

for existence, it is impossible that he should not feel their influence. That a man is known by the company he keeps is an old saying; it is no less true that his opinions are materially affected by the company he keeps.

An increase in the salaries of the judges will not only determine the social environment of the judges, but it will contract the circle from which judges may be selected. When the president looks about for a man for the United States court, he naturally looks for one who enjoys an income substantially equal to the salary which the appointee is to receive, and the larger the judicial salary, the greater the certainty that the judge will be selected from among those who have distinguished themselves as the representatives of corporations, for those, as a rule, are the lawyers who enjoy the largest incomes.

Then, too, the action of the federal government sets an example for the state governments, and as soon as the salaries of federal judges are increased, a movement is started to raise the salaries of state judges. Thus a larger and larger per cent of the practicing attorneys are excluded from consideration, and these, too, are the very attorneys whose practice brings them into close touch with the general public.

Democratic representatives should consider well the natural tendency of this movement toward an increase of salaries. There has been no such increase in the average income as it is proposed to make in the income of officials, and the official ought to take his chances with those who contribute through taxation to his support.

WHAT! ANOTHER SCARE?

Bradstreet says that in various lines "the prospects of tariff revision tend to develop a certain degree of hesitancy in making large future commitments, and that as a matter of fact some contracts being entered into contain clauses which provide for new prices in the event of existing tariff schedules being rearranged."

Can it be that the "contingent order" which figured so prominently in the late campaign is going to be used to prevent tariff reform? Is it not enough to elect a republican president by scaring the manufacturers and employes with contingent orders? Are they now to be used to scare the country out of any change in the tariff law? Are we to substitute government by unanimous consent for the rule of the people on the tariff question? And if so, when will we get the consent of the beneficiaries of the tariff?

A WORD OF WARNING

Senators, members of congress and legislators in the various states ought to be on their guard against an effort which is now being made by electric companies to secure perpetual water rights along the mountain streams in the west and south. Jefferson said that eternal vigilance was the price of liberty, and liberty is not the only thing that depends upon the vigilance of the people and their representatives. There is a constant effort on the part of the great corporations to over-reach the public and to so monopolize the natural resources of the country as to make the many the servants of the few. The improvements in the methods of transmitting electric energy open up a field for a new utilization of the mountain streams. Congress is being urged to grant water rights. Senator Crane, of Massachusetts, and Mr. Mondell, of Wyoming, has introduced bills which look to the granting of large advantages to those who will seek to acquire water rights under the laws. There ought to be no such thing as a perpetual franchise. No one can look ahead far enough to judge the conditions that the people will have to meet twenty-five, fifty or one hundred years hence. A perpetual franchise is one-sided. If those who secure it miss their guess and obtain something that is worthless, they can give it up, but if the legislators miss their guess and exact too small a compensation, the people must suffer. EVERY GRANT OF A FRANCHISE OUGHT TO BE LIMITED TO A CERTAIN NUMBER OF YEARS; twenty-five is enough, but under no circumstances should the period be longer than fifty years. Compensation ought to be demanded, and the right ought to be reserved to increase the compensation from time to time, at stated periods, if it is found that justice requires it.

Whether the franchises are granted by congress or by state legislatures, care must be taken. It must be remembered that no official is perfect and that no one can, therefore, be

entrusted with authority to surrender in perpetuity rights and privileges which may become enormously valuable in time, even if they may appear of little value now.

In the conservation of our nation's resources the purpose should not be merely to conserve them, but to conserve them for the whole people. Europe is cursed with a system under which a few are landlords and the rest tenants; let not our country put its neck under a yoke equally galling—a system under which the people will have to pay perpetual tribute to monopolies.

PAYING CAMPAIGN BETS

Mr. Bryan has received a number of photographs showing democrats in the act of paying campaign bets. Most of them have represented some losing democrat as pushing a winning republican around the town square in a wheelbarrow. Mr. Bryan regrets that through his defeat the democrat has been holding the handles instead of enjoying the ride.

While betting, even on an election, can not be encouraged, the wheelbarrow ride is one of the least harmful forms of the wager. The man who loses does not suffer a great deal, at least he does not suffer the pain of seeing a republican spend democratic money, and in the payment of his wager he adds to the gayety of his community. If men can not entirely restrain the temptation to bet, the wheelbarrow ride can be recommended as the best vent for enthusiasm. May it be the democrat's turn to ride next time.

"LOOTERS"

The Portland (Ore.) Printing House has published a very interesting book entitled "Looters of the Public Domain." In this book the story of that extraordinary conspiracy against the government, planned and executed in Oregon, is told by one of the leaders of the conspiracy, S. A. D. Puter, aided by Horace Stevens, late of the government land service. It embraces a complete exposure of the fraudulent system of acquiring titles to the public lands of the United States. Those who are interested in informing themselves in regard to this celebrated case which resulted in the disgrace of senators, congressmen and public officials as well as of private individuals, will find the book very instructive.

