

The Nation.

NEW YORK, THURSDAY, SEPTEMBER 29, 1910.

The Week.

Mr. Taft's renewed pledge that he will veto any River and Harbor bill hereafter if drawn in the old-fashioned log-rolling style is most welcome. If he really ends that mischievous "pork-barrel" style of internal development of the nation he will merit the hearty praise of his countrymen; for, we believe, one veto will end it forever. Next to conservation of our resources comes in order of merit their orderly and economical development and the business-like erection of public buildings and works necessary to the carrying on of the public business. No President ever had a greater chance to make memorable reforms than Mr. Taft; certainly, no one can assert that his predecessors have left him nothing to do. To take the postmasters out of politics and make service in the post offices a life-career for American citizens as it is abroad; to extend the civil service; to take the consular and diplomatic service entirely out of politics; to end some of the pension abuses—if Mr. Taft will but devote himself to constructive work of that kind he may yet win the affections of the American people to the degree his friends desire for him.

One the eve of the Republican Convention the *World* of New York printed the facts as to the tremendous bills for Mr. Roosevelt's travelling expenses incurred by the Pennsylvania Railroad during his Presidency. They amount, according to this report, to no less than \$100,000 for transportation, Pullman cars, food, wines, and cigars for himself and his travelling companions. For this the company received not a cent from Mr. Roosevelt or from the Government. For weeks past it has been known that the Pennsylvania Railroad would be challenged for its failure to enforce payment of these bills, as soon as Mr. McCrea returned from Europe. He arrived last week, and a stockholder has now written to him asking if there is any reason why this debt of \$100,000 should not be collected. On the face of it, it is a gross injustice to the stockholders that such costly services should be given

free of charge even to the President of the United States. It is a difficult question the Pennsylvania Railroad is compelled to answer. Ought it, from any point of view, to give favors to a man in the highest office when that man is in a position to do it very great harm? As for ourselves, we sincerely hope that the day will come when there will be a President in the White House who will attend to his business and travel little. When he travels, we trust such a man as we have in mind will be enough of a Jeffersonian to travel in a Pullman car, or at most in a private car attached to a regular train, without any uniformed attendants, save on occasions of state, and quite free from newspaper correspondents to exalt and advertise him wherever he moves.

Tuesday's final and crushing defeat of the Old Guard at the Saratoga Republican Convention was merely the climax of a series of blunders committed by men whose boast it has been that they were the greatest political experts living. Their strategy this year began with a trick and ended in a rout. The thing which they most chuckled over as a supreme proof of their astuteness—the voting down of Roosevelt in the State Committee—is now seen to have been an act of sublime folly. It at once forced an issue which they had not the strength to fight through. If they had been wise enough to let Mr. Roosevelt's name go through the Committee without a contest, they might have been able quietly to rally their followers and to control the Convention; instead of that they had made their attack gratuitously and ostentatiously. And as a crowning evidence of their masterly tactics they put up "Abe" Gruber, with his Bowery eloquence, to make their final appeal! Gruber vs. Roosevelt—this was the high-water mark of political adroitness! No wonder that it was a Waterloo for the Old Guard.

Presently, what may come to be called the "Rhode Island experiment" may challenge the general attention. The death of "Boss" Brayton at Providence has given the electors of that State an opportunity to make an essay in self-government. So accustomed had they

become to his domination that even in his broken old age his control was not questioned. His death takes from the political stage the last of the old-time "bosses" of the type of Buckley and Ruef in San Francisco, "Ed" Butler in St. Louis, McLaughlin in Brooklyn, Quay in Pennsylvania, and Croker and Platt in New York. None of these went about the routine of their business so directly, so simply and without pretence, as the purposeful and resolute old blind man who for so many years ruled Rhode Island as an absolute autocrat. There was never any secret about his power or its sources. While the Legislature was in session, he went to the State House each day and personally told it what it might and what it might not do. As the Governor had no veto, Brayton exercised the functions of both Governor and Legislature. He debauched the rural voters, and made Rhode Island's shame and corruption a by-word. He was merely amused at the sporadic denunciations of his rule not followed by any efforts to overthrow him. There was no "insurgent" spirit among Rhode Island Republicans, while he lived and Aldrich was in the Senate. What will the people of the State do when bereft of both their rulers?

Republican progressives in Illinois are planning changes in the rules of the House at Springfield to prevent the smothering of bills in committee, by providing that the bills not reported in a certain time may be brought directly before the House. They also propose to limit the number of employees of the House by a rule that no janitors can go on the pay-rolls except by resolution. Other States might well take similar action. There is also the custom, which is observed in Maryland at least, of increasing the legal pay of legislative employees by a series of bills rushed through at the end of the session granting special compensation to the various grades of scrubwomen, janitors, door-keepers, etc., not forgetting so high-placed an officer as the reading clerk, for "extra services." It is probable that many far greater reforms will have become the accepted order long before these insidiously petty irregularities have succumbed.

