statutes on its books, which are violated flagrantly every day. When this is done it breeds disrespect for the law, which all good Americans should uphold in every way possible. Laws which can be laughed at by the monopolists of a country are a detriment, rather than a source of strength to a nation. The government cannot afford to shield the big violators of the laws and punish only the petty thieves.

#### ◆◆◆◆ CLINTON BABBITT

Clinton Babbitt died suddenly March 11, at his home in Beloit, Wisconsin. In chronicling Mr. Babbitt's death the Beloit Daily News refers to him as the "last surviving member of the first common council of the city of Beloit, ex-congressman from the First district, ex-secretary of the state agricultural society, ex-postmaster, and friend to everybody."

Mr. Babbitt was a personal friend of the editor of *The Commoner* and *The Commoner* heartily endorses the beautiful tribute paid by the editor of the Beloit Daily News when he said: "Clinton Babbitt is dead. He blessed the times in which he lived. He was a simple man, unpretentious, lovable and loving. He grappled with no abstruse problems, he did not force radical opinions upon others. His was a kindly nature and considerate and the world—artificial as it is—loves to honor such a man. Mr. Babbitt had his struggles and his sorrows and bore them philosophically and all the time he helped his fellows to bear their burdens. Like Henry George he recognized 'that the true law of social life is the law of love, and law of liberty, the law of each for all and all for each.' Few men die more mourned by a community than is Clinton Babbitt. His monument is erected in men's hearts. To die thus is to die great."

#### ◆◆◆◆ MONARCHY SUGGESTED

The Chicago Record-Herald in collecting views upon a third term for Mr. Roosevelt drew the following from Richard Mansfield, the actor:

"Benjamin Harrison said to me: 'I am just beginning to learn now when I have to leave.' I am most heartily in favor of a third term, and for the matter of that, of a fourth term for President Roosevelt. I do not see how any fair-minded or honest citizen can be of any other opinion. I am furthermore in favor of a constitutional monarchy for this country."

President Roosevelt's friends will not thank Mr. Mansfield for this blunt disclosure of the dangers which lie but half concealed in the perpetual presidency movement. For more than a century the precedent set by Washington and Jefferson has been observed, and the one man who aspired to a third was defeated for the nomination notwithstanding the fact that he was the successful general in the world's greatest civil war, and made an effort to secure the third nomination when most of his comrades in arms still survived. Not only has public sentiment opposed the third term but three presidents—Jackson, Hayes and Cleveland—have presented arguments against a second term, pointing out the perils involved in the use of presidential patronage to advance personal ambition. President Roosevelt himself recognized the force and wisdom of the precedent when on the night of the election he announced that he regarded this as his second term and would not be a candidate again. He is not likely to be moved from his position by such appeals as are now made to him. He knows that his renomination would turn public attention away from the economic questions in which he is inter-

ested to the consideration of a governmental question supposed to be settled. If the issue thus raised was decided against him the enthusiasm of his friends could not save him from mortification; if it was decided in his favor he could not rid himself of the fear that some less scrupulous successor might use his example to establish himself permanently in the office.

Has the republican party but one man available for the presidency? If the president has done so well as to deserve a third term it is strange that he has not developed at least one co-laborer to presidential size.

Is his nomination necessary to save the republican party from defeat? Why should he be so solicitous about the party when its leaders have refused to assist him to carry out the reforms which he has advocated? Will he sacrifice himself in order to defeat the democratic party? Why should he so dislike the democrats? Has he not won his popularity by adopting their ideas? And has he not received more loyal support from the democrats in the senate and house than from the republicans? And is it to save his country that he is urged to run? The democrats, if successful will inaugurate several reforms which he has tried to inaugurate but which the democrats were advocating before he ever spoke in their behalf? The believers in constitutional monarchy and the advocates of a continuous performance in the White House cannot advance any arguments that will appeal to the president's ambition—which has been abundantly satisfied—or to his love of party or to his devotion to country, but the discussion may reveal that we still have a few people in the country who prefer a life-term to the agitation involved in quadrennial elections.

#### ◆◆◆◆ STATE VS. NATION

The discussion of railroad regulation is furnishing a conclusive answer to the charge that the "states rights" doctrine is a cover for the friends of predatory wealth. The federal congress after great effort passed a bill that stopped rebates and enabled the railroads to keep what they had formerly returned in the way of rebates to favored shippers. The railroads weakened the bill as much as possible and no one knows yet how valuable or valueless the measure will prove. But the state legislatures went to work to lower rates. A number of legislatures enacted two-cent fare laws and some reduced freight rates. The railroads instead of accepting these laws loudly proclaimed that they would ruin the roads and now as a result—not of the laws but of the wild language of the railroad managers—the roads find it difficult to obtain loans for improvements. And what is the result? They want all regulation exercised by the general government because the states annoy them and scare the public.

No wonder the railroads want to get away from state legislatures. The state legislatures are near to the people and quickly respond to public sentiment, while the national congress is more remote and harder to reach. But the people will not have to consent to any proposition which weakens their control of the highways of commerce. Events are strengthening the democratic position and the Sun news item published in this issue supports the doctrine that the states should be protected in the enjoyment of all the authority reserved to them by the constitution.

#### ◆◆◆◆ WHAT THEY WANT

The New York Sun prints this statement concerning the efforts at centralization on the part of the railroad speculators:

"The report of the coming conference at the White House between President Roosevelt and the heads of some of the country's leading railroad systems imparted to the stock market a stronger tone this morning. The standard railway shares were up about a point at the opening.

"The railroad men who will take part in the conference are President Newman, of the New York Central, President Mellen, of the New York, New Haven and Hartford, President McCrea, of the Pennsylvania, and President Hughitt, of the Chicago & Northwestern. Edward H. Harriman said today that about the proposed railway council he knew nothing.

"It is the belief in Wall street that the meeting between Mr. Roosevelt and the presidents of the roads named cannot fail to bring about a better understanding between the government and the country's railway interests. But as to the conference being able to accomplish any more than that Wall street is skeptical.

"If they must have their rates regulated at all, the railroads would prefer a unified system. This could only be achieved through a federal statute, which would fix a definite rate for the whole country and supplant the various state measures which have recently been enacted. It is the opin-