

members of that race living in San Francisco. Upon no subject will the people of a state insist more strenuously in controlling their own affairs than in matters of education. The school room is in close and constant contact with the home, and the parents, having a vital interest in the instruction of their children and an intimate acquaintance with local conditions, would not and should not consent to national control or supervision. No construction of the constitution could bring state schools within the scope of federal legislation, and no amendment contemplating such a change would commend itself to any section of the country.

The third and most attractive proposition looking to an enlargement of the powers of the general government is that involved in anti-trust legislation. There is a real evil to be corrected, and a real public sentiment to be satisfied. A constitutional amendment was proposed a few years ago specifically authorizing congress to deal summarily with the subject. It was opposed by democrats on the ground that it did not protect the rights of the states. While such an amendment, properly drawn, conferring plenary power upon congress, but reserving to the several states the powers which they now have, would be unobjectionable, it has not yet been shown to be necessary. Congress has power to control interstate commerce, and the decision of the supreme court in the lottery case leaves little doubt that that power can be so exercised as to withdraw the interstate railroads and telegraph lines and the mails from corporations which control enough of the product of any article to give them a virtual monopoly. No assault upon the authority or contraction of the sphere of the state can be justified on the ground that it is necessary for the overthrow of monopolies. Federal remedies should supplement state remedies; they should not be substituted for state remedies.

Two constitutional amendments have been shown to be necessary: one relating to the method of electing United States senators, and the other to the income tax. The first amendment is required to make the senator the servant of the people whom he represents; the second is necessary to permit an equitable distribution of the burdens of the federal government; but neither of these amendments would disturb in the least the balance between the general and the state government. So delicately was this balance adjusted in the beginning that the dual form of government designed by the fathers adjusts itself ever more perfectly to conditions as our nation develops.

THOMAS BAILEY ALDRICH

Thomas Bailey Aldrich, poet and novelist, died at his home in Boston on March 19. The announcement of his death will be received with regret in literary circles, but it is doubtful if his sincerest mourners will be found among men of letters. Men not yet middle-aged—professional men, business men, farmers and mechanics—will mourn the demise of "Tom Bailey," for the news of Mr. Aldrich's death will bring to mind the "Story of a Bad Boy" that gave them so much pleasure in their youthful days. The "Tom Bailey" of that splendid story for boys was Thomas Bailey Aldrich himself. His sincerest mourners will be the boys who will never forget the snow fight on Slater's hill, the bursting of the old 1812 cannon, the initiatory services of the "Centipedes," the cruise of the Dolphin or old "Sailor Ben." Mr. Aldrich wrote things much more literary than "The Story of a Bad Boy," but nothing that appealed more to the boy-heart of the nation, which is, after all, the man-heart of the nation. The boys of the last generation and of this, will recall old Rivermouth as the days go by, and whenever Portsmouth, the place where the Russo-Japanese peace treaty was signed, is mentioned, a million boys and men will recall that the Portsmouth of history is the Rivermouth of "The Story of a Bad Boy," who, after all, was not so bad—just a boy.

RUSSIAN REFORM

It is good news that comes from Russia. The Czar, through Premier Stolypin, informs the Duma that he will propose measures guaranteeing freedom of speech, freedom of the press, freedom of conscience; habeas corpus, abolition of administrative exile and popular education.

"Our country," he says, "must be transformed into a constitutional state. Real measures must be adopted to define and determine the rights of the state and of private individuals, and to abolish the contradictions between the old and new laws and the arbitrary interpretations placed upon them by private persons as well as by officials. The government, therefore, has decided that it is necessary to submit a series of bills establishing the new regime in Russia."

The Minister of Justice is to propose bills "patterned on the procedure of civil and criminal law in other European states, and the government

promises to insure full liberty of action both to employers and their workmen, including freedom in matters of economic strikes." The government also plans workmen's insurance and medical relief and measures prohibiting night and underground work for women and children, as well as shorter hours. Surely a brighter day is dawning for Russia and her well-wishers will rejoice that these great reforms are coming without revolution. It will take time to transplant in that country the constitutional liberty so long enjoyed throughout Europe, but people are apt to be patient when they are assured of ultimate relief. Reforms have been delayed so long that some may doubt the Czar's good intentions, but distrust will give place to confidence if the promised measures are presented. With freedom to speak and write the reformers can hope to remove abuses, and with freedom of conscience and universal education Russia will take her place among the great nations of the world. Here's to "the bear that walks like a man."

REAL INFIDELITY

The Chicago Inter-Ocean in an editorial endorsing Germany's refusal to consent to a limitation of armaments and characterizing as "hypocritical humanitarianism" England's offer to join in the discouragement of larger navies says:

Peace in the world is secured by predominant force, and a gentlemen's agreement among nations has no guaranty except mutual respect for one another's force. There was once a "pax Romanus" and there has been talk of a "pax Britannica;" but such a universal peace is kept by the sword, not by Hague agreements, just as international respect for our Monroe doctrine is secured not by the voluntary consent of nations, but by fear of the power of these United States.

