

to the reform a majority of nearly 375,000 of those who voted on the question at all. It is evident that the sentiment in favor of the direct election of senators is overwhelming among republicans as well as democrats, and yet in spite of this well recognized demand that the government be brought nearer to the people, men like Senator Depew and other representatives of the corporations still obstruct the submission of the amendment.

It is time that the legislatures were joining in a call for a constitutional convention to adopt this amendment. It requires three-fourths of the states to call such a convention, but by the time two-thirds of them asked for it the senate will be forced to act and then the convention will be unnecessary.

Take Your Choice.

The attention of the editor of *The Commoner* has just been called to an item which appeared in the *Philadelphia Record* some time ago. The *Commoner* published a letter written by William J. Longenberger, which appeared in the *Morning News of Danville, Pa.* The *Record* reports that Mr. Longenberger, who is still a member of company A, Fifteenth infantry, has written a letter to his commanding officer saying that the published letter written by him gives "a mistaken impression;" that he had heard the story from another enlisted man, and that he never witnessed the death of a native in the islands. He further believes that the story told him "was only idle boasting." The *Commoner* calls attention to this correction and leaves its readers to decide between the testimony given by the soldier when he wrote to his mother and his testimony to a commanding officer when he was confronted with the letter.

Publicity Then and Now.

The only remedy for trusts which Mr. Roosevelt directly pointed to in his message to congress was publicity. Republican newspapers have warmly commended this suggestion and some of them have actually treated it as though it were a new proposition, and one on which the republican party through its representatives had not already gone on record.

On February 15, 1902, the bill to provide for a permanent census bureau was before the United States senate. Senator DuBois of Idaho offered to amend section 9 of the bill by adding thereto the following:

"To enable the director of the census to perform the duties prescribed by this section, true and accurate reports shall be made to him annually by all corporations engaged in manufacturing, which reports shall state in detail the nature of the business or different lines of business, if there be more than one conducted by such corporation; the number of factories or establishments owned or controlled by it, the precise character of the business conducted at each factory or establishment, and the gross receipts of such business; the amount of the capital stock, and the proportion of which has been fully paid up; the surplus, the operating expenses, wages, taxes, both national and state, together with detailed statements as to the quantity of its product or products sold for export, the prices per unit obtained therefor, the rebates, if any, allowed upon products sold for export, and the prices charged to dealers in the United States; any and all agreements with other corporations, companies, or individuals engaged in manufacturing the same or similar products for the maintenance of uniform prices, the limiting of production or with reference to the wages of labor and all arrangements with transportation companies for specially advantageous freight rates.

"Such reports shall be verified by the president, manager, or chief officer of the corporation, who, upon the demand of the director, shall furnish such additional details as said director may deem necessary to apprise

him fully of the nature and extent of the business and the methods applied in its management. The failure by the president, manager, or chief officer of any manufacturing corporation to make the reports herein provided for, or any intentionally false statements concerning any matters set forth in a report which he does make, shall for every such offense be punished by a fine of not less than \$1,000 or more than \$5,000, or imprisonment for not less than one month or more than one year, or by both such fine and imprisonment.

"All information thus obtained by the director of the census shall be permanently filed in his office in convenient and accessible form, be classified and published annually."

Now, it would seem that Mr. DuBois' amendment complied with the "publicity" suggestion. After the DeBois amendment had been read the senator from Idaho called upon the secretary to read what President Roosevelt said in his message for December, 1901. In that message Mr. Roosevelt insisted that publicity was the first essential in determining how to deal with the trusts. Mr. DuBois urged that the president's recommendation be complied with in this respect. He said that there would be no better time or place in which to start this publicity machinery than at the moment they were providing for the establishment of a permanent census bureau.

What was the result?

The DuBois amendment was defeated.

Seventeen democrats voted in favor of it and thirty-one republicans voted against it.

Can it be possible that in the republican view there can be too much publicity to suit the interests of the trust magnates?

The Great Moneyed Interests.

