

and the rise is no hardship as it would have been then."

Now, if this increase in the price of beef is due to good times, why is it necessary for these beef firms to enter into an agreement, as the Eagle says they have done, to maintain prices?

If the Eagle's general statement is correct, would not these facts themselves operate to maintain prices?

One need not search for statistics to disprove the Eagle's statement concerning general conditions. The fact that a large number of working men are required to do without meat as a food indicates that even if the increase in the price of other things has been commensurate with the increase in the price of the products of the beef trust, there has been no similar increase in the wages of the working man.

The fact is that the average household feels the burden of the beef trust's greediness. According to the New York papers, the increase in beef prices has been so marked that a large number of small butcher shops have been driven out of business because they could not obtain customers for their high priced beef.

The Brooklyn Eagle has perhaps exerted its best efforts to provide a defense for this great trust, and yet it is difficult for an intelligent man to read the Eagle's opinion on this subject without being convinced that it is the trust system, rather than any general beneficial conditions, that is responsible for the large increase in the price of one of the necessities of life.

Gardener's Startling Report.

The senate committee on the Philippines has dragged from the war department the report of Major Cornelius Gardener, civil governor of the province of Tayabas, to which report reference was made by General Miles in his correspondence with Secretary Root.

It was the reference in General Miles' letter to this report which aroused, more than did anything else, the anger of the president. That it was the administration's intention to conceal this report there is abundant evidence.

In this testimony before the senate committee, Governor Taft submitted reports from twenty-three provinces and after doing so, he explained that it was "quite probable there might be in the mail other reports." He did not, however, produce them and he particularly failed to produce the report to which General Miles referred and which report was made public at the urgent request of the senate committee.

In this report Governor Gardener reveals a deplorable state of affairs in his province. He refers to "the extensive burning of barrios in trying to lay waste the country so that the insurgents cannot occupy it, the torturing of natives by the so-called water cure, and other methods, in order to obtain information, the harsh treatment of natives generally," and he says that these things have had the effect of destroying any favorable sentiment and as a consequence, "A deep hatred toward us is engendered."

Governor Gardener says that the course now being pursued in at least four of the provinces is, in his opinion, "sowing seed for a perpetual revolution against us hereafter whenever opportunity occurs." According to the governor, "The political situation is slowly retrograding and the American sentiment is decreasing and we are daily making permanent enemies."

In his speech made at Charleston, President Roosevelt said that there was more warfare over the Philippines within the United States than there was in the Philippine islands, and other representatives of the administration have been exerting every effort to place the Philippine situation in a good light. But even with the necessarily limited congressional investigation into these affairs, enough has been developed to show that

the administration has been deliberately concealing the truth, and deceiving the American people.

It is not strange that these gentlemen go to such unusual lengths to conceal the truth. Enough is already known by the daily newspaper reader to convince the intelligent man that in the Philippines the American people have an elephant on their hands which is costing them even more in the loss of dignity and self-respect than it is in the enormous sums of money we are required to expend in maintaining our Philippine policy.

Good Enough for a King.

Commenting on a letter written to a New York society by Mr. Bryan relating to the sending of a special envoy to represent this country at the coronation ceremonies of King Edward, the New York World insists that we do not surrender our convictions "by an act of common courtesy toward a friendly and kindred nation and its ruler." The World adds that

If this assumption be true, it follows that Great Britain, Germany, Russia and all other European countries whose ambassadors and ministers attended the inaugural ceremonies of our presidents must "surrender their convictions" in so doing and approve of the doctrine that "governments derive their just powers from the consent of the governed," and that a democracy is the true system. "It is a poor rule that won't work both ways."

Then the World says that this government should pay the expenses of this special envoy.

It is true that common courtesy toward a friendly nation is due from this government, but when the inaugural ceremonies of our president, to which the World refers, occur, Great Britain, Germany, Russia and those European countries do not send special envoys. The heads of those governments think that "common courtesy" is met by being represented by their ministers regularly stationed at Washington. Why would not Mr. Choate and his retinue be sufficient for the purpose of "common courtesy?" Why is it necessary that this government be represented by a special envoy at the coronation of a king, when all that is necessary for a king's representation at the inaugural ceremonies of a president is the regular diplomatic representative of his country residing at the time in the city of Washington?