AN OLD DOCTRINE

The doctrine of government by consent of the governed is not a new one, even if it is now disputed by imperialists. In 1800 Grattan, the Irish patriot, said: "I will trust the people with the custody of their own liberty, but I will trust no people with the custody of any liberty other than their own, whether that people be Rome, Athens or Britain."

Grattan was right, no people can be trusted with the liberty of another people. Liberty does not mean the right to live according to conditions prescribed by some alien power, but the right of men to a voice in their own government.

THE POWDER TRUST

The following comes as a press dispatch from the city of Cleveland:

"Cleveland, December 10.—A world-wide agreement of all the powder companies in this country and Europe was presented at the federal hearing before Special Master Mahaffey here today. It provided for a \$50,000 fine for any breach of the agreement. This document, after presentation, was identified by Almo Lent of the Austin Powder company of this city. The agreement was signed in 1897, and provided that it should continue in force for ten years and afterwards indefinitely. The document sets forth that the Dupont company, the Austin Powder company, and nearly one hundred other concerns in this country had signed it, and also all the powder concerns in Europe. The one hundred in this country include every powder company in the United States. The agreement states that at the time it was drawn up there was immense competition that was detrimental to the powder trade, both in Europe and here. It was believed, it said, that by reaching some agreement in regard to prices trade could be regulated so that each concern could live and make profits. A detonation factory was being built in New Jersey at that time, to which the European concerns objected. The companies in this

country agreed, according to the document, to stop the erection of this factory. It was also agreed that the United States companies should buy five million pounds of detonators from Europe. Regulations were made as to black powder, sportsmen's powder and smokeless military powder."

Here is an agreement covering both the United States and Europe for the control of the powder trade. Governments and private individuals were to be the victims—the price of the product to be arbitrarily fixed by those in control. Gradually the principle which underlies the private monopoly is being understood. After a while even the republican leaders may become as well informed on the subject as the members of the house of commons were in Elizabeth's time. They, three centuries ago, condemned monopolies and demanded their abolishment. No one would think of letting a judge try a case in which he was peculiarly interested as a party, and when the principle of monopoly is clearly understood, it will be just as absurd to allow any man or group of men to eliminate competition and then decide arbitrarily the price which the monopoly will collect from those who, by necessity, must use the product of monopoly.

"GREASE" AND OTHER THINGS

Generously, to the public, is vouchsafed the benefit of an official Standard Oil statement appearing as an advertisement. We reproduce the essential parts:

"STANDARD OIL COMPANY—

"A Protest and a Warning

"26 Broadway, Dec. 19, 1908.

"To the Press and Public:

"Moved by many recent publications of false, misleading, and injurious statements regarding its acts, motives and associations in business and otherwise, the Standard Oil company * * * hereby enters a protest and a warning against all such unauthorized and unfounded publications.

"The Standard Oil company is interested in its many industries growing out of the producing, manufacturing, and marketing of oil and its products, and in no others.

"Against these and similar inventions, we take, then, this means of bringing the matter before the public, for the public's as well as for the company's protection, and respectfully insist, as we have done before, that no credit whatever be given to any statement regarding the Standard Oil company's views, acts or intentions unless the same be duly vouched for by an executive official of the company or by its designated attorneys.

"CHAS. T. WHITE, Assist. Sec'y."

Condensed, this means: "Don't believe anything about us except what we ourselves tell." This is a fairly large order; yet the public might honor it if it were coupled with good faith, frankness, and willingness to answer questions. But the gist is really this: "Believe only what we say—and we won't say anything." In the recent examination by Government Attorney Kellogg, the most frequent single answer of Mr. Rockefeller, under oath, was: "I don't recall." Mr. Archbold merely varied the verb; he said: "I don't know." Consider, in the light of this "protest and warning against all unauthorized and unfounded publications," those platform readings of Mr. Hearst. They certainly were "unauthorized." On the other hand, Chancellor Day's frequent lucubrations doubtless may be "authorized." "The Standard Oil company is interested in its many industries growing out of the producing, manufacturing, and marketing of oil and its products, and in no others." This is "frank and straightforward." Railroads are for the carrying of oil; banks are to hold the money made from oil. The "Oil City Derrick" is an obvious incident of the lubricating oil business; and "Leslie's Weekly" comes under the head of grease.—Collier's Weekly.

LOOKING BACKWARD

Asserting that "Senator Tillman's defense of himself was temperate, convincing and obviously truthful," the New York World can not avoid the temptation to give the reminder that in an article on "The College Graduate and Public Life," printed in the Atlantic Monthly of August, 1894, Mr. Roosevelt said:

"The worst offense that can be committed against the republic is the offense of the public man who betrays his trust; but second only to it comes the offense of the man who tries to persuade others that an honest and efficient public man is dishonest or unworthy."