The "greatest sensation" in the history of the Cincinnati police department is said to be impending as a result of charges of the exaction of "tribute" in return for protection to saloons in the lowest districts. The Director of Public Safety, Mr. Small, at once began a personal investigation, which is said to have resulted in a mass of evidence confirming the charges. James Mulligan, owner of a small saloon and hotel, furnished the most direct testimony, naming Inspector Casey as personally receiving money from him for a period of five years. At first the money was paid irregularly, but finally Mulligan was informed that Casey wanted a stipulated sum weekly. Unable to pay the amount named, Mulligan replied that he would give what he could spare. As a result, he says, "I kept open every night in the five years I paid Casey money. Before that, I was arrested repeatedly. If any one doesn't believe what I say, look over the police court docket." The inspector denies the charges, and George B. Cox, the Republican boss, declares that the organization will not cover up anything. Meanwhile, two rules have been added to the regulations of the police department, one providing that the Mayor or the police director may at any time instruct the chief of police to bring charges when the occasion seems to warrant it, and the other, that either of the two officials may transfer policemen at will.

Last Sunday's decision of the four leading organizations of railway employees to back up the campaign of the railways for higher rates is, no doubt, important, but the weight to be attached to it is uncertain. These railway unions do not and cannot profess to have gone into the question with the minute analysis of economists, or even of the lawyers employed by shippers who are stoutly contesting the proposed advances and asking the Interstate Commerce Commission not to allow them. The employees appear to go blandly upon the theory that whatever is good for the railways will be good for them. So far as their action implies a readiness to coöperate with their employers, it is welcome. If they have in mind to ask higher wages for themselves after the increased rates for transportation are in force, their move is clearly tactical. But, in any event,

they do not speak as experts in the matter of the proper charge for carrying freight and passengers. That has to be decided by other tribunals, and upon evidence which is statistical and financial, rather than emotional.

The invariable desire for more pensions has again marked the annual gathering of the Grand Army of the Republic at Atlantic City. Not satisfied with the general service pension for cowards, bummers, and brave men alike, there was voiced a demand for a dollar-a-day pension. This was too much, however, for the Pension Committee, which is reported to have declared it to be wholly without reason. As a compromise, however, there is a plan to urge a much larger pension for veterans seventy-five years of age or over than they are now receiving. Again, there is a plan to let down the bars in regard to soldiers' widows. The present wise provision of law that no woman who was married after 1890 shall receive aid is to be changed to read that any widow who was married to her husband three years before his death shall go on the pension-roll. But this would open the doors wide to some of the worst pension abuses the country has heretofore seen. The marrying off of senile veterans of the Revolutionary and Mexican wars, and of the Civil War as well, to young women was a regular business at one time, the object being to assure a life's pension to the woman. The present law ended that; it should never be touched. The annual spectacle of the rapidly thinning hosts of the men who wore the blue uniform is pathetic enough. It ought not to be made more so by further demands on what is and has been the most generous country on earth to its old soldiers.

Automobile owners everywhere will read with interest the news that a certain company which manufactures automobile parts and accessories has made net profits of 300 per cent. a year for the last three years. They have known that the rubber tires they are compelled to buy show an enormous profit, and they feel sure that cars which now sell for \$4,500 or \$5,000 and cost the makers only \$1,800 when they leave the factory, could be retailed for \$3,000 to the advantage of purchaser and seller, if the big agents' profits were cut down and less money spent on costly build-

ings. Gradually there will be a readjustment in the automobile world, which has had a tremendous inflation similar to that which went on among bicycle-makers when the bicycle craze was at its height. Low-priced cars are certain of a steady market, for the automobile has come to stay; but the higher-priced cars have not quite so plain sailing before them, if one may judge by certain signs of the times. Already, for instance, tops and other appurtenances are being given without extra charge, thus reducing the price of the car by perhaps \$200. When still further reductions are made, the trade will profit by it and reach a normal permanent basis.

