

trusts, why doesn't the president enforce the present law and destroy them? If a new law is necessary, why has the president failed to suggest such a law? Every day between the opening of congress and its adjournment afforded him an opportunity to recommend a specific law for dealing with the trusts, but he recommended none. His party was in power in both house and senate and every day presented an opportunity for the party to introduce and pass a bill dealing effectively with the trusts, but nothing was done. Has the president just discovered what the trusts are doing? On the contrary, before he became president he seemed to know more about the subject than he does now, for when he spoke on the trust question then he did not use so many qualifying and limiting words as he does now. Is the republican party ignorant of the existence of the trusts? Not at all. Just before the adjournment of congress in 1900 the republicans of the house of representatives had a spasm of virtue and passed a bill with the aid of the democrats, providing what they considered an additional remedy. The bill was pointed to all through the campaign, but when the administration was indorsed by a large majority the bill was put to sleep in the senate and never even considered. It had served its purpose. It had furnished arguments for campaign speakers, and then it was thrown into the waste-basket. This year the republicans enter a campaign without even having passed an anti-trust bill through the house, and to remedy their failure the president, fresh from his visit to Mr. Frick of Pittsburg, fresh from his eulogy of Mr. Knox, the greatest trust attorney in the United States, now attorney general by demand of the trusts, causes it to be announced that he is going to take the subject up "just as soon as congress convenes" and do something—no one knows what. The voters will be credulous, indeed, if they accept a campaign promise of future activity as an atonement for six months of inactivity when action was possible, nay, even imperative.

If the republicans make gains in the congressional campaign this fall the trusts will point to it as an indorsement of them, and will scare the republicans into inaction again. If, on the contrary, the democrats make gains in the coming election the republicans may be frightened into doing something. If the republicans who want the trusts destroyed will quietly vote the democratic ticket this fall and make the country show decided democratic gain, the republicans will be so frightened that they may pass a law before the next campaign.

No action need be expected from the dominant party so long as everything is running smoothly and the people indorse Mr. Hanna's doctrine of "letting well enough alone."

Compensation for Mail Trains.

Dr. C. S. Taylor, editor of the Medical World of Philadelphia, has called the attention of the public to the fact that the government is paying to the railroads for the carriage of mail a great deal more than is necessary or reasonable. He asserts that we are now paying to the railroads about thirty-four millions a year for the hauling of mail, with about three millions additional for the rental of postal cars. He quotes as follows from the investigation made by Professor Frank Parsons:

In France the railways carry the mails free, with the single exception that where the government runs a postal car of its own the railway receives 2 centimes per kilometre, or about 1 cent per car mile, which is so near nothing that the railway official, when questioned about the mails, usually makes the broad statement that the government pays nothing for the railway carriage of the mails, and it takes a cross-examination to bring out the fact of the 2 centime special charge in case of government postal cars. The free car-

riage of the mails is a part consideration for their franchises.

In Switzerland the minister of railways in answer to my question said: "On the great railways the government pays nothing for the mails; their concessions require them to carry the mails free. On the small lines if the dividends fall below 3½ per cent, the government pays the fair cost of carrying the mails; when the road attains 3½ per cent it must carry the mails free." This is the law relating to private railways. All the railways of Switzerland are private as yet. The transfer to government management, under the provisions of the referendum vote of 1898, has not yet taken place.

In Germany the mails go free on the railways up to one car per train. If a second postal car is needed on any train, the government pays 5 pfennig per axle per kilometre, or 10 pfennig if the car belongs to the railway. There are usually two axles per car, sometimes three, so that the outside charge is 8 to 12 cents per car mile, and this only for extra mail cars. The great bulk of the mail goes free, and the excess beyond one car per train pays merely the actual cost of haulage. This law applies to both public and private roads, and was in force long before the government took over the leading railways.

In Austria it is provided in the railway concessions that the letter post shall be carried free, and that all mail shall be free up to one car per train. Beyond this the railway receives 18 heller per axle, or 10 to 15 cents per car per mile, which is intended to cover the cost of transportation of the excess beyond one car per train. This is the law in respect to the Nordwest, one of the principal private systems of Austria, and is a fair example of the policy of the company in respect to railway carriage of the mail; the theory being that the roads should carry the mail as part return for the franchises given them by the state.

In Italy the minister of railways told me that the government pays nothing for the railway carriage of the mails. It is so provided in the railway contracts.

