

more and more the completeness with which Christ fills the requirements of the heart and, grateful for the peace which he enjoys and for the strength which he has received, he repeats the words of the great scholar, Sir William Jones:

"Before thy mystic altar, heavenly truth,
I kneel in manhood, as I knelt in youth,
Thus let me kneel, till this dull form decay,
And life's last shade be brightened by thy ray,
Then shall my soul, now lost in clouds below,
Soar without bound, without consuming glow."

WHAT ARE THE FACTS?

The Topeka Herald, fearful that Senator LaFollette will be credited with securing legislation in the interests of the people, denies that Senator LaFollette is the author of the bill limiting the hours of labor that an employe of a railroad may put in. The Herald says the bill which passed recently was drawn by a representative of the labor unions and introduced by Senator Dolliver. Surely the author of such a beneficent bill, and the senator who introduced it, should have full credit. What are the facts? Is it not true that the only protests against the sixteen hour maximum have come from railroad employes? Is it not true that Senator LaFollette introduced the bill upon his own initiative and with a view to lessening the risk of accidents by preventing the overworking of railroad employes? Is it not true that the most violent opposition to the bill came from the republican side? Is it not true that the senate emasculated the bill with amendments calculated to protect the railroad interests? And is it not true that when the matter came up for final action Senator LaFollette secured the elimination of all the amendments and had the bill as it now stands inserted after the original enacting clause? The Topeka Herald should quote from the records to sustain its contention, otherwise Senator LaFollette will be given credit for securing this beneficent bit of legislation.

NOW FOR THE SHIP SUBSIDY

Mr. Roosevelt, in a special message to congress, advocates a ship subsidy to the extent of "encouraging the building and running of lines of large and swift vessels to South America and the Orient." The president's message will be found in another column of this issue. He points out that the bill pending before congress provides for fourteen steamships, subsidized to the extent of over 1,500,000 dollars, from the Atlantic coast, all to run to South American ports; also for twenty-two steamers on the Pacific coast, subsidized to the extent of 2,225,000 dollars; some of these to run to South America, most of them to Manila, Australia and Asia.

Here is a subsidy amounting to \$3,725,000 per year. The South American and oriental subsidy is but an entering wedge, and with that subsidy granted it will be but a short step to the larger and more general subsidy, for which the ship subsidy promoters have so long contended. From every state in the union protests against this subsidy should be sent to members of congress. We have an object lesson in the exorbitant tariff rates provided by the Dingley law. It is well established that Mr. Dingley himself said that the rates provided for in his bill were purposely placed high in order that they might be used as a basis for obtaining reciprocity treaties with other countries. So far as concerns the well meaning men who had to do with the Dingley tariff law, there was no intention to permanently maintain the high tariff rates concerning which republican leaders now say we must "stand pat." But once having enjoyed these exorbitant rates, the subsidy grabbers refuse to surrender them. Habitually these men have taken advantage of one favor to secure another and, given the subsidy which Mr. Roosevelt in his message formally endorses, they will not rest until they have made that subsidy general for sea-going vessels controlled by powerful men.

It is strange that Mr. Roosevelt, with all his progress along democratic lines, should retrace his steps and advocate a plan, which, if adopted, would make it all the more difficult for the people in their struggle with organized wealth. It is not so difficult to understand why the subsidy grabbers move for these privileges at this time. Schemes like these are usually pushed forward at the short session, and the very fact that at this moment there is a strong popular protest against special privileges, encourages the promoters to hope that the very brazenness of their demand will give it character; they hope that the people will conclude that this subsidy must be a righteous one, else its promoters would not dare to urge it at this time.

Is it possible that republican newspapers that have in the past vigorously condemned this proposed subsidy will now rush to its defense? The most bitter condemnation of this scheme has been given by republican editors. For instance in December, 1900, the Indianapolis Journal said: "Congressmen must have mistaken the atmosphere of

Washington for that of the country at large or the clamor of a few ship-builders and owners and their lobbyists for the voice of the people. Let republican members go back to the platform of 1896, which demanded the upbuilding of our merchant marine and carrying trade by other methods than a ship subsidy."

In December, 1900, the Dubuque, Iowa, Times said: "No inconsiderable part of President McKinley's support in the recent election came from those to whom the subsidy idea is extremely distasteful."

About the same time the Portland Oregonian protested against the subsidy, and said: "The fact that building and sailing American ships in competition with the fleets of the world has enabled a few Americans to pile up colossal fortunes shows that we can operate the ships as cheaply as the foreigners can operate their craft."

In its issue of December 15, 1900, the New York Press said that senators and representatives had been carried to Europe and back every summer for the past ten years in anticipation of a roll call on the ship subsidy scheme. The Press added: "It may be true of our government, as Hamilton said of the English, that it can not be worked without bribery, but there is no reason why the measures and men which require bribery should be mixed up with those which do not."

The Chicago Record-Herald, while declaring that the west was "not affrightened by the word 'subsidy,'" said "it balks over a proposition to take money from the national treasury to render the conditions of a self-supporting merchant marine more unprofitable than ever." The Record-Herald denounced the ship subsidy as a "preposterous proposition."

