

gotiation. At the very least let us adhere to the President's instructions and if conditions require the keeping of Luzon forego the material advantages claimed in annexing other islands. Above all let us not make a mockery of the injunction contained in those instructions, where, after stating that we took up arms only in obedience to the dictates of humanity and in the fulfillment of high public and moral obligations, and that we had no design of aggrandizement and no ambition of conquest, the President among other things eloquently says:

"It is my earnest wish that the United States in making peace should follow the same high rule of conduct which guided it in facing war. It should be as scrupulous and magnanimous in the concluding settlement as it was just and humane in its original action."

This and more, of which I earnestly ask a re-perusal, binds my conscience and governs my action.

Wednesday, 12:30, night.

GEORGE GRAY.

Was It an Error?

The New York World reports an interesting "error" made by Vice-President Roosevelt on the third day that he presided over the Senate. This New York paper describes the incident thus:

The Senate had fallen into a discussion of one of those questions of precedent and tradition so dear to the senatorial heart. Some one—it was Teller, of Colorado—ended a sentence with the phrase, "and the Senate transact such executive business as the President may see fit."

There was no occasion for Mr. Roosevelt to say anything. In fact the only thing for him to do was to be quiet, as he is a mere servant of the Senate with no voice in its proceedings. But Mr. Roosevelt was nervous and did not know what he was doing. His fingers were fluttering about, the tip of his nose ran in and out rapidly, as seen from above, and he said in a voice of suppressed hysteria, "Such business as the President sees fit."

Several Senators lifted their white whiskers off their shirt bosoms and peered about curiously. In his agitation the unhappy new presiding officer had kicked the Senate in a very sore spot. Old Morgan of Alabama, able, but as windy as Nassau street when a gale is blowing, rose to his feet and examined Mr. Roosevelt with the air of one who is noting with contempt a small and disagreeable object. Then he said in a voice as dry and cold as a December day at the North Pole:

"Such business as the Senate sees fit."

Roosevelt's hands shook "like an aspen." From the press gallery you could see the end of his nose quiver, the tips of his cheeks and ears redden and his neck swell as if he were swallowing rapidly.

He betrayed all the symptoms of a nervous child.

The Senate settled back with a look of complacent forbearance. It has heard of "Strenuous Teddy" and it is watching him closely. It was pleased to see that he has the proper awe and fear. And there is not the slightest doubt that he has, that he purposes to lead a quiet, civilized life and try to live down his reputation for bumptiousness and boyish fondness for noise and for tearing and killing animals. But to return to the remark, was Mr. Roosevelt right in the statement of fact, or was Mr. Morgan right?

Why does the World refer to this incident as Mr. Roosevelt's "error"? It is not surprising that the Vice-President's interesting remark should grate harshly upon the nerves of the dignified Senator from Alabama. Senator Morgan yet labors under the delusion that we have three branches of government, and that Congress occupies a sphere where the executive dare not invade. But Mr. Roosevelt knows that that is a delusion just as well as all the world knows it is a delusion in these days of trusts and imperialism. The republican congress has been permitted under the present administration to transact only

"such business as the President sees fit." Mr. Roosevelt is as candid as he is strenuous, and it was only characteristic of the Vice-President that he did not apologize for his so-called "error."

The "symptoms of a nervous child" betrayed by the Vice-President probably were not nervousness at all. Mr. Roosevelt was endeavoring to control himself. He was probably indignant that the Senator from Alabama had the temerity to deny a statement which all the world understands to be full of stubborn, even though regrettable, fact.

President's Growing Powers.

