

"Roosevelt's statements are based on misleading evidence." It terms his views 'muddled and boyish.' 'The speech was well meant, but it was wholly unnecessary and is calculated to complicate further the difficult problem in Egypt,' says the Westminster Gazette. Even the Evening Standard, a conservative paper, after referring in friendly tone to Roosevelt, declares that his 'laying hands on England's private political subjects seems at first glance a social crime, little short of sacrilege.' That Roosevelt violated the proprieties of the occasion nearly everyone concedes, even his friends not defending him on this charge. To receive at one moment the greatest honor that the city could confer and in the next to arraign the English people for the maladministration of Egyptian affairs was so unusual that papers have not yet fully recovered their full composure. The Pall Mall Gazette refers to this feature by saying that 'Roosevelt prefers realities to the proprieties.' Not since the death of King Edward have the London papers played up a story both editorially and in a news way as they have Roosevelt's speech. Naturally the conservative press is more friendly than the liberal and radical, inasmuch as Roosevelt's views are a paraphrase of their own. The Express, Telegraph, Mail, Post, Standard and Times are almost forced to approve of the speech. But even the conservative press, while agreeing with his views, doubt the propriety of his utterances. 'Roosevelt must not be surprised,' says the Times, 'should unpleasant manifestations occur, due to the sensitiveness of his criticism, regarding which it is probable the colonel had not reckoned.' The News concludes contemptuously by decrying the validity of Roosevelt's claim to first-hand information after such a hurried tour of Egypt. Roosevelt's plea against sentimentality furnished the Leader with a good laugh and it refers to the colonel as 'the greatest modern sentimentalist.' The Chronicle considers Roosevelt's outspokenness a compliment to Anglo-American solidarity, and advises England to take no offense, 'even though the speech did outrage every conventional canon of official international propriety.' The real view of Roosevelt, however, is found in the streets, where the people are freed from the restrictions that bind the government officials and influence the press utterances. Here the comment is generally and emphatically that Roosevelt not only went beyond the bounds of propriety, but that he touched on a subject that was none of his business. If the street opinions are a criterion, Roosevelt is less a popular idol today than he was twenty-four hours ago. Whether England liked the speech apparently made no difference to Roosevelt today, for he was rustling about in his usual jovial mood. He was the guest of honor at a luncheon by the Irish nationalist members of parliament. The luncheon was given at the Carlton house and presided over by John Redmond, the nationalist leader."

THE ASSOCIATED Press does not appear to be in love with the insurgent cause. It is not always easy for the Associated Press to conceal its feelings, particularly in a political crisis. The following is an interesting Washington dispatch carried by the great news dispenser: "The vote in the senate on the amendment of Senator Martin of Virginia as an amendment or substitute for the Cummins amendment affords a fair illustration of what has often been observed in the course of the debate on the railroad bill, namely, that the insurgent republicans are battling for their political lives, and are vastly more interested in making political capital out of the matter than in accomplishing the reforms they advocate. They wish to amend the railroad bill proposed by the regular republicans, but they only wish to do it when the amendments are offered by themselves, and then, although their only hope of carrying these amendments lies in securing democratic votes, they are zealous in claiming the credit for themselves and as anxious to see that no credit flows to the democratic party, as they are to defeat the regulars with the aid of the democratic vote. The proposed amendment is of value simply to the extent of the political capital that it gives to the insurgents. This particular Cummins amendment in substance provided that there should be no increase in rates until such increase had been approved of by the railroad commission. The Martin substitute likewise provided that there should be no increase in rates until such proposed increase should be approved of by the railroad commission and required the commission to pass upon the proposed increase within six months from the time it was filed by the railroad, but if not passed upon within that time that the increase should

not go into effect, but that the regular rate should remain in force. The object of the provision simply was to insure speedy action by the commission, it being equally of interest to the railroads and to the shippers to have any proposed change in rate passed upon within a reasonable time. But under the provision, if the commission was unable to pass upon it within six months, the increase would not become operative. The amendment was so obviously fair and proper that it was thought it would be accepted by the insurgents, and at one time they indicated that they would accept it, yet when offered it failed to receive an insurgent vote, and yet the insurgents were surprised that the democrats did not rally in a solid phalanx to the support of the Cummins amendment, which came up immediately thereafter. The Martin amendment practically commands as little support among the insurgents as among the regular republicans. The insurgent idea of co-operation with the democrats seems to be that the democrats shall be the tail to the insurgent kite."

WESTERN SHIPPERS made a strong plea to Attorney General Wickersham, urging him to enjoin the railroads from putting into effect a general increase in the freight rates on June 1, notice of which was given by the railroads several weeks ago. Senator LaFollette introduced a resolution calling upon the attorney general to issue injunctions against these railroads. Senator Elkins objected to an immediate consideration of the resolution. Senator LaFollette said he had introduced his rate resolution because the increases to be made by the railroads ranging, according to his estimation, from five to sixty per cent, would impose intolerable burdens on the people. He declared that the excuse given that the increases were made because of an advanced wage scale amounted to mere pretense, and the higher rates would result in annual profits to the railroads of from \$40,000,000 to \$800,000,000. Senator LaFollette's resolution, although not adopted, had the effect of causing the attorney general to act. Federal Judge Dyer of Hannibal, Mo., issued injunctions against twenty-five western railroads restraining them from making the advance in railroad rates.

