

immigrant who advocates assassination as a means of reforming our government.

We welcome Oklahoma to the sisterhood of states and heartily congratulate her upon the auspicious beginning of a great career.

We favor separate statehood for Arizona and New Mexico and demand for the people of Porto Rico the full enjoyment of the rights and privileges of a territorial form of government.

We sympathize with the efforts put forth for the reclamation of the arid lands of the west and urge the largest possible use of irrigation in the development of the country. We also favor the reclamation of swamp lands upon the same principle.

We favor the preservation of the forests still remaining, and the replanting of the denuded districts in all our mountain ranges, as well as the forestation of the western plains.

We believe that the Panama canal will prove of great value to our country and favor its speedy completion.

We urge liberal appropriations for the improvement and development of the interior waterways, believing that such expenditures will return a large dividend in lessened cost of transportation.

We favor a generous pension policy, both as a matter of justice to the surviving veterans and their dependents and because it relieves the country of the necessity of maintaining a large standing army.

We condemn the experiment in imperialism as an inexcusable blunder which has involved us in an enormous expense, brought us weakness instead of strength, and laid our nation open to the charge of abandoning the fundamental doctrine of self-government. We favor an immediate declaration of the nation's purpose to recognize the independence of the Philippine Islands as soon as a stable government can be established, such independence to be guaranteed by us as we guarantee the independence of Cuba, until the neutralization of the islands can be secured by treaty with other powers. In recognizing the independence of the Philippines our government should retain such land as may be necessary for coaling stations and naval bases.

Desiring the prevention of war, wherever possible, we believe that our nation should announce its determination not to use our navy for the collection of private debts, and its willingness to enter into agreements with other nations, providing for the investigation, by an impartial international tribunal, before any declaration of war or commencement of hostilities, of every dispute which defies diplomatic settlement.



KENTUCKY'S SHAME

Kentucky is the last state to show the necessity for the election of senators by direct vote of the people, and we have scarcely had a more striking example of the embezzlement of power than Kentucky has presented. Four members of the legislature who were elected as democrats, and by their election pledged to vote for a democratic candidate, have voted for the republican candidate. They did it, too, under circumstances which take away every possible excuse that they had or can offer.

At first they excused themselves for not voting for Governor Beckham on the ground of opposition to him personally. This excuse was not a valid one because he was nominated at a primary, and they were elected after his nomination and when their constituents had a right to expect them to vote for him. But even this subterfuge was taken away when Governor Beckham appeared upon the floor and withdrew his name, and left the democrats to select a democratic candidate by caucus. The four democrats, however, refused to change their votes even when the reasons for objection had been removed. They simply preferred to elect a republican rather than elect any democrat, for they could not assume in advance that no acceptable democrat could be found.

It is not necessary to inquire what things led them out of the democratic party and into the republican ranks. It is enough to know that they are embezzlers of power, and that as such they have sinned as grievously as one can sin by the embezzlement of money. As individuals they had a right to change their opinion, but as the representatives of constituents, they had no right to convert the suffrages of the people to their own private use. A public office is a public trust and representatives of the people have no more right to make a private use of the authority conferred upon them than

a person has to convert to his own use money left him in trust.

For those who are responsible for Governor Bradley's election no satisfactory explanation can be given, and if Governor Bradley was as devoted as he ought to be to the principles of representative government, he would not accept an office secured by the betrayal of a trust.

What would we think of a candidate for the presidency who would accept the position if it was secured by a betrayal of duty on the part of electors? Electors are voted for because they are pledged to the candidate who heads their ticket and no language could describe too harshly the sin of an elector who would desert his party after an election and vote with the opposition, and the public would have contempt for a presidential candidate who would accept the position under such circumstances.

Wherein do the members of the legislature differ from electors? They were instructed at a primary and were elected with the supposition that they would carry out the will of the party expressed at the primary. Even if they could have claimed that their democratic constituents preferred another democratic candidate, they could not assume that the democrats who elected them would have preferred a republican senator.

The Kentucky incident ought to strengthen the sentiment in favor of the election of senators by popular vote. Let the democrats in congress push this measure and put the republicans upon record if they refuse to adopt so necessary and popular a reform.



ANARCHY

The dastardly killing of a Catholic priest at the altar in Denver by one who claims to be an anarchist has revived the fear naturally excited by anarchy and led to a renewed discussion of it. Anarchy has no excuse for existence in the United States. Whatever defense may be made of assassination under arbitrary government where the people are denied participation in government and the right to express themselves in regard to government, no apology can be offered for it in a country like ours where speech is free and where everyone has an opportunity to raise his voice against an injustice done either to himself or to others. A clear line can be drawn between the advocacy of reforms, however sweeping, and the advocacy of murder. The taking of a human life is anywhere and at all times a supreme tragedy and as civilization advances, more and more respect is paid to life. Only in the case of the gravest crimes does the state assume the right to put an end to a human life, and there are many who insist that this extreme penalty should never be enacted.