The *New York Times* has published a letter from one of its readers declaring that "the immediate cause of the recent slump in the stock market is the premeditated and joint action of the great moneyed interests for the purpose of averting a very serious break in the prices of securities, which would be ruinous to all concerned market-wise." Mr. Alexander Del Mar, once connected with the treasury department and for many years an expert on matters of finance, wrote the following reply to the *Times'* letter:

Editor *Times*: The statement of your correspondent, R. E. A., that "the immediate cause of the recent slump in the stock market is the premeditated and joint action of the great moneyed interests" is too remarkable to pass without comment.

The entire capital of the country increases at the rate of about 3 per cent per annum compounded; a proof that in the long run and all things considered, capital cannot earn any more. This conclusion is corroborated by the common use of 3 per cent tables for compounding the capital earnings of life insurance companies.

Yet we find good 4 per cent and 5 per cent securities—one of the latter having paid such dividends without interruption for more than twenty years—depressed on the stock market below par.

If such depression is due to the "joint action" of any set of men, then the investing public is under the thumb of a conspiracy; and so far as fair play is concerned, the stock exchange may as well be closed.

ALEX. DEL MAR.

Occasionally the truth in regard to the manipulation of the market will crop out and then the ordinary people have a chance to see what is being done by the extraordinary people who make money by the influence which they can exert over other people's property.

Roosevelt vs. Roosevelt.

In his recent message to congress Mr. Roosevelt referred to "the triumph of our principles" in the Philippines. Assuming that Mr. Roosevelt meant American principles it will be inter-

esting to observe the view Mr. Roosevelt entertained, before he became president, of policies like those adopted in the Philippines by the republican party. Mr. Roosevelt is the author of a book entitled "The Winning of the West." In one chapter of that interesting volume he drew an interesting contrast between American expansion and European colonialism. Referring to the Louisiana purchase Author Roosevelt said:

"In one respect the ordinance marked a new departure of the most radical kind. The adoption of the policy therein outlined has worked a complete revolution in the way of looking at new communities formed by colonization from the parent country. Yet the very completeness of this revolution to a certain extent veils from us its importance. We cannot realize the greatness of the change because of the fact that the change was so great, for we cannot now put ourselves in the mental attitude which regarded the old course as natural. . . . Each Roman colony that settled in Gaul or Iberia founded a city or established a province which was tributary to Rome, instead of standing on a footing of equality in the same nation with Rome. . . . The modern European nations had followed the Roman system. Until the United States sprang into being, every great colonizing people followed one system or the other. The American republic, taking advantage of its fortunate federal features and of its strong central government, boldly struck out on a new path, which secured the freedom-giving properties of the Greek method, while preserving national union as carefully as it was preserved by the Roman empire. New states were created, which stood on exactly the same footing as the old; and yet these new states formed integral and inseparable parts of a great and rapidly growing nation. This movement was original with the American republic. She was dealing with new conditions, and on this point the history of England merely taught her what to avoid."

And yet, referring to our policy in the Philippines, Mr. Roosevelt says that it marks "the triumph of our principles."

As an author Mr. Roosevelt told us that in the Louisiana purchase the American republic "boldly struck out on a new path which secured the freedom-giving properties of the Greek method, while preserving national union as carefully as it was preserved by the Roman empire." He pointed out that while new states were created they stood on exactly the same footing as the old states and yet these new states formed, and, according to Author Roosevelt, very properly so, integral and inseparable parts of a great and rapidly growing nation; and while claiming that this movement was original with the American republic Author Roosevelt told his readers that on this point the history of England merely taught the American republic what to avoid.

Is it not strange, then, now that this author has become president of the United States, that he should point to the policy of imperialism and colonialism as being representative of the triumph of American principles?

A Pertinent Question.

A reader of *The Commoner* makes a pertinent inquiry in reference to the question of incomes. The mine owners insist that the coal miners are getting enough wages. The aforesaid reader calls attention to the fact that a large number of the working people receive less on an average than \$350 a year and are never retired, but must continue their work to the end of life, while federal supreme judges with an income of ten thousand a year are retired after a certain age, but continue to draw their pay for the remainder of their life. He asks why it is that ordinary people with small incomes are expected to lay up enough for old age, while this is not required of those with large incomes. The question is one capable of being answered in a number of ways—in ways enough for each one to have an answer of his own.