

the rule of uniformity applied alike to states and territories of the United States. If, then, Puerto Rico is to be regarded as a territory of the United States such a law is unconstitutional. Congress, then, in passing the act, must have construed as they said they did, Puerto Rico to be, not a territory, but a dependency of the United States; that it did not come under the constitution but was to be governed by congress, unhampered by constitutional restraint. A republican congress took the position, without precedent in the annals of American legislation, that congress, the creature of the constitution, was greater than its creator; that it could suspend or limit the jurisdiction of the authority that made it. If congress can limit or suspend the constitution and extend its own jurisdiction at will, where will the application of the principle end? Is there a single provision of the constitution safe in such capricious keeping, in the hands of men who have shown themselves to be so disrespectful of law.

It is this that has caused doubting men to become all the more wavering, and loyal friends of the administration to become suspicious. It is the discovery that the promises of constitutional privileges and liberties for the people of the newly acquired islands, on whose behalf we had professed to have undertaken such an unselfish and humane war, were but the empty pledges of party leaders in whom the element of sincerity is most conspicuous because of its non-existence; it is the now certain knowledge that the present administration is woefully lacking in moral sensibilities and painfully deficient in scruples of conscience; it is this and nothing else that has turned the great mass of thinking citizens away from McKinleyism.

If those who are opposed to the present administration, wish to make their opposition effective, and if they will be

governed by reason, they will agree upon a platform typical of this outburst of protest against those who are seeking to destroy constitutional government in the United States. To appeal to this vast army of American voters it is only necessary to make the constitution the platform and let the issue in the campaign be plainly drawn with constitutionalism on one side and imperialism on the other. It is upon this all can unite. It is by the consistent adherence to this one principle, and in this way alone, that victory can be attained. It is by making the fight upon this issue that the words of the president may be used to condemn his own conduct and the editorial expression of many prominent republican newspapers may be employed to refute any sophistry they may now advance.

What a splendid opportunity for the display of patriotic political sagacity! But to insert in the platform issues previously rejected and proven to have been unsound is to invite certain defeat. By consistent adherence to this platform is meant the naming of a candidate thoroughly in harmony with it, and not one who owes his political prominence to a leadership in fantastic finance, once rejected by the American people and less forceful today than at the time of its rejection; the nomination of a man because of his peculiar qualifications for such responsible leadership and not because he may, for four years, have kept up an unceasing candidature for it; to select a man who has qualities of statesmanship to commend him and not one who is unable to point to a single line of legislative enactment that is indebted to him for its authorship; the choosing of a man who, by his personal success in his private business demonstrates his ability to look after other people's business, and not one who owes his livelihood, not to legitimate business enterprise, but to an altogether unique method of trade, the promotion of a market for the negotiation and sale of words, words, too, not freighted with substance, but mere sparkling words of silvery eloquence, originally coined and addressed, in humble veneration, to another deity, and now, with the inconstancy of a fickle lover, sung in rapturous praise of a new divinity.

What a splendid opportunity for the display of patriotic political sagacity! But to insert in the platform issues previously rejected and proven to have been unsound is to invite certain defeat.

By consistent adherence to this platform is meant the naming of a candidate thoroughly in harmony with it, and not one who owes his political prominence to a leadership in fantastic finance, once rejected by the American people and less forceful today than at the time of its rejection; the nomination of a man because of his peculiar qualifications for such responsible leadership and not because he may, for four years, have kept up an unceasing candidature for it; to select a man who has qualities of statesmanship to commend him and not one who is unable to point to a single line of legislative enactment that is indebted to him for its authorship; the choosing of a man who, by his personal success in his private business demonstrates his ability to look after other people's business, and not one who owes his livelihood, not to legitimate business enterprise, but to an altogether unique method of trade, the promotion of a market for the negotiation and sale of words, words, too, not freighted with substance, but mere sparkling words of silvery eloquence, originally coined and addressed, in humble veneration, to another deity, and now, with the inconstancy of a fickle lover, sung in rapturous praise of a new divinity.

PATERNALISM. There is a growing tendency on the part of the American people to appeal to legislation as a remedy for all ills public and private; to seek to avoid, in this way, the effect even of natural laws of trade and to prevent personal misfortune in private business.

A few years ago it was the railway corporations, about which timid people became alarmed and asked for the appointment of a state board of transportation, to supervise the transportation facilities of the state. This piece of paternalism has cost the state in salaries alone over \$70,000. Ten years of service or rather non-service has demonstrated the complete incapacity and ineffectiveness of this commission to do that for which it was created. Not a single instance can be cited to show where it has brought about better service or cheaper rates from the railway companies.

Now, another class of citizens are asking that the state assist them to make money. The butter makers, and by butter makers THE

CONSERVATIVE does not mean the farmers who operate their own separator and churn, but those who buy from the farmer the product of the dairy and in

large establishments, with expensive machinery, convert it into butter—these butter makers are demanding both state and national legislation to make their business more profitable by restricting the manufacture and sale of oleomargarine. They want it stipulated by statutory enactment that butter, of the variety they manufacture, shall be the only legalized breadspreader throughout the United States, and that oleomargarine be declared unconstitutional.

Demands of this character are not entitled to serious consideration by law makers, let alone compliance with them. It is contrary to the spirit of our institutions to enact laws that foster one industry to the detriment of another. The manufacture of oleomargarine is a legitimate industry and is entitled to the protection of the law the same as any other industry. It is made from the fat of the bovine while butter is made from the milk of the same species. Why should we legislate in favor of the product made from milk and against that made from fat? If such legislation is contemplated in the interests of the farmer, why should the farmer, who raises his herd for the purpose of selling to the beef packer, be discriminated against in favor of the farmer who maintains his herd for the purpose of supplying the market of the butter maker? The fact is that all legislation against oleomargarine is directly opposed to the interests of every farmer engaged in supplying the beef market.

Then, too, oleomargarine is a cheap product, by the use of which the poorer people are able to get a commodity that is cleanly, nutritious, and infinitely superior and more healthful than the inferior grades of butter. This kind of legislation presupposes, on the part of the people, a pitiable degree of ignorance. It assumes that the average citizen is not sufficiently gifted in powers of discrimination to pass upon the merits of plain, ordinary butter, but that it must first be tested and tasted by a state commission and before it can be legally used it must smack of the seal of their approval. It would seem that most anybody, even a buttermaker, after including this product as one of the staple articles of his bill of fare for twenty or thirty years ought to be fairly competent to judge of its excellence or mediocrity without state or federal assistance. It is time the American people desist from these paternalistic tendencies of interfering, upon the slightest provocation, in matters which are exclusively private and not public business.

How do you citizenize a Puerto Rican, how constitute a Filipino voter under the constitution?