

private life to shift for a living for himself and family as best he can." It may shock the nerves of a few, but to the vast majority it is conclusive proof that the citizen is the sovereign and that the official is merely the temporary agent through which the sovereign speaks and acts—a lesson too often forgotten by those who have enjoyed distinction at the hands of their countrymen.

The World says: "It is not seemly that a Grant should lend his name to a firm of Wall Street gamblers, or that a Cleveland should be compelled to accept a Ryan sinecure, or that a Harrison should have to appear before the United States supreme court to argue that a street railway company's franchises are perpetual."

It is not necessary to discuss the incidents to which the World refers. It was not necessary for General Grant to "lend his name to a firm of Wall Street gamblers;" Mr. Cleveland was not "compelled to accept a Ryan sinecure," and Mr. Harrison was not obliged to argue that a street railway company's franchises are perpetual; neither is it necessary to discuss whether President Roosevelt is wise in allowing "so virtuous a periodical as the Outlook to capitalize a president's prestige and popularity, and use him to advertise its business four months in advance of his retirement from the White House." Men may differ as to what it is proper for a president to do after he leaves the White House, just as men differ as to what a president ought to do before he goes to the White House, but there is no reason why a president should be made a senator for life at a salary of \$25,000 a year just to keep the dignity of the office from being "shockingly lowered."

The World says that after a president's term has expired "his influence and experience should be retained by the people in the interest of the general welfare." If a president retires from office with the confidence of the people, his influence and experience will be retained by the people in the interest of the general welfare. He has the ear of the public and can speak upon any question that he deems important; he will always have a hearing. There are foreign commissions that give him an opportunity to serve his country in international courts and on international boards where his prestige and his influence can be of advantage to his nation. All these things are possible if he has so commended himself to his country as to compel recognition of his high purpose and his breadth of statesmanship.

If, on the contrary, a president is a disappointment; if his conduct is not satisfactory, a life position and a \$25,000 a year pension would not save him from censure or compel respect. Rather, his forced continuation in public life would be a constant reminder of his failure and he would rattle around in a permanent senatorship like an unworthy son in a great ancestral estate.

There is no reason why a president should not be sent to the senate if the people of the state want him to go, but if he is sent, it ought to be for the same reason that other men are sent and not because it is disgraceful for one to become a private citizen after he has been a president. If we adopt the theory that the executive chair is so far above the people that a man can not step down from it to the people, we will soon be considering the chair so high that one can not step up to it from the people. And what about the sons of presidents? Will it "shockingly lower" the dignity of the office to have them thrust into private life and compelled to make a living? And what about ex-governors and ex-mayors? Should the ex-governors be pensioned and made life members of the state senate, and should the mayors be pensioned and made life members of the city council, or is it only the dignity of the president that we have to guard?



#### INVESTIGATE PANAMA CANAL

Many people may be entertained for a time by the exchange of epithets between Mr. Roosevelt and the editor of the New York Sun. But to the great American republic there is a serious side to this affair. The Commoner does not refer to the humiliating spectacle of the chief magistrate of the United States hurling epithets from his high position in the American White House and engaging in bitter personal controversy, although that is, indeed, a serious matter to thoughtful citizens. But the more important fact is that for several months there have been whispers concerning Panama canal affairs. These accusations have taken on such definite form that they can not be dismissed with

a sneer; they can not be disposed of with the charge that they come from men actuated by malice. They must be met.

Congress should immediately provide for a thorough investigation of Panama canal affairs and particularly the canal purchase. The friends of Mr. Roosevelt owe it to the president to see to it that the committee making this investigation is composed of men who have no intimate relations with the administration.

The Commoner hopes that this investigation will be provided for and that it will be so thorough and complete that its verdict of acquittal will command such complete respect among the American people that the charges will never be revived.



#### A VICTORY, INDEED!

Writing in the Chicago Record-Herald Walter Wellman says:

"President-elect Taft has won his contest for honest and thorough revision of the tariff. Speaker Cannon and the standpatters have made full surrender."

This sounds something like the story of the ruler who, when approached by a number of his subjects, with "we demand our rights," replied with a wave of the hand, "I grant them to you."

Mr. Wellman adds: "Peace again prevails—peace on the Taft terms." Then it's "dollars to doughnuts" that they are "Uncle Joe's" terms, too.



#### "NOT SAFELY"

John D. Archbold, of the Standard Oil trust, on the witness stand at New York was asked why the trust agreement, respecting the various properties of the Standard Oil, was made. He replied:

"Our counsel had advised us that a single corporation could not successfully hold all these properties which had been acquired—that is, not safely—and it seemed a simple and effective form of overcoming the difficulty. The properties were located in many states, the laws of some of which were restrictive against corporations. More than this, it would give a market value to the holdings and permit of administrative oversight."

"Not safely" means that the plan was unlawful, a conspiracy in restraint of trade.



