

and influence to the system. The boss system places the renomination of a public officer in the hands of the boss. Who will such an official serve? The boss system places government in the hands of whoever controls the bosses of both parties. It reduces the control of government to a science—a simple matter—and makes democracy a farce.

The direct primary renders it possible to restore representative institutions, to restore public service to an honorable career, to restore respect for law and authority, and ultimately to save our democratic institutions.

Only those actively engaged in politics—partisans—object to direct nominations. With the power to select candidates taken away from the “machine,” substantially all of the usefulness of the “machine” to those exploiting the people through the “machine,” is taken away. The Direct Primary Law of this state was repealed preparatory to the carrying through of matters of great moment. Does anyone think that the members of the last Legislature would have voted for certain measures now the general law of the state if they had not known at the time that the Direct Primary Law would be repealed, thus leaving their renomination to the “machine,” and not to their constituents. Does this not apply to the renomination of the Governor?

---

### SUPPLICATION

By MARY BRENT WHITESIDE

Life crowds upon us in the market place,  
And crushes back the starting of a tender wing—  
God grant us room again for blest remembering;  
God grant us space!

The vision dies too swiftly, and its bloom.  
Dear Lord, upon the altar of a fine desire,  
Let Thy four winds still fan the elemental fire—  
God grant us room!

## CANAL TOLLS AND AMERICAN HONOR

*By* CHARLES NAGEL

**T**HE proposed exemption of our vessels, engaged in coastwise traffic, from the payment of Panama tolls has given rise to renewed discussion. Indeed, in the heat of the argument, even the motives of the fair-minded have been challenged. I assume that in the progress of the discussion, every possible angle of the question has been covered. But at the risk of repetition, I shall endeavor to state a position which impresses me as entirely fair, and calculated to respect the just demands of every country.

I admit that upon some other points there may be considerable doubt about the correct interpretation of the Hay-Pauncefote treaty. But I submit that most of the confusion in the discussion of the subject of tolls has arisen from a failure to make clear to ourselves the reason and the effect of the proposed exemption. In other words, it is entirely possible, as it seems to me, to provide for exemption to our shipping, without in the least denying equality of treatment, or just and reasonable charges, to foreign shipping. And this in my judgment is precisely what the law of 1912 proposed to do and actually did do.

The language of the treaty is as follows:

"The canal shall be free and open to the vessels of commerce and war of all nations, observing these rules on terms of entire equality, so that there shall be no discrimination against any such nation, or its citizens or subjects, in respect to the conditions or charges of traffic or otherwise. Such conditions and charges of traffic shall be just and equitable."

The discussion of toll exemption has generally turned upon the provision that there shall be no discrimination.