This is infidelity to the fundamental principle upon which our civilization rests. It overlooks the influence of Christianity, the power of truth and the strength of the sense of justice which is to be found in every human heart. The Inter-Ocean would seem to build upon the basis of brute strength, but it is probably not so degraded as its argument would indicate. More likely it is deluded by the builders of war ships who play one nation against another for the money to be made in the sale of ships. There is no end to such a rivalry but the bankruptcy of the rivals. Even our nation has been caught by the argument that peace can be promoted by cultivating a spirit of war, but in time a wise counsel will prevail.

A JOURNAL OF AMERICAN HISTORY

The first number of the first volume of the Journal of American History has been received at The Commoner office and is a most creditable and ambitious publication.

Four numbers are issued each year at a subscription price of two dollars. It is published by the Associated Publishers of American Records, New Haven, Conn. Its purpose is to present life stories of men and events that have entered into the building of the western continent.

The first number contains colored prints of the various flags that have floated over the United States from its discovery until the adoption of the stars and stripes. If the inaugural number can be accepted as an index of what may be expected, it will set a high standard of literary, historical and artistic excellence.

OUR SHIPPING LAWS

Something like a hundred years ago we enacted a law to the effect that no foreign-built or foreign-owned boat should be allowed to engage in coastwise trade with United States ports. That law is still on the statute books. It was enacted to "build up our shipping industry." About a third of a century ago we enacted a law prohibiting the importation of lumber from a foreign country unless under heavy penalty in the shape of a tariff tax. That was to "protect our lumber industry."

The other day a British freighter sailed from Vancouver, British Columbia, for Fort Markes, Mexico, with a cargo of four million feet of lumber. That lumber will be freighted 1,500 miles and sold to the Mexicans at less than one-half the price demanded by the lumber barons of the United States from the homebuilders of the country. The tariff on lumber has denuded our forests, enabled men to accumulate riches without making adequate return in services rendered, and doubled within the last ten years the price the American workman has to pay if he builds a modest cottage to cover himself and family.

That antiquated shipping law has left us with a lot of wooden freighters in our coastwise trade, while other nations have built steel freighters that can be made serviceable in time of war.

An American vessel engaged in the coastwise

trade cannot haul lumber from Canada to the United States profitably because the tariff tax would prevent the sale of the lumber. If that vessel should meet with a storm and be forced to make repairs in a Canadian port, before it could land again at an American dock its owners would have to pay a duty of 50 per cent of the amount paid for repairs in the foreign port.

Under our navigation laws a ship cannot carry the American flag unless built in the United States, then we turn around and put on a tariff that adds 50 per cent to the cost of the ship if built in an American shipyard and registered to enable it to carry the flag of the republic.

Yet, despite these absurd laws there are people who mourn the decadence of American shipping and ship building and insist that the only remedy is a subsidy.

WHAT THEY WANT

The Chicago Tribune, after printing interviews with the presidents of eleven railroads, summarizes what these railroad magnates want as follows:

"Repeal of the Sherman anti-trust law, so far as it applies to railroads and forbids combinations, which are as much in the interests of the general public as of any individuals; national regulation, removing railroads from state control so far as necessary for protection against vicious and unintelligent legislation; a recognition of the fact that prosperity of the railroads is necessary for the extensions which the growth of the country makes indispensable; a spirit of fair play, a better understanding, and a pull all together for a greater and more prosperous country."

The first demand means that the railroads be given to right to pool. It will be remembered that in his message to congress Mr. Roosevelt recommended that the railroads be given this right. Upon that point, then, the railroads and Mr. Roosevelt were at agreement. But at the time the rate regulation bill was passed the railroads bitterly fought federal regulation. There the railroads and Mr. Roosevelt were not at agreement. Now, however, the railroads and Mr. Roosevelt agree, first upon the pooling proposition, and second, upon the plan to lodge all control over the railroads in the federal government. Upon one point at least the railroad magnates have changed front. Where but a year ago they were bitterly opposed to federal regulation they are now enthusiastically in favor of federal regulation.

One need not look far for an explanation. The power of the state government in the protection of the public interests has recently been demonstrated. It is not "vicious and unintelligent legislation" which the railroad magnates fear on the part of state governments. They fear legislation that results in practical benefits to the people. They fear laws which require from the railroad magnate justice to his patrons. So far as concerns other portions of the Tribune's statement, they are balderdash. Of course every one recognizes that the railroad ought to be prosperous and the men who insist upon railroad regulation believe in "a spirit of fair play, a better understanding, and a pull all together for a greater and more prosperous country."

The Harrimans, however, do not believe in the spirit of fair play. They do not want the people to have any understanding of the railroad speculator's method. And instead of "a pull all together for a greater and more prosperous country" they want the public to be the servant rather than the master of the corporation, and they want the men and women of America, for whose use and benefit the corporation was created and for whose use and benefit the public highways were loaned for a time to the corporations' agents—to "pull all together" for the benefit of the Harrimans of today and the creation of a greater and greedier Harriman in the days to come.

MR. ROOSEVELT

It is good politics as well as patriotism to endorse the president when he does right. Democrats cannot know what Mr. Roosevelt's attitude will be in the coming campaign, but they do know that he cannot take back the things he has said in favor of democratic ideas.

NOT CONTAGIOUS

The president has a cabinet—are none of its members big enough to be president? Haven't they been exposed to reform all this time? Why haven't they caught it? Why is it that the president alone has escaped the paralysis that has fallen upon all the rest? There is only one explanation, and that is his popularity is due to his following the democratic doctrine.