

fications as easy as conditions would permit, and doing justice to the black man and the white man both according to my best judgment.

As a citizen of the north, practically unacquainted with the conditions that the southern whites have to meet, I would refuse to express an opinion without first informing myself more fully. I might favor a qualification if I lived in one state and oppose it if I lived in another, being governed entirely by the conditions that had to be met.

The position which I take does not in the least controvert the principles set forth in the Declaration of Independence. A qualification for suffrage does not deny the natural and inalienable rights of the black man. The negro in the south, as I have frequently pointed out, has the same constitutional guaranties as the white man, and lives under the law that the white man makes for himself. If he cannot vote today, he can look forward to the time when he may vote. The subject, on the other hand, who lives under a colonial system is denied constitutional protection, cannot look forward to citizenship, and lives under a law passed by the dominant power, a power which itself escapes the burdens that it imposes upon the subject.

Where two races must live together under the same government, the superior race, as a matter of self-preservation, will impose conditions upon the inferior, just as the individual may defend himself even to the point of taking life in the protection of his own life, or he may put a dangerous enemy under bonds to keep the peace. It is not a denial of the equal rights of others to protect one's own right, but as it is always necessary for one to show that he acted for the protection of himself, so at the bar of public opinion those who fix suffrage qualifications upon others must show that it is done in self-defense and for self-preservation. Yours truly,

W. J. BRYAN.

The Philippine Question.

A reader of The Commoner asks whether the republican party has done anything in the Philippine matter that would prevent the carrying out of the democratic policy. It has done nothing and it can do nothing that would make it unwise to carry out the democratic platform on this subject.

The democratic party contends that title to people cannot be obtained by conquest or by purchase, and that no lapse of time can validate a title gained by force and held by force. If a man makes a note while under duress no continuation of the duress can make the note good. The democratic platform announces a permanent policy. It denies that this country can exist half republic and half empire, and it insists that the right of the Filipinos to independence should be recognized. If that right had been recognized in the Paris treaty it would have saved the expenditure of millions of money, and the loss of thousands of lives. If it is recognized now it will save future loss and bloodshed, although it cannot repair the loss already suffered or restore the lives already sacrificed.

A long continuance of the colonial policy simply means a continuation of sacrifice of life and money, but no amount of wrong-doing can commit this country permanently to a wrong policy or make it dishonorable to do right. From the beginning the democratic position has been that the nation should immediately declare its purpose, first, to establish a stable form of government in the Philippine islands in the place of the government overthrown; second, to recognize the independence of the Filipinos as soon as the stable government is established, and, third, to protect the Filipino government from outside interference as we have protected the republics of Central and South America. That policy was right when it was adopted; it is right now, and

it will be right when the opportunity comes to put it into practice, whether it is this year or next year, or farther in the future.

The democratic position on this question cannot be abandoned without an abandonment of our principles of government. It cannot be revised, because there is no other course that is democratic. To recognize the right of this country to administer a colonial system is to impeach the foundation principles of our government. To advocate the incorporation of the Filipinos as embryo citizens to participate in the election of members of congress and senators and presidents, is not to be thought of, for it would involve this country in a race question even more difficult to handle than the tremendous race problem with which the nation is now grappling.

No democrat need fear to defend the position of his party on the Philippine question. No republican with prominence enough to be considered a leader dares to outline the policy of the republican party and as long as the republicans have no position that they are willing to announce there is no reason why a democrat should be afraid of the discussion of the Philippine question.

Is It a Battle Without Quarter?

The retail price of anthracite coal in Chicago was recently raised to \$7.75 a ton.

In April, 1903, the price was \$7.25 and each month since then a 10-cent raise has been made.

In April, 1902, before the strike began, the price was \$6.75, or 50 cents lower than April, 1903.

In April, 1901, the price was \$6.50, or 75 cents lower than in 1903.

In an editorial printed in its issue of September 3, the Chicago Record-Herald says:

"These increases in price, both month by month through the summer and from year to year, are arbitrary acts on the part of the men who monopolize the anthracite coal fields and who own the coal-carrying railroads. There is no excuse for such increases because of the advance in wages of the miners, for, as we have already shown, that advance represents not over 10 or 15 cents a ton.