THE RAILROAD bill passed the United States senate June 3 by a vote of fifty to twelve. No republicans voted against the bill and six democrats voted for it. They were: Messrs. Chamberlain, Clay, Gore, Paynter, Simmons and Stone. The democrats recorded against it were: Messrs. Bacon, Fletcher, Frazier, Hughes, Money, Newlands, Percy, Purcell, Rayner, Shively, Smith of Maryland, and Smith of South Carolina. An Associated Press dispatch says: "Senators Heyburn and Gallinger today took Senator LaFollette to task for his action in offering amendments to bills and afterward in public lectures parading the records of senators who opposed his measures. LaFollette, in a heated reply, said he intended to pursue the same course in the future. A spirited colloquy followed."

ELECTION OF SENATORS BY THE PEOPLE

(Continued from Page 5)

do not rule in fact, because the party machinery is so largely in the hands of machine men, is so largely controlled in the interest of the few and against the interest of the many; because the present mechanism of party management is so contrived as to largely exclude automatically the co-operation of the great body of the members of the party, and is so contrived as to cause the party power to fall by gravity into the hands of professional manipulators.

The remedy for these evils is to restore the government of the people and to overthrow the present mechanism of party government.

In order to accomplish this there must be:

First—An honest and effective registration law.

Second—An honest and effective ballot law.

Third—A direct primary law, properly safeguarded, by which candidates for public office and for party office may be directly and safely nominated.

Fourth—Constitutional and statutory laws providing the initiative and referendum, by which the people may directly legislate, if the legislature fail, and may directly exercise the veto power over an act of their representatives in the legislature if a law is passed they do not want.

Fifth—A thoroughgoing corrupt practices act, forbidding election rascalities, prohibiting the use of money, and providing full publicity.

Sixth—An act providing for the publicity

pamphlet, giving the arguments for and against every measure, the argument for and against every candidate, and putting this pamphlet in the hands of every citizen before each election for his information and guidance.

Seventh—The right of recall.

I trust to see the time come, Mr. President, when the citizen can vote with full knowledge and by secret postal ballot, to be counted at state headquarters and registered with the same certainty, secrecy, and security that his check would be registered in a bank office.

Only by the overthrow of corruption in politics and by the elimination of the sinister influences of commercialism will the people of the country ever be able to consider dispassionately the great matters of public policy which are so essential to their future development and welfare. When we shall have purged our government of dishonest methods and have provided a means by which the people can intelligently and honestly rule; when we shall have provided a mechanism by which the people can authoritatively express themselves, they will vote for universal peace. The people of the United States today, if they could vote on the question of international peace, on the question of limiting the armament of nations, would heartily be in favor of it. The people of Germany would do the same thing. The people of Great Britain would do the same thing.

The danger of war arises not from the people, but from ambitious leaders, anxious for activity, anxious for service, anxious for promotion. The dogs of war in every nation are anxious to fight, and commercial interests engaged in furnishing the muniments of war, in furnishing material for building battleships, fill the press with rumors of war when the naval appropriation is before congress and tend to irritate nations with each other.

The international mischief makers, who prate too much about the excessive delicacies of questions of national honor that can only be settled by the arbitrament of war, should be sternly suppressed and would be rendered powerless for harm under the rule of the people.

If the people could express themselves, they would immediately vote for good roads, improved waterways, wholesale education, eight hours of labor, improved protection of the public health, lower prices, reasonable control of public-utility corporations, reasonable freight rates, reasonable rates by express, telephone, and telegraph.

Mr. President, the citizens of the great republic wait in vain for substantial relief, while machine politicians in state and municipalities growl at each other; but the democrats and republicans at home and men of all opinions are robbed with perfect impartiality by the organized monopolies and trade conspiracies of this country. I am unwilling to see the people wait any longer.

I respectfully submit a simple code of laws looking to the restoration of the rule of the people of the United States, and when I say people, I mean the rule of the republican people, the democratic people, the independent people, the socialist people, and the populist people.

At present these people do not rule; they only think they rule. They are, in fact, ruled by an alliance between special commercial interests, at the head of which is the great political trade combination known as the Protective Tariff League and a great political machine whose name I need not mention in this presence.

Mr. President, the senator from Oregon has heretofore set up in the clearest possible manner, in his magnificent speech of May the 5th, the system of the people's rule of Oregon. I wish to give it my cordial approval and to say with the adoption of this method the people of the United States can relieve themselves in very great measure of the sinister influences to which bad government in this country is directly due.

Mr. President, as one of the steps to the restoration of the people's rule I call to the attention of the senate joint resolution No. 41, providing for the submission to the states of the union of a constitutional amendment providing for the election of senators by direct vote of the people, and move that the committee on privileges and elections be instructed to report the same favorably within thirty days, and on this motion I call for the yeas and nays.

The American Homestead, a monthly farm journal of national scope, will be sent to all Commoner subscribers, without additional cost, who renew their subscriptions during the month of June. Take advantage of this offer at once, and send in your renewal.