#### BUT THE CHIEF HELPED

The Omaha (Neb.) Bee (rep.) says: "Senator Foraker has a letter of recommendation from the officials of the Standard Oil. That should get him a job with any concern needing his kind of a corporation lawyer."

Well, a letter of recommendation written by John D. Rockefeller helped one distinguished republican to the presidency of the United States. A similar letter might influence the disposition of a mere senatorship.



#### "CLOSE TOGETHER"

The Ledger, published by Mr. Thomas E. Quinn, New York, takes exception to the publication by The Commoner of an editorial printed in the Tammany Times and attacking Mr. Bryan. The Ledger says that it was not fair to print Mr. Murphy's interview and the Tammany Times editorial "close together without explanation." The Ledger adds:

"Mr. Murphy and the present control of the great Tammany organization have had no more abusive opponent in print in the past two years than this same Tammany Times." Also: "Scarcely one issue of the Tammany Times has come out in the past two years without assailing Mr. Murphy more bitter than even its attacks upon Mr. Bryan either before his nomination or since the election."

The Ledger complains that the readers of The Commoner "could draw no other inference from Mr. Murphy's frank and friendly statement placed side by side with the fierce assault on Mr. Bryan by the Tammany-titled supposed mouth-piece—no other inference, we repeat, than that Tammany Hall and its leader were both disingenuous and disloyal."

It is not necessary for The Commoner to tell its readers that it had no intention of misleading them in the publication of these particular articles "close together." Inasmuch as it was not The Commoner's intention that Mr. Murphy be held responsible for the Tammany Times editorial any more than that the Tammany

Times' editor be held responsible for Mr. Murphy's interview it did not occur to the associate editor to make the explanation which the Ledger has given so completely.

The Commoner has printed many opinions with which The Commoner does not agree; but it intends to keep its readers accurately informed upon the subjects with which it deals. Inasmuch as the Ledger publisher thinks that the hostility existing between Mr. Murphy and the Tammany Times is an important matter of fact, The Commoner gives the Ledger's explanation on this point.



#### IT HAS COME!

We knew it was coming but it arrived somewhat earlier than we expected. The Philadelphia North American has discovered, now that the election is over, that there is to be no tariff revision in the interests of the general public. In an editorial entitled "The Tariff Farce" the North American says:

"The tariff hearings by the ways and means committee at Washington have progressed far enough to justify the North American's view that they are a dishonest pretension. Cannon, Payne, Dalzell, Fordney and the others of the inner circle of the reactionaries are deceiving no one in their effort to make a farce and a falsity of the pledge for scientific and equitable tariff revision upon which Taft stood and the national ticket was elected. Cannon proclaims himself a tariff revisionist. He does so in these words: 'If I live, I am going, so far as my vote is concerned, to see to it that the policy of the republican party on this question is written in the national laws as promptly as possible. The laws should be written promptly, so that business can adjust itself to changed conditions, for the change will of necessity bring disturbance.' Which means that an evasive and deceptive hodge-podge is to be rushed through to passage, without regard to the needs of the consuming public or the legitimate business interests if Cannon preserves his old-time power to 'see to it' in behalf of the trusts. It is to be called the Payne bill, we hear. And the god-fathership of Sereno C. Payne is sufficient surety that the product will be a freak and a changeling."

Is the Philadelphia North American really so simple as it pretends? It might have known that the fathership of the republican party, so far as a tariff revision measure is concerned, would be "sufficient surety" that the product will be a freak and a changeling.



#### "PATRIOTISM"

Mr. Elihu Root was asked by an Associated Press correspondent whether he had anything to say regarding the announcement of Timothy L. Woodruff that he would not be a candidate for the New York senatorship and that Mr. Root ought to be elected. Mr. Root told the correspondent that he had seen the Woodruff statement and was much pleased with it, declaring that it was "a patriotic utterance."

It will be difficult for some old-fashioned people to understand the relationship between patriotism and anything that tends to the election to the United States senate of the ablest trust lawyer in all the land—a gentleman whose candidacy has, unquestionably, the support of every one of the special interests.



#### EASY

Theodore E. Burton, member of congress from Ohio, announced his candidacy for senator to succeed Mr. Foraker. Charles P. Taft, brother of the president-elect, is also a candidate for the place. Hot Springs, Va., dispatches say that Mr. Burton has been told that he may have a cabinet position. With several cabinet offices in addition to all other federal positions in Ohio at his disposal, Charles P. Taft's pathway to the senate ought to be clear.



#### SAMUEL GOMPERS' GOOD FIGHT

The Louisville Post says Mr. Bryan is not satisfied with Mr. Gompers' effort to deliver the labor vote. With two exceptions the Post's statement may be considered correct. First, Mr. Bryan is well satisfied with the work performed by Mr. Gompers. Secondly, Mr. Gompers made no effort to "deliver the labor vote." He merely sought to show workingmen that it was to their interests to vote the democratic national ticket at the recent election.