It is indeed a poor rule that won't work both ways. The rule with respect to the king's representation at the inaugural ceremonies of the president ought to be sufficient for the republic's representation at the coronation ceremonies of the king.

"Duty" vs. Ambition.

Walter Wellman, the Washington correspondent of the Chicago Record-Herald, who very often has made accurate predictions of the administration's action, recently wired his newspaper that "President Roosevelt is both deeply wounded and highly incensed at General Miles' conduct. He was already sufficiently irritated by previous occurrences, but this episode is understood to be the last straw."

This relates to General Miles' testimony before the senate committee. Describing Mr. Roosevelt's feelings, Mr. Wellman adds:

If he finally decides to retire General Miles, which is equivalent under the existing circumstances to dismissal in disgrace, he hopes to have reasons to give for his action which will satisfy fair-minded men. The president will state these reasons in an official order and will state them fully. President Roosevelt greatly regrets that matters have taken such a turn, but he has his duty to perform as the official head of the army, and neither political agitation nor quips about the youthful bronco buster riding roughshod over the veterans of the army and navy will deter him from doing what he thinks is right.

Now it would be too bad, indeed, if Mr. Roosevelt neglected the opportunity of retiring

General Miles, which, according to Mr. Wellman, would be "equivalent, under the existing circumstances, to dismissal in disgrace." It is to be observed, however, that level-headed republican politicians have advised the president that it would hardly be safe, from the political standpoint, for the president to become responsible for General Miles' "dismissal in disgrace."

But of course the president "has his duty to perform as the official head of the army," and while Mr. Wellman intimates that nothing would deter him from doing what he thought to be his duty, it is noticeable that at the last writing, Mr. Roosevelt had concluded to pause a while before discharging this rather delicate task.

Not Duty but Bounty.

A reader of The Commoner calls attention to the fact that the republican national platform of 1896 favored discriminating duties instead of bounties as a means of building up our merchant marine. The plank reads as follows:

We favor the American policy of discriminating duties for the upbuilding of our merchant marine and the protection of our shipping in the foreign carrying trade, so that American ships—the product of American labor, employed in American shipyards, sailing under the stars and stripes, and manned, officered and owned by Americans—may regain the carrying of our foreign commerce.

Mr. McKinley's letter accepting the first nomination said:

The declaration of the republican platform in favor of the upbuilding of our merchant marine has my hearty approval. The policy of discriminating duties in favor of our shipping, which prevailed in the early years of our history, should be again promptly adopted by congress and vigorously supported until our prestige and supremacy on the seas are fully attained.

That was the position of the republican party in the campaign of 1896. The resolutions committee of the republican convention of 1900 refused to indorse a ship subsidy bill because the republicans were not willing to risk judgment upon that issue. But when the election resulted in a victory the greedy corporations that dominate republican policies at once demanded not a fulfillment of the St. Louis platform or of the platform of 1900, but of the secret promises made by Mr. Hanna and his associates. As a result the senate has passed as conscienceless a bill as ever received the support of a majority of the senate.

The same reader who called attention to the republican plank in regard to discriminating duties points out that Lincoln once declared that a person elected upon a plank was not at liberty to shift his position. Poor Lincoln! How unkind of him to use words which so emphatically condemn the shifting policies of the republican party! For several years past it has made platforms for the purpose of deceiving the people and has immediately shifted its position as soon as it won a victory.

Governor Stone's Candidacy.

Some of the reorganizers in Missouri are attempting to make political capital out of the fact that The Commoner has not said anything in regard to the candidacy of Governor Stone. The Commoner does not take part in contests between democrats for a party nomination, unless the contest involves the principles of the party. When Congressmen Clark and De Armond were candidates against Governor Stone nothing was said in behalf of any of the candidates because all stood for the same principles and all were worthy representatives of those principles. Now that Mr. Clark and Mr. De Armond have withdrawn and Governor Stone is the only one who is running upon the Kansas City platform, The Commoner can wish him success and express its confidence in his ability and in his loyalty to the principles of the party as promulgated at Kansas City. Governor Stone served through the campaigns of 1896 and 1900 as the second member on the national committee and no leader of the party has been more trusted or is more deserving of confidence.