

Chicago Tribune, credited with being "an outspoken opponent of the Nicaraguan canal bill." The Tribune says that "Mr. Hanna spoke without reserve," and in explaining Mr. Hanna's position, the Tribune says:

Senator Hanna is not so much an advocate of the Panama idea as he is an opponent of the Nicaraguan route, and that he opposes only because he thinks it is not the best one geographically or financially. Mr. Hanna, indeed, is inclined to believe that the old Darien route is the one that offers the best advantage, all things considered.

About a year ago he had his attention called to the reports made upon this route at various times and talked with one of the engineers, who found in an out of the way place some maps and drawings which he brought to the attention of President McKinley, and through him to Senator Hanna. It is probable that the fact of the Darien route, which seems to have been entirely lost upon the present generation of congressmen, may be submitted to the senate committee during its consideration of the canal question and to the senate when the bill comes before that body.

This would seem to be a fairly accurate description of the attitude of those who oppose the Nicaraguan canal. For instance, according to the Tribune, Senator Hanna is "not so much an advocate of the Panama route as he is an opponent of the Nicaraguan route;" and, indeed, according to the Tribune, "Mr. Hanna is inclined to believe that the old Darien route is the one that offers the best advantage, all things considered."

What is the fair interpretation of this position? It would seem to be that Mr. Hanna and the men who stand with him in opposing the Nicaraguan route are not so much agitated because of geographical considerations, or because of economical questions, as they are by the determination that no canal shall be constructed across the isthmus until their individual or political interests in the canal becomes greater than it now is. As a matter of fact, the American people are very generally in favor of an isthmian canal. Had the Panama route been agreed upon by the commission, undoubtedly that route would now be in high popular favor. But the people seem to have settled upon the Nicaraguan route, not because of any particular prejudice in favor of that route, but because the Nicaraguan plan seems to give the best promise of an early completion of the much desired result.

Many powerful influences are at work, not particularly against the Nicaraguan route, but against any isthmian canal. One pretext and another will be resorted to in order to destroy the primary object. In the prompt passage of the Nicaraguan bill, the house of representatives has set a good example for the senate. It is also gratifying that no partisanship entered into the battle for an isthmian canal in the house. Let us hope that the senate will speedily dispose of this question. The specious pleading of men who insist that they are not so much advocates of the Panama route as they are opponents of the Nicaraguan route, or that "indeed" they are inclined to believe that the old Darien route is the one that "offers the best advantage, all things considered"—let us hope that the specious pleading of these men will be ignored in the very general demand that the congress pave the way for a prompt beginning of the enterprise in which the American people have so deep an interest.

### Interpreting the Decision.

The New York World thinks it is strange that many usually careful persons and newspapers have missed the point of the supreme court's simple and clear statement of the colonial problem. The World points out that the administration's contention was that the constitution did not extend to the colonies. The World insists that Justice Brown was the only member of the court who assented to this view. It claims that the other eight justices agree that the constitution does extend to the colonies, but they disagree as to the manner

in which it provides for them. The World rests its conclusions on the fact that Justices Gray, McKenna, Shiras and White based their opinion, which, with the vote of Justice Brown, was made the prevailing opinion, on the fact that the constitution provides "the congress shall have power to dispose of and make all needful rules and regulations respecting the territory or other property belonging to the United States."

The World disturbs its own position when it admits that the supreme court finds that congress has "a practically free hand in all the colonies." The restraints upon the congress, according to the World, "are the people, the spirit of our institutions and the broad guarantee of human rights embodied in the constitution."

The fact is that it was necessary for the court to find something in the constitution upon which to rest its opinion; but it will be difficult for the World to show, by reference to the various opinions delivered by those justices who comprise the majority, that in the court's opinion any part of the constitution followed the flag other than that section giving to congress the power "to dispose of and make all needful rules and regulations respecting the territory or other property belonging to the United States."

If the World's position that, under the decision of the supreme court "the spirit of our institutions and the broad guarantee of human rights embodied in the constitution," operate as a restraint upon the congress, how does it happen that the court sustained a law levying a tariff upon goods shipped from Porto Rico to the United States? How does it happen that the court sustained a law levying practically an export tax upon goods going from the United States to Porto Rico? How does it happen that the administration has interpreted the many recent decisions as authority for the congress to enact a tariff law for the Philippines similar to that which was enacted for Porto Rico? Finally, how does it happen that the administration has accepted every decision rendered by these five justices as an indorsement of the administration's policies, and as a complete warrant for the administration to carry out and extend its plan?

