

justification in proceeding individually against the officers of the Atchison, Topeka and Santa Fe railway for contempt when neither the interstate commerce commission or the special counsel you have employed have determined a single fact of any kind beyond the holding of their offices tending to implicate any one of these officers."

But now, according to Mr. Roosevelt's intimate friend, Kohlsaat, Paul Morton himself confessed the fact to Mr. Roosevelt. Yet after that confession Mr. Roosevelt not only appointed Mr. Morton to the cabinet but refused to permit proceedings to be commenced against him, on the charge of rebating, on the theory that there was not sufficient evidence to justify suspicion against Morton!

If Mr. Kohlsaat has not made a terrible mistake then Mr. Roosevelt did something more than blunder in the appointment and in the defense of Paul Morton.



NO DANGER OF PANIC

There is no danger of a panic. Those who are predicting it overlook the fact that the world's volume of money is increasing. Rising prices follow an increase in the currency and it is impossible to have a general panic when prices are rising. Of course, there will be readjustments in special cases where speculation raises prices above the normal level but we may expect a steady increase in the level of prices and a continuation of prosperity as long as the volume of money increases more rapidly than population and business.

The trouble is not with wealth production, but with distribution. The trusts are bleeding the public; the tariff barons are extorting from consumers and the railroads are overcharging patrons, but these things can be remedied now easier than ever before. The trusts can be dissolved and they will employ more people and sell more goods under competition; the tariff can be reduced and the wage roll and the output increased; railroad rates can be reduced and the patrons can use the money thus saved in buying what the manufacturers have to sell.

Now is the time to dissolve the trusts, reform the tariff and reduce railroad rates, and no threat of panic should scare the public.



MR. WATTERSON'S IDEAL CANDIDATE

Mr. Watterson seems to think that a man who talks and writes is not available for the presidency. He says that a sentence defeated Blaine and that a letter defeated Clay. A natural inference is that to be a successful candidate one must avoid editorial work, lecturing, letter writing and the use of sentences. Of course, speeches are not to be tolerated and votes on public questions have some elements of danger in them.

The Commoner protests against these restrictions for they would make Mr. Watterson himself unavailable and that is in itself sufficient to condemn his position. Mr. Watterson writes a brief editorial occasionally and some times lectures—who ever gave these as a reason for questioning his availability? And do not La Follette and Dolliver and Landis lecture? Must the door be closed against them? Folk and Tillman and Champ Clark lecture also and they have increased rather than diminished their popularity by so doing. A man whose position is sound and whose sympathies are with the people is not apt to render himself less available by championing the rights and interests of the masses, and a man whose sympathies are against the people will be found out even if he never writes or speaks a word. His sponsors indicate his position if he refuses to reveal it himself.

But Mr. Watterson's suggestion is an interesting one. How would it do to get up a futurity race, pick out the candidates at birth and train them for the nomination? They could be reared in seclusion, allowed to talk only to their trainers and be brought out at the proper age with a guarantee that they had no record to embarrass the party.

But, after all, it is fortunate that we have no such system, for suppose Mr. Watterson had been put in training for the position, what a loss the world would have suffered!

It is better as it is. The country has had the benefit of his brilliant editorials and of his delightful lectures (public lectures as well as those addressed to individuals) and he still has his chance for the presidency.

The old way is the best—let each do his duty as he sees it and speak as he thinks and

then the voters can select the one most available for the work to be done.

It was once thought right for one to spend his life in seclusion, preparing himself for future bliss, but it is a selfish view of religion which ignores the needs and claims of others to our constant service; and so one who is selfish enough to avoid participation in the discussion of public questions for fear of injuring his availability is not likely to commend himself to a party composed of earnest and patriotic men.

Colonel Watterson has written letters, and editorials, sent telegrams, used sentences, made speeches and delivered lectures—he has even used harsh language in criticising public men, and in the opinion of some he may have made mistakes but in spite of all these he would poll more votes than any namby pamby, colorless candidate who tried to conceal his views.

Moral cowardice is the greatest weakness a man can have—it is more disastrous than either error or indiscretion.



"INDESTRUCTIBLE"

Condemning Governor Glenn of North Carolina for his determined stand in defense of the laws of his state the St. Louis Globe-Democrat (republican) says: "Certain things took place a few decades ago which have made the American government an 'indestructible union of indestructible states,' and that verdict will not be overruled in Raleigh or any other state capital."

The Globe-Democrat would doubtless be very happy if, by a few waves of the bloody shirt, it could distract public attention from the evils of monopoly. "Indestructible union of indestructible states" describes our dual form of government. But a few months ago corporation newspapers were protesting against the exercise, by the federal government, of power over the corporations. Then, in their view, it was not such a thoroughly "indestructible union." But recently it has been demonstrated that the power of the states may be used in a practical and effective way for giving relief to the people and monopolists, with practically one voice, uphold the plea that power over corporations be centralized in the federal government. Whenever a federal judge seeks to annul the laws of the state in the interests of corporations and the authorities of the state enter protest the corporation organs have much to say of "indestructible union of indestructible states."