The anarchist takes into his own hands the execution of a murderous intent not against an individual, but against one who stands in a representative capacity and is clothed with the authority of law. As the official is elected by the people, he is responsible to the people, and as the laws fix the punishment in case he betrays his trust, no one can justify the execution of vengeance by individual decree.

In dealing with anarchy two remedies are to be considered. First the direct remedy and second the indirect remedy. The direct remedy deals with the punishment of the offender and with the prevention of the crime. The man who kills another deliberately and with malice aforethought is guilty of murder, although he may have argued himself into the belief that he is serving a public purpose, and those who advocate the killing of officials, share in the guilt, however sure they may feel that they are public beneficiaries. Assassination must be condemned and those guilty of the assassination, or of advising it, must be punished, whether the blow is aimed at an individual, a spiritual leader, or a public official.

In our effort, however, to apply the immediate remedy, we must not overlook the fact that conditions may contribute to the false ideas which lead up to assassination. While we enforce the law and protect those who administer the law, we must not forget that the surest basis of law is the affection of the people, and laws to be loved must be just. Government is a great instrumentality for good, but it may be made an instrumentality for injustice. Equality before the law, both in the enforcement of the law and in the making of the law, is necessary if we are going to make the people love their government. Punishment of the petty offender is wise and necessary, but the escape of the large offender breeds discontent

and incites revenge. Those are doing most to prevent anarchy who seek to make the government so just that all, being beneficiaries of the government's blessings, will seek to preserve the government for their children and their children's children; those are doing most to cultivate anarchy who either cause or defend partiality and injustice in government.

No language can be too severe for the condemnation of those who would raise their hands against an official merely because he is clothed with a power given him by the people, and yet in our indignation at the acute forms of anarchy, we must not be indifferent to the sowing of the seed from which anarchy grows. All injustice involves a denial of the claims of brotherhood, and insofar as we can compel a recognition of the claims of each individual for justice and fair treatment, we shall remove the dangers that follow in the wake of anarchy.



MISSOURI'S OPPORTUNITY

The Missouri legislature has submitted the initiative and referendum proposition to the people, and it will be voted upon this fall. It is a democratic proposition and ought to be supported by the democratic party unanimously and by the republican party as well. A large majority of the rank and file of the republicans believe in the democratic doctrine that the government should be responsive to the will of the people. The initiative and referendum do not destroy representative government—they simply perfect representative government. They do not take away from the legislators the power to legislate, but they compel legislators to respect the will of the voters in matters of legislation. Where legislators do their duty, the initiative and referendum will not be invoked; where legislators betray their trust or neglect to do their duty, the initiative and referendum are useful. The honest legislator will not object to the initiative and referendum and any objection made by dishonest legislators ought not to be heeded.

Representative government will be better when it is purified by direct legislation. The initiative and referendum protect the representative from temptation and protect the public from betrayal. It has already been adopted in a number of states and will be adopted in all of the states when the people thoroughly understand the subject. Oklahoma has set an example which Missouri can well afford to follow. If the governor has a right to veto a measure passed by both branches of the legislature, why should not the voters have a right to veto? The legislators and the governor are the servants of the voters; the voters are the masses and ought to be allowed to sit in judgment on the work of their public servants. By all means let Missouri have the advantages of the initiative and the referendum.



THE FULL DINNER PAIL AGAIN

A special dispatch to the Chicago Record-Herald (rep.) under date of Newcastle, Pa., March 4, follows:

"Adams Hainer, poor director, was confronted by forty foreigners today, who marched to the city hall and demanded that they be sent to the poor farm to work for their meals and lodging. They had just been turned out of their boarding-houses. Most of them formerly worked at the mills as laborers. Only fifteen of the applicants were sent to the poor farm, as no more could be taken care of."

"Four years more of the full dinner pail!"



WHAT ABOUT IT?

Mr. Harriman is now able to control the Illinois Central by a decision of a court which allows him to vote the stock of the road. Is it not about time that the railroads were prevented from buying stock in other roads? What are the republican leaders going to do about the matter? Are they going to sit idly by and let a few men gobble up the railroad systems of the country, extinguish competition and collect tribute at will?



CONFISCATION

The Wall Street Journal complains because a recently enacted law "confiscates \$34,000 of the stockholders' money each year." But that isn't a marker to the amount of the freight payers' money confiscated each year by the holders of watered stocks.