A writer in the Forum, discussing the growing power of the President, shows that aside from the offices in War and Navy departments, the President has patronage at his disposal as follows:

State Department—	
318 consular and diplomatic appointments..	\$ 1,000,000
Treasury Department—	
743 customs, revenue, marine hospital, etc..	617,355
Postoffice Department—	
4,015 postmasters.....	6,931,000
Interior Department—	
747 pension officials, land office agents, etc.	1,997,640
Department of Justice—	
Judges, attorneys, marshals, etc..	1,126,000
Total.....	\$11,671,995

It is estimated that, including all departments, the President is, as the Chicago Times-Herald says, "able to divert into the pockets of his supporters annually the sum of \$20,000,000, a total distribution of \$80,000,000, during his term of office." The Times-Herald declares that "there is much apprehension among the students of our political system concerning these growing powers of the President." This republican newspaper says:

In adjusting some of the problems growing out of the recent war we have seen Congress practically abdicate in favor of the President. The framers of the Constitution rightly appreciated that in a republic the popular branch of the government must be paramount. We have recently seen the President become the autocratic ruler of hundreds of thousands of people in Cuba and of millions of people in the Philippines. He has appointed and removed officials without asking the consent of the Senate. The laws promulgated by the Taft commission in the Philippines declare that they were enacted "by the authority of the President of the United States"—not of Congress.

And then the Times-Herald concludes that "the only remedy appears to be through the extension and enforcement of the merit system." This is, indeed, a profound suggestion. A more sensible one, however, would be that we restore the machinery of our national government to its proper order; that the law-making and war-declaring power be exercised exclusively by the congress; that the President resume his constitutional place as an executive, content with being the beloved magistrate of a nation of freemen, rather than the autocratic ruler of peoples who have never consented to United States government.

Is It "Essential Oneness?"

The London Spectator has discovered that the tributes paid by the American people to the memory of Queen Victoria is "A proof of the essential oneness of the English speaking race."

"It is impossible," says the Spectator, "for

any person, sovereign or president, poet or divine, philosopher or weaver of romance, to rise to the very highest place in either land without becoming the common property of both peoples. Say what we will, we are sharer in the really great." The Spectator then refers to Great Britain's reverence for Abraham Lincoln, whom the British nation recognize as "A representative of what was highest and noblest in the English speaking kin." The Spectator says that "this good feeling will continue as long as we speak the same language and read the same bible, and as long as Mr. Lincoln and the Queen remain as examples of public duty."

As a matter of fact, the tributes paid by the American people to the memory of Queen Victoria were the tributes due to a good woman, whose virtues were made conspicuous by the public place she so long and creditably filled. Our English friends frequently make the mistake of thinking that the American people comprise exclusively the descendants of Englishmen. The tributes paid to the memory of Queen Victoria came from all classes of people regardless of their ancestry. We do not remember that any American President, prior to the present regime, held a very high place in the affections of the British public. We do not recall that any of the American poets ever received even a small proportion of the attention from the British public which the American people pay Kipling—that fearful and wonderful maker of prose and verse. We have a distinct recollection that Henry Ward Beecher was one divine who rose to a very high place in this land, and we have a faint recollection of some stirring scenes at Manchester and in other neighborhoods when this great American preacher visited England to plead the cause of the Union and made himself famous by the courage he displayed in the presence of the English mobs.

It rather grates on the American nerves to have this English newspaper refer to Lincoln. The American people very gracefully paid tributes at the bier of Queen Victoria because, while that good woman lived, we did her no injustice. If she had eccentricities we did not exaggerate them. Our newspapers were in the habit of referring to her in the kindest of terms, and when she died our tributes simply represented the expressions we had given while she lived. But the English attitude toward Lincoln was quite different. We remember that when Lincoln died, the Union having been preserved in spite of the embarrassments Great Britain sought to put upon us, there were many expressions of regret by the British public, and many tributes paid by British publications that had devoted their energies to libels upon the martyred president while he lived.

A memorable rebuke entitled: "The Atonement of Mr. Punch" read like this:

You lay a wreath on murdered Lincoln's bier,
You who with mocking pencil were wont to trace,
Broad for the self-complacent British sneer,
His length of shambling limb, his furrowed face.

You whose smart pen backed up the pencil's laugh,
Judging each step as though the way were plain,
Reckless so it could point its paragraph
Of chief's perplexity or people's pain.

Beside this corpse that bears for winding sheet
The Stars and Stripes he lived to rear anew,
Between the mourners at his head and feet,
Say, scurrile jester, is there room for you?