In December, 1900, the Chicago Tribune, discussing James J. Hill's prophecies of what the merchant marine of the United States is approaching in development, said: "It was not understood when the spellbinders were urging the people of the northwest to vote in favor of the re-election of President McKinley that one of the first items on the senatorial program when congress met would be the passage of a 'shipping subsidy' bill which contemplates annually expenditure for thirty years for the special benefit of a number of rich men residing in eastern cities. There is nothing whatever in this adroit resolution (the shipping plank of the republican national platform of 1900) about 'subsidies.' The word 'subsidies' was carefully omitted from the platform. Nor was anything said during the campaign in regard to the extension of our merchant marine by a scheme of public expenditure continuing for a generation. Nobody can recall an instance of a public meeting at which the shipping subsidy bill was made the subject of fair, candid argument or any argument at all; nor were the claims to public aid of the persons interested in such legislation ever explicitly set forth. * * * The republican party should not be in favor of one set of measures prior to November 6 and in favor of an entirely different kind of measures subsequent to November 6."

FOR A GUEST BOOK

A book of guests! May it include
The wise, the witty, and the shrewd,
And such as own the double art
That makes them friends of head and heart.
May those who stand recorded here
Grow dearer with each added year;
Acquaintance into friendship grow,
And friendship ever brighter glow.
Old friends are best, we lightly say,
But, as they fall upon the way—
Keep full the ranks with newer friends,
Till time the adjective amends,
And if old friends still seem the best,
The adage should be thus expressed:
Friends are not best because they're old,
But old because the years that rolled—
The years that try and mar and mend—
Have proved them worth the title friend.

—S. Weir Mitchell in the Century.

RAILWAYS NOT PRIVATE HIGHWAYS

Judge William J. Gaynor of New York delivered an address recently at New Rochelle. The following report of Judge Gaynor's address is taken from the New York Herald:

As a remedy for violations of the interstate commerce law Judge Gaynor suggested that the government appoint the general freight agents of all railroads, for such agents could see that no man got his freight carried more cheaply than his competitor. This might require an amendment to the constitution. He said the constitution was framed before we had railroads and the people should no longer fear to revise it. Judge Gaynor then spoke of how railroads came to be public highways, saying in part:

"With the invention of the locomotive steam engine came the matter of building roads for the

use of such engines. This was about 1825. From the beginning of the world the public highways had been built by government, if we except a few canals and turnpike roads. In this state government built the Erie canal and smaller ones.

"It could have built our iron highways." That is what government did in most countries, including the colonies of the British empire. Toll roads were built as public highways, open to all on the same terms. That was the law. On the same plan were the iron roads built, open to all on the same terms.

"Government may take land against the will of the owner by its eminent domain power for public highways or any other public or government use. But land can not be taken for any private use. Fasten that in your mind.

"In order that these iron roads could be built at all they had to be built as public highways, for the government had not the power to acquire the land for them except to build them as public highways, and the government had to confer on the corporations the right to use its power of eminent domain to take the land. You therefore perceive that our iron roads are not private roads but public highways. The corporations or the individuals who run them can not do with them as they will. They are mere trustees or agencies of the government or of the people of the state or nation to run them as public highways for the benefit of all on the same rates and tolls to all. Every free pass issued, every favor in freight rates granted, is in defiance of the law.

"Some persons are under the delusion that recent statutes made these things unlawful. Not at all. They were unlawful from the beginning. The fact that the iron roads were public highways, like the dirt roads, became so far forgotten by some that they thought it was meddling of us to interfere with the management of them. No new laws were needed to make free passes and freight rate favoritism illegal."

Turning to the usurpation of the railroad highways the judge said:

"Just think for a minute of these public highways, open to all on absolutely equal terms by the very law of their being, being used to enable a few men to destroy their business rivals, drive them out of business and beggar them and their families by means of favoritism in freight rates. It is the basest, I do not hesitate to say, the most dastardly crime of our day and generation.

"Transportation rates enter controllingly into the price of commodities to the consumer. If I give an illustration it is not to hold any one man up to reproach above others. About 1870 in the oil region of Pennsylvania I saw a wilderness of derricks and engines pumping oil. Hundreds of persons owned these wells. In about five years all had passed into the ownership of one man or set of men. All those others had failed. And why and how? Were those few men able to dig wells or pump oil or refine it better than the hundreds? Not at all. They went to the few powerful individuals who controlled the railroads—the public highways and conspired with them to carry their oil to market for, say, \$1 a barrel, while every one else was charged \$2 or more a barrel.

"More than that, they got these railroad autocrats and defiers of law to secretly pay to them a part or all of such extra rates charged to all accepting them, and then there was a division among them all. Of course, this favoritism in freight rates enable them to undersell and destroy all their rivals.

"Poor unfortunates, destroyed by the unlawful use of the public highways open by law to all on the same terms, destroyed by the neglect of their government to enforce the laws of these highways! Nothing was left to them but to quit. And this same thing has since been done in respect of all of our principal products.

"Some have come to the conclusion that the government should take the railroads and run them to end the abuses. It is very certain that if the abuse can be ended in no other way the people will compel the government to take the roads. This country and government of ours are great enough to do anything. There is nothing radical or startling about the government owning and running railroads, when one-half or more of the railroads of the world are owned and operated by government.

"For my part I would rather not see government do it. Private enterprise is too valuable to be eliminated from railroad building and management if it can be avoided. My own view is that it is only necessary for government to appoint the general freight agent of every railroad, for he could stop all rate favoritism at once. It would not be his office to draw up schedules of rates, but only to see that every one paid the schedule rate, no more and no less. His summary dismissal of any local agent who gave a false rate and criminal prosecution by government would soon destroy the evil."