It may be fair to infer from the various opinions delivered in the insular cases that the court would place restrictions upon the executive authority in the colonies apart from the levying of tariff taxes and with relation to the creation of civil government. But the fact remains, exactly as the World says, that the supreme court finds that congress has "a practically free hand in all the colonies;" and there is nothing in the opinion of the majority of the court to warrant the impression that any of the spirit of our institutions, any of our traditions, any of our well-established sentiment, will necessarily operate as a restraint upon the congress when it comes to make what the congress shall regard as "needful rules and regulations respecting the territory or other property belonging to the United States."

### That Populist Influence.

The reorganizers are always complaining of the influence which the populists have exerted upon the democratic party in recent years. Whenever a reorganizer wants to find fault with the democratic platform or any part of it, he denounces it as populist. The fact is, most of the things which are complained of as populist were advocated by the democrats before the populist party was organized, and that which the democrats did borrow from the populist party was indorsed by practically all of the democratic party prior to the Chicago convention. Take for instance the question of free silver. The democratic party in congress had for years been contending for the very thing which the Chicago platform indorsed. Time and again before there was a populist party nearly all of the democrats in both the house and senate had voted for the financial system indorsed by

the platform. They had voted for free coinage and for unlimited coinage; they had voted for a bill opening the mints at the ratio of 16 to 1 without waiting for the aid or consent of any other nation, and no national democratic platform had ever announced a different doctrine. The Chicago convention opposed the national bank of issue, but in so doing it was entirely consistent with the party record.

The Chicago platform indorsed the income tax. The principle of the income tax had been indorsed in previous populist platforms, but it had also been embodied in the revenue measure passed by congress in 1894. Comparatively few of the democrats in the house and senate voted against the income tax, Senator Hill of New York being the most rabid of its opponents. While it was known to the democrats in congress that Mr. Cleveland did not favor an individual income tax, he allowed the bill containing this tax to become a law without his signature. The opposition to the income tax plank has not been directed so much to the principle involved as to the wording of the platform, and the wording of the platform was not suggested by anything the populist party had ever said or done.

Government by injunction was also denounced in the Chicago platform, but it will be remembered that the United States senate had already passed, practically without opposition, the bill which the democratic platform commended.

These are the propositions usually referred to as populist, and yet, while the populist and democratic party agree on these propositions, they are thoroughly democratic, and no democrat can consistently object to them merely because the populist party also favors them.

But why should men who voted the republican ticket find fault with populists who supported the democratic ticket? Should men who supported the Palmer and Buckner ticket feel aggrieved because the populists were more anxious than they to secure the reforms for which the democratic party had been working? If men are to be judged by their actions rather than by their words, the populists are much more in sympathy with democratic principles than those who spend their time criticising and carping at the populists.

### Manifest Destiny.

One of the most interesting of the books published by Houghton, Mifflin & Co., is Theodore Roosevelt's book on Thomas Benton. It appeared in the Statesman's Series and was copyrighted in 1886. In this book the president of the United States gave special attention to a phrase which was much used just before the civil war, but not much used afterwards until it was employed as an excuse for the exploitation of the Philippines. On page 40, Mr. Roosevelt said:

Among such people Benton's views and habits of thought became more markedly western and ultra-American than ever, especially in regard to our encroachments upon the territory of neighboring powers. The general feeling in the west upon this last subject afterwards crystallized into what became known as the "Manifest Destiny" idea, which, reduced to its simplest terms, was: that it was our manifest destiny to swallow up the land of all adjoining nations who were too weak to withstand us; a theory that forthwith obtained immense popularity among all statesmen of easy international morality.

At that time the author did not like the doctrine of "manifest destiny;" his conscience would not permit him to indorse a policy of swallowing up even adjoining nations merely because they were too weak to withstand us. How could he have condemned the doctrine more severely than he did when he suggested that it became immensely popular among "all statesmen of easy international morality?"

It will be seen that it contained a moral question as well as a political one. If it was then immoral to swallow up the land of adjoining nations who were too weak to withstand us, is it