The bloody shirt will not serve in this day. The union is indeed indestructible but so is the state; and we must not forget that solemn constitutional warning: "The powers not delegated to the United States by the constitution or prohibited by it to the states are reserved to the states respectively or to the people."



STEEL MAIL CARS

While the railway mail clerks do not feel free to urge important improvements in the service there seems to be unanimity in the desire for the adoption of the steel mail cars, and the desire is a reasonable one. Most of the collisions are head-end collisions and the railway mail clerk occupies a position of danger. Experience seems to have demonstrated that the steel car is safer than the car made of wood and it is perfectly natural that it should be preferred by these men who spend so much of their time upon the road. And why not provide the mail clerks with the best and safest cars that can be constructed? The amount paid the railroads for carrying mail in excess of what should be paid would soon replace all the wooden cars with steel cars, but the change will be delayed as long as the railroads can control the senate and house.



"AFTER THE ELECTION"

Will any anti-trust republican be deluded by the administration's assurance, given through Senator Hopkins of Illinois, that the tariff will be revised "after the presidential election?"

Will any one be deluded by the claim that the republican party may be depended upon to give the people relief on the trust question or on the tariff question, or on other questions in which it is to the interest of those who provide the republican party with campaign funds to maintain present conditions?

Republican leaders can not claim that the failure to provide relief was due to oversight. Democratic members of the house of representatives met in caucus on June 27, 1902, and adopted resolutions in which it was charged that

the republican majority in congress "is dominated and controlled by the trusts and monopolies which have the great industries of our country in their grasp." These resolutions charged that the republican party refused and failed "to bring in any measure to suppress the trusts or to favorably report any of the numerous anti-trust bills introduced by democratic members during this session." Then the democratic members resolved:

"We favor the immediate passage of a measure to amend the present anti-trust law, so as more fully to protect trade and commerce against unlawful restraints and monopolies, and also a measure to reduce the duties on all articles and commodities manufactured and controlled or produced in the United States by a trust or trusts, so as to destroy such illegal combinations, and to reduce the rate of duty on any article or commodity manufactured in the United States and sold in foreign country more cheaply than in the United States.

"We oppose the adjournment of congress until the measures mentioned above have been enacted into law."

The republican congress adjourned. The anti-trust law was not amended. Nothing was done to more fully protect trade and commerce against unlawful restraints and monopolies; nothing was done to reduce the duties on articles and commodities manufactured and controlled or produced in the United States by a trust or trusts, so as to destroy such illegal combinations; nothing was done to reduce the rate of duty on any article or commodity manufactured in the United States and sold in a foreign country more cheaply than in the United States.

The republican congress clearly showed that the arraignment made by the democratic caucus was justified. In the refusal of this congress to provide the people with any of the relief demanded, the republican congress provided proof, if, indeed, proof was necessary, that the republican party "is dominated and controlled by the trusts and monopolies which have the great industries of our country in their grasp."



FILIPINOS AND CUBANS

Should we treat the Filipinos as we have treated the Cubans? That is the only American plan. It recognizes the principles of our government, is in harmony with the wishes of the Filipinos, is justified by their capacity, and is consistent with our commercial interests. If the Cubans were entitled to liberty and independence, so are the Filipinos; no line can be drawn between the rights or the capacities of the two peoples. (The recent insurrection in Cuba has been cited by some as an evidence that they are incapable of self-government, but that argument can have no weight with us, since we had the greatest civil war in history.)

The Filipinos desire self-government. That has been disputed, but our observation in different parts of the islands convinces us that there is no division among the people as to the desirability of independence; some ask for it immediately, some are willing to wait a few years, but all demand it and expect it as the ultimate solution.

Now, as to their capacity; this is the question upon which the controversy turns. There are two theories, and there is a material difference between them. One is that capacity for self-government is a cultivated rather than a natural quality; the other is that capacity for self-government is an inherent quality, subject to development, to be sure, but a thing that does not have to be grafted upon the parent stalk.

The first is the theory of kings. They must assume incapacity upon the part of the people in order to justify their own usurpation. Once admit the doctrine that people below a certain level—a level never yet defined—are incapable of self-government, and you confess that governments rest upon force and force alone, for the king never admits capacity for self-government until the people compel a recognition of their demands.

The second theory is the one adopted by our forefathers. They assumed the capacity for self-government as a starting point, and believed that experience in government would develop the people. The advantage of our form of government is that it suits itself to the capacity of the people; they can make it as good as they deserve to have. It is not that all are equally capable of self-government, for there are degrees of capacity in people, whether for business or government, but, as a rule, people can gov-