

PRESIDENTIAL POWERS. In his annual message to congress in December, 1900, the president claimed constitutional authority for the military operations in the Philippines and used this language to define his powers:

"I stated my purpose, (in his last message), until the congress shall have made the formal expression of its will, to use the authority vested in me by the constitution and the statutes to uphold the sovereignty of the United States in those distant islands *as in all other places where our flag rightfully floats*, placing, to that end, at the disposal of the army and the navy, all the means which the liberality of the congress and the people have provided."

The provision of the constitution to which the president refers reads as follows:

"The congress shall have power to provide for calling forth the militia to execute the laws of the Union, suppress insurrections and repel invasions."

In accord with this section the congress of 1795 passed the act referred to by the president, empowering him to use the military force of the country in the cases cited.

This declaration of the president that the section of the constitution and the statute of congress in accord therewith, relative to the suppression of insurrection, apply to the Philippines, "*as in all other places where our flag rightfully floats*," is an acceptance of the doctrine that the "constitution follows the flag." For if one provision of the constitution applies to the Filipinos all others apply. If he must suppress an insurrection in the Philippines in accord with the constitution he must exercise the power of taxation in the manner prescribed by the constitution. The constitution was intended to limit the authority of the president as well as to give him a grant of powers. He cannot consistently assume powers granted by the constitution in dealing with the Filipinos, with whom we are at war, and at the same time decline to recognize constitutional limitations in dealing with the Porto Ricans with whom we are at peace.

In the same message the president incorporated his instructions to the Philippine commission in which the following pledges to the Filipinos are enumerated:

"At the same time the commission should bear in mind and the people of the island should be made plainly to understand, that there are certain great principles of government which have been made the basis of our governmental system which we deem essential to the rule of law and the maintenance of individual freedom, and of which they have, unfortunately, been denied the experience possessed by us; that there

are also certain practical rules of government which we have found to be essential to the preservation of these great principles of liberty and law, and that these principles and these rules of government must be established and maintained in their islands for the sake of their liberty and happiness, however much they may conflict with the customs or laws of procedure with which they are familiar.

"Upon every division and branch of the government of the Philippines therefore must be imposed these inviolable rules:

"That no person shall be deprived of life, liberty, or property without due process of law; that private property shall not be taken for public use without just compensation, etc."

If paternal assurances and pretty promises, couched in pleasing verbiage, could end the Distrust of Filipinos. Philippine war it should have ceased the moment the message of the president reached the island. But the Filipinos are not fighting because they are unwilling to receive the privileges and liberties described by the president in his letter of instructions. Their hostility is due in a great measure to their distrust of the sincerity of our government and a general conviction that we will not do what the president says we will do. Our refusal to recognize a plain duty in dealing with the Porto Ricans was an unwise, an injudicious precedent. It tended to confirm the suspicions of the Filipinos. Their unhappy experience with Spanish tyranny and duplicity taught them to be suspicious of all men. Hence the necessity of our government acting at all times in the best of faith, fulfilling to the letter every promise and assurance and thus by kind acts and honorable dealings establishing ourselves in the confidence of the Filipinos. But instead of trying to remove their distrust we are doing all we can to confirm and intensify it.

Only a few days ago one of the "great principles of government" so feelingly referred to by the president was openly disregarded by the commander-in-chief of the army in the Philippines. An American citizen residing there was "deprived of liberty" and expelled from the islands by order of General MacArthur and without "due process of law." Of what avail is it to assure the Filipino that he will not be deprived of liberty or property without "due process of law" if at the first opportunity we prove our assurance meaningless by openly violating it. What care the Filipinos for the pledges of the president if a despotic military authority is permitted to defy them with impunity. The too frequent disregard of solemn promises makes the work of pacification in the Philippines peculiarly difficult. How may we hope to induce the Filipinos to trust us when we compel them to

distrust us? How may we hope to secure their permission to establish for them, to use the language of the president, "a government designed not for our satisfaction but for the happiness, peace and prosperity of the people of the Philippine islands" when the representatives of American authority in the Philippines ruthlessly violate "the great principles of government which have been made the basis of our governmental system which we deem essential to the rule of law and the maintenance of individual freedom." And still more shocking are our shame and humiliation after these "great principles" have been specifically promised to the Filipinos.

A GOOD PRECEPTOR.

There is—in the opinion of THE CONSERVATIVE—no journal in the city of New York which should receive the patronage of the very best citizens—without regard to party or church affiliations—except the New York Evening Post.

In economics, in morals and in right-living, with a due regard to the sacredness of the home-hearth, the Evening Post is a faithful and righteous preceptor.

MR. CARNEGIE ON WAGES AND LABOR.

Anything that Mr. Andrew Carnegie has to say on the matters of labor and capital is always interesting. Mr. Carnegie is one of the richest men in the world, and also one of the largest employers of labor.

In a recent newspaper contribution Mr. Carnegie said this when speaking of the great reduction in the cost of steel, three pounds being made for 2 cents:

"There is one element of cost, however, which every student of sociology will rejoice to know has not been cheapened, and that is human labor. It has risen, and the tendency is to higher earnings per man. In one of the largest steel works last year the average wages per man, including all paid by the day, laborers, boys, mechanics, exceeded \$4 per day—for 311 days. Fewer men being required, the labor cost per ton is less, and, contrary to the opinion often expressed, these men are of a higher quality as men. It is a mistake to suppose that men are becoming mere machines."

Mr. Carnegie here states only general facts which all statisticians recognize. The price of labor is steadily rising, although the products of labor are steadily decreasing in price. The result is beneficial in every way. Laborers form much the largest body of consumers, and if the commodities they buy become cheaper and the wages they receive larger, they are bound to be benefited.—Louisville Courier-Journal.