

adopted the more simple course. They appealed to congress to propose one specific amendment that provided for the election of United States senators by the people. Had congress proposed this amendment it would, after ratification by the legislatures of three-fourths of the states, have become a part of the constitution.

A republican senate did refuse to adopt this more simple plan, and because of this refusal, and in the presence of the very plain public sentiment on this proposition, it is fair to say that "the republican senate has refused to grant the demand of the people for the election of United States senators by direct vote."

The Journal says:

It is desirable that the present system of electing senators should be retained. It preserves our organic form of government and maintains a higher level of dignity, honesty and ability in the upper house of congress than might be secured if popular elections were made the rule.

The election of senators by popular vote would not disturb our organic form of government. That is a favorite claim made by the opponents of this plan, but they have never been able to provide intelligent defense for the claim.

The interesting statement made by the Journal is that the present system "maintains a higher level of dignity, honesty, and ability in the upper house of congress than might be secured if popular elections were made the rule." In the presence of the record relating to the election of multi-millionaires to the United States senate and the manipulation of legislatures in the interest of senatorial candidates who have no other claim than that they are backed by the corporations, what intelligent man will agree with the Journal that the present system maintains "a higher level of dignity, honesty and ability in the upper house of congress than might be secured if popular elections were made the rule?"

If that is true with respect to the members of the United States senate, why not adopt a similar plan with respect to the members of congress? Why not abolish popular elections altogether, and by abolishing popular elections thus secure "a higher level of dignity, honesty, and ability?"

Upon one point there will be general agreement with the Journal. This republican paper says that "it is absurd to represent that anybody can stand between the people and their object if they really desire to make a change in this system, or in any other part of the federal constitution." This is quite true so far as the final result is concerned. Certain influential republican leaders have stood between the people and their object on the question of the election of United States senators, but in time the people will have their way.

Liberty's Golden Beams.

Referring to Henry Grattan, the famous champion of liberty, some one said: "He wore himself out with labors in behalf of Ireland."

Grattan said many things that may be applied to the situation in the United States today. To the imperialist's contention that we are the custodians of the liberty of the people of our new possessions, Grattan furnished an interesting reply when, in a speech delivered May 26, 1800, he said: "I will trust the people with the custody of their own liberty; but I will trust no people with the custody of any liberty other than their own, whether that people be Rome, Athens, or Britain."

On the question of expediency, Grattan, in a speech delivered April 19, 1800, said: "Sir, 'expedient' is a word of appropriated and tyrannical import; 'expedient' is an ill-omened word selected to express the reservation of authority while the exercise is mitigated; 'expedient' is the ill-omened expression of the repeal of the American stamp act. England thought it 'expedient' to repeal that law; happy had it been for mankind if when she

withdrew the exercise she had not reserved the right! To that reservation she owes the loss of her American empire, at the expense of millions and America the seeking of liberty through the sea of bloodshed."

As to the claim that a "debt of gratitude" requires payment by the people of our new possessions, Grattan furnished an answer when he said: "A nation's liberty cannot, like her treasures, be meted and parcelled out in gratitude; no man may be grateful or liberal of his conscience, nor woman of her honor, nor nation of her liberty; there are certain unimpartible, inherent, invaluable properties, not to be alienated from the person, whether body politic or body natural."

The imperialist frequently points to former violations of our fundamental law as justification for his course. On this point Grattan said: "That there are precedents against us I allow—acts of power I would call them, not precedents; and I answer the English pleading such precedents, as they answered their kings when they urged precedents against the liberty of England: Such things are the weakness of the times; the tyranny of one side, the feebleness of the other, the law of neither; we will not be bound by them; or rather in the words of the declaration of right: 'No doing, judgment proceeding or otherwise to the contrary, shall be brought into precedent or example.' Do not, then, tolerate a power—the power of the British parliament over the land, which has no foundation in utility or necessity, or empire, or the laws of England, or the laws of Ireland, or the laws of nature, or the laws of God—do not suffer it to have a duration in your minds."

The ambition of a people to obtain national existence was described by Grattan thus: "I wish for nothing but to breathe in this our island in common with my fellow subjects the air of liberty. I have no ambition, unless it be the ambition to break your chain and contemplate your glory. I never will be satisfied so long as the meanest cottager in Ireland has a link of the British chain clanking to his rags; he may be naked, he shall not be in irons; and I do not see the time is at hand, the spirit is gone forth, the declaration is planted; and though great men shall apostatize yet the cause will live; and though the public speaker should die, yet the immortal fire shall outlast the organ which conveyed it, and the breath of liberty, like the words of the holy man, will not die with the prophet, but survive him."