"The operators have power to add another 25 or 50 cents to the price whenever they wish. Indeed we have no means of being sure that they are not experimenting with prices this year in order to see how much higher they can put the figure next year."

The Record-Herald thinks that this condition of things is "a continuous challenge to the people of the country to an aggressive warfare through their legislatures and in the courts." Although the Record-Herald places a high estimate upon the power of the coal trust in Pennsylvania and also upon the influence of that trust with the interstate commerce commission, it thinks that the fight against that trust is not "entirely hopeless." On this point the Record-Herald says:

"Legal ingenuity has not as yet been exhausted in meeting their case, and as they operate a notorious monopoly and carry on a combination of business interests which is generally repugnant to the law, it is quite within the possibilities that a way may be found to obstruct and hamper them and so to bring them to terms. It is perhaps not necessary to say that if it should be found there will be no compunctions of conscience over the use of the power of the state against them. They are making this a battle without quarter."

It is not only necessary for the Record-Herald to say that if a way may be found to bring these coal barons to terms "there will be no compunctions of conscience over the use of the power of the state against them;" but it is necessary that the Record-Herald give some reason for its faith upon this particular point.

It is not necessary to rummage through musty lawbooks in order to discover a very effective way of dealing with these trust magnates. The authorities have but to turn to the Sherman anti-trust law with whose provisions they are already

quite familiar. The chief provision of that law and, indeed, the very first section thereof, provides fine and imprisonment for men who seek to do the things these coal barons have done and which they are now doing.

As a rule, the Record-Herald is a frankly spoken newspaper. The Commoner desires to direct its attention to the fact that no republican newspaper and no spokesman for the administration has yet undertaken to explain why the republican authorities have ignored the criminal clause of the anti-trust law. In the presence of a criminal statute, enforced by an honest and relentless prosecutor, the most powerful and the richest of men have quailed. If the coal barons have made this, as the Record-Herald says, "a battle without quarter," why should the people's representatives remain idle while the trust magnates continue their impositions upon the public? Why not bring every one of these influential law-breakers to justice under the criminal clause of the federal anti-trust law? Why should the authorities content themselves with restraining orders and injunction proceedings when they have ready at hand the criminal prosecution, the most simple and effective proceeding under the circumstances?

Can the Record-Herald explain, and will it explain, why the first section of the Sherman anti-trust law has been ignored by republican authorities who pretend to be willing and anxious to enforce the law against the coal barons?

Another Gold Bug Fallacy.

An Illinois reader of The Commoner says that the gold bugs are asserting that England is buying up silver at a low price with the expectation of making a profit if the United States restores silver. This is on a par with the arguments that are generally used to support the Wall street system of finance. There is no considerable amount of silver bullion held either by individuals or by governments, and England least of all would be benefited by the rise in silver. When silver is cheap she can purchase silver at a low price and send it to India for cotton and wheat (not the English government, but the English traders). With silver at \$1.29 per ounce, England would have to pay more for her wheat and her cotton, and our producers would reap the benefit. The argument made by the more conscienceless of the gold papers that the mine owners are the only people who would profit by bimetalism, and that those who advocate it are in the employ of the mine owners, is an insult to the intelligence of the readers of those papers. Bimetalism is a system of finance, and those who advocate it are interested in silver as money, not in silver as merchandise. We have already had four international conferences to deal with the money question, and have a commission abroad now. If it is only a matter of interest to the mine owners, why have all the nations in the world been considering it for twenty-five years? The editor who attempts to put aside the money question by abusing the producers of silver writes himself down as an ignoramus or a knave. He lacks either brain capacity or conscience.

"Money to Burn."

Some of the imperfections of the methods employed by the United States government are shown in the annual report of the auditor for the treasury department. In this report, it is made known that while there are 158 ports of entry where customs revenues are collected, there are also thirty-two different systems of compensating collectors and surveyors of the ports.

The United States government is presumed to do business on business principles and yet a glance at this auditor's report will convince the most skeptical that in the adjustment of the salaries for collectors and surveyors of the ports, the government falls very short of the mark. For