In Belgium a similar policy prevails, and even in England, where the house of commons is crowded with railway directors and others more or less under railway influence—even in England with the postoffice carrying a large part of the parcels that go by express in this country—even in England the postal payment to the railways is only about one-ninth of the total expenditure, instead of one-third as in the United States.

If the government would reduce to a fair basis the compensation paid to railroads there would be no trouble about second class mail matter, but so long as the railroads control the republican party, and the republican party controls the government, the postoffice officials are not likely to protest against the exorbitant rates paid to the railroads.

The figures furnished by Professor Parsons will, however, prove useful to those members of congress who interest themselves in reform legislation.

The McCall Amendment.

Mr. Hoar, while denouncing the republican policy in the Philippines as a wicked policy, adheres to the republican party because he insists the "irrevocable step" has not yet been taken. There are also many republicans who, while not having the slightest sympathy with the policy of imperialism, "lay the flattering unction to their souls" that they may interpret the administration policy along American lines when, in fact, that policy leads directly along imperialistic lines.

Mr. Roosevelt, in a recent speech, said that the flag having been put in the Philippines would "stay put." And yet even after that speech was delivered there were many republicans who insisted that the republican policy did not mean colonialism and imperialism.

During the proceedings incident to the passage of the Philippine bill in the house, the republican party had an opportunity to define its position on this question. Mr. McCall, a re-

publican member from Massachusetts, offered as an amendment to the pending bill the following:

In this first organic act, creating a civil government for the Philippine islands, it is hereby solemnly declared to be the settled purpose of the congress to extend to the inhabitants of those islands every aid in enabling them to develop the capacity for self-government, and when such capacity shall have been developed we pledge the faith of the republic to confer upon them the right of self-government after the fashion of the really free nations.

Mr. McCall's amendment would not exactly suit those who believe it to be the duty of the American people to pledge to the Filipinos a government of, by, and for the people of those islands. But it will be observed that Mr. McCall's amendment carries with it the spirit and almost the exact words used by President Roosevelt in a public address.

Mr. McCall's amendment did not provide, as the Kansas City platform provided in explicit words, that the people of the Philippine islands were to have a republic, to the establishment of which they were to be helped by the American people and to the maintenance of which they were to be aided by that people. There was, indeed, to Mr. McCall's amendment a bit of ambiguity, but the amendment was doubtless framed in order that it might be fairly in line with the position which Mr. Roosevelt has taken in his public addresses. Indeed, we may detect in the McCall amendment terms and phrases which Mr. Roosevelt used.

What was it that Mr. McCall proposed? Mr. McCall proposed that the republican congress give its promise to extend to the Filipinos "every aid in enabling them to develop the capacity for self-government and when such capacity shall have been developed we (the congress) pledge the faith of the republic to confer upon them the right of self-government after the fashion of the really free nations."

This does not involve the "scuttle" policy even as that policy is defined by the most radical republican. It does not pledge the establishment of a republic under the protection of the United States. It does pledge, however, in the form of law, and it would therefore become a most solemn pledge, that the things which the republican politicians, the republican editors, and even the republican president have been assuring the American people that the republican party stood for, would be carried out in all fairness.

The reason the McCall amendment was not adopted was that the republican leaders do not dare to incorporate into a formal law any of the pledges they have been making on the stump and through the columns of republican newspapers. Those pledges were made to be broken. Whatever the republican president may have said, whatever the republican editors may have written, whatever the republican orators may have spoken, the purpose of the republican party in the Philippines is imperialism and colonialism, nothing more and nothing less; and nothing proves this more clearly than the refusal on the part of the republican congress to adopt the McCall amendment.

That amendment is not what democrats would ask. It was clearly, however, in line with every speech made by Mr. Roosevelt and by other republican leaders whenever they found it necessary to deny that the republican policy meant imperialism; and if Mr. Roosevelt's public addresses, and if republican editorials and republican speeches that have been made in protest against the charge that the republican policy meant imperialism were true, then the McCall amendment would have been adopted unanimously by the republican members of congress.

The republicans have made many mistakes, but they have made no greater mistake than when they refused to adopt the McCall amendment. That amendment will provide one of the most interesting and important features during the coming campaign, so far as concerns the Philippine question.

In the defeat of that amendment the American people, already knowing that it is not the intention of the republican party to establish a republic in the Philippines, know that the republican party does not intend to give the Filipinos any aid in enabling them to develop a capacity for self-government, or to confer upon them any of the practical rights of self-government as the president of the United States in his public addresses said, "after the fashion of the really free nations."