One of the most striking passages in Grattan's speeches was that wherein he said: "The constitution may be for a time so lost; the character of the country cannot be lost. The ministers of the crown will, or may, perhaps at length, find that it is not so easy to put down forever an ancient and respectable nation by ability, however great, and by power and by corruption, however irresistible; liberty may repair her golden beams, and with redoubled heat animate the country; the country loyalty will not long continue against the principles of liberty; loyalty is a noble, a judicious, and a capacious principle; but in these countries loyalty, distinct from liberty, is corruption, not loyalty."

A Damaging Admission.

Major Glenn, who administered the water cure in the Philippines and who was punished by a ridiculously light sentence (\$50 fine and one month's suspension from duty) attempts to defend himself, but in doing so makes a damaging admission. The administration tries to make it appear that hostility to American rule is confined to few people, but Major Glenn says that "every man, woman and child in the island was an enemy." And what method was employed for making friends of them? The methods best calculated to give them new reasons for hating us. The following extract from a recent interview given out by him will give some idea of the implacable animosities engendered by imperialism

and shows what must be expected while we have a colonial system supported by an army of invasion:

"I found very soon after my arrival in Panay that every man's hand was against us; that every man, woman and child in the islands was an enemy, and in my best judgment they are today, and always will be. Practically every presidente and other official has been playing double. They organized and were the active members of secret societies, known as the Katipunan, etc., whose avowed objects were to advance the cause of 'independencia' in any and all ways, and under this high sounding phrase they have made use of every means forbidden to them by the laws of war."

"These men of peace have actually waged war by killing straggling American soldiers. They have made use of poison in the drinks sold to American soldiers. They have poisoned their arrows and the tips of their spears and bolos, together with the bamboo tips placed in the deadly traps that abounded on the trails. They have hired assassins to kill those who were even suspected of being friendly to the Americans, and likewise have endeavored to have our American officers assassinated."

"They openly stated in the island of Bohol that they would gladly sacrifice twenty natives for every American officer assassinated. They employed corps of assassins, who, under the name of Ducot, Mandoducot, or Sandathan, spread death and terror in their wake."

A Valuable Asset.

The Washington correspondent of the Chicago Record-Herald, republican, recently sent to his paper the following:

It was not a democratic campaigner, but a western republican who said to your correspondent: "I see President Schwab of the steel trust has made public an estimate of the value of the various assets of that great corporation, \$700,000,000 for ore mines, \$300,000,000 for steel plants, \$200,000,000 for transportation facilities, etc.—But I am surprised that Mr. Schwab, with his keen business acumen, should fail to include one of the most valuable of all the assets of the United States steel corporation. This is a device which shuts out all foreign competition. It is a scheme which compels foreign manufacturers of steel and iron who want to sell goods in the American market to stand a handicap of 40 per cent before they can do so. How much this asset is worth to the steel trust it would be very difficult for an outsider to estimate, and for that reason I should like to see President Schwab's figures. I venture the assertion that he would not rate it a penny less than \$1,000,000,000. Probably the fact that this asset is on the federal statute books under the name of the Dingley law led Mr. Schwab to leave it out of his long, imposing list of the property and resources of his corporation."

What party provided this trust with this valuable asset, an asset that Mr. Schwab would probably not rate a penny less than one billion dollars? The republican party.

What has the republican party received in return for the maintenance of this valuable asset? Generous campaign contributions.

If this valuable asset is worth not a penny less than \$1,000,000,000, from whose pockets does this immense sum come? From the pockets of the people.

Why should the American people give their votes to a party that would provide so valuable an asset to a handful of men at the expense of the people upon whose votes the republican party depends for its power?

A Falling Balance.

The decrease of 106 millions in the exports of 1902 as compared with the exports of 1901 and the increase of 80 millions in the imports for the same period is not being discussed much by republican leaders, but it ought to be considered by the rank and file. When the balance of trade in our favor is increasing the fact is proclaimed in big headlines and the republican party is given all the credit, but when the balance falls it seems to be a matter too insignificant to mention.