The annual sophomore-freshman clashes have begun with the usual amount of excitement, determination, and bruises. To the uncollegiate outsider, these performances at times seem somewhat inharmonious with the advertised atmosphere of the institutions at which they flourish, so that now and then an ignorant policeman gets himself into trouble by interfering with what looks to his unsophisticated eyes like a fight. But the phenomenon is only a strange phase of college loyalty, plus its natural corollary, class spirit. Here is a band of barbarians with the audacity to invade our sacred campus and our classic halls, even to aspire to be in a fleeting twelvemonth what in the same time we ourselves have become. Shall the door automatically swing open—especially now that we are in, and more especially that we got in only at the price of various humiliations which can be conveniently avenged only upon the new-comers? And so individual and class spirit blends with love for alma mater in a beautiful ideal that exists nowhere else about the quadrangle, except, of course, upon the gridiron.

One of the results of the "Osborne Judgment" by the House of Lords, holding that trades unions could not use their funds to pay members of Parliament, has been to revive the agitation for the payment of salaries to all members of Parliament, out of the Exchequer. Curiously but characteristically, this proposal is favored by several of the true-blue Conservative newspapers. Although they have long denounced the payment of members of the House of

Commons as a sure step toward its degradation, and a menace to the state, they now see in it a clever electioneering move, and are urging their party leaders to be first in the field with an endorsement of the plan. Both the *Observer* and the *Morning Post* have taken this line, and the *Tory Standard* goes even further, declaring that "the solution lies in the payment of members of Parliament out of public funds, and—within reasonable and restricted limits—the payment of their election expenses also. The member's stipend should be no larger than would compensate a superior artisan for abandoning his employment and enable him to discharge his public duties in comfort."

The meat question in Germany has become a grave political issue. It is not merely that the prices are so high as to be prohibitive for the poorer classes, or that the present emergency is temporarily acute. There is an actual dearth of meat. The high prices were bad enough in 1905 and 1906, when there were debates in the Reichstag and many legislative bodies, and protests and resolutions from all over the country. On the 30th of November, 1905, the then Prussian Minister of Agriculture, Herr von Podbielski, actually declared that the high prices were "merely a passing phenomenon"; but where there was then discomfort, there is to-day a real crisis. What angers the Liberal press in Germany is that much of the resultant suffering is quite unnecessary. By means of laws drawn by and passed by the Agrarians, all sorts of unreasonable restrictions upon importations, and too severe quarantine regulations, imports of cattle from the Argentine Republic, and from Denmark, Holland, and France, are virtually prohibited. The Government could help at once by lowering the duties and the freight rates on cattle, and by being less rigorous about the exclusion of cattle for medical reasons, while still protecting the country from animals suffering from tuberculosis. But it does nothing, because it is controlled by the Agrarians and the protectionists. Quite recently the city fathers of Berlin and Frankfort-on-the-Main have protested officially to the Government; the large cities are suffering the most.

General Botha's decision to remain at the head of the Government of the South

African Union, despite his defeat in the elections to the Parliament, is what might have been expected of that doughty leader of the Nationalist party. He was beaten in the constituency of Pretoria East by Sir Percy Fitz Patrick, but can easily find another seat. Four members of his Cabinet were returned unopposed; and while the Nationalist majority in the Parliament will not be so great as was expected, it will be fully adequate to carrying on the Government. The recent electoral campaign followed pretty closely the old lines of political division in South Africa. The Nationalists still represent most strongly the Dutch element, though the Unionists have drawn away to themselves many Dutch votes; particularly among the commercial and industrial classes. The Boer farmer, however, has stood firmly by the Boer Premier. Dr. Jameson is singled out as the predestined leader of the Opposition, having won for himself a high place in public confidence since his return to public life ten years ago. Next to Gen. Botha, he is said to be to-day the South African statesman "most widely trusted by South Africans of either race." This is a surprising achievement after the intense bitterness engendered by the Jameson Raid. But it is equally surprising to read the high praise which the *London Times* gives to Gen. Botha, along with Dr. Jameson, concluding that "South African politics is safe in the hands of two such men." Surely time does bring its revenges.

The little flurry about the Turkish loan of \$30,000,000 recalls to the European stage the shadowy figure of "the balance of power." That once familiar actor has not been often seen in recent years. The events of 1870 and succeeding years caused a complete derangement of all the old ideas about the proper "equilibrium" of Europe. Then came new adjustments and alliances, to play off one against the other—the Triple Alliance against the Dual, and so on. But that "balance," too, got badly upset by the blow to the prestige of Russia in the Japanese war, and later by the success of England in coming to a good understanding with France, and afterwards Russia, besides establishing herself securely in Spain and practically detaching Italy from the *Dreikaiserbund*. Germany, however, has recently, with Aus-

tria, been strengthening herself in the Near East; and a diplomatic and international question of great importance has been whether Turkey, under her new régime, would cast in her lot with the Central European Powers. Having to pay for ships and military material, mostly bought from Germans, she went to her old borrowing markets, Paris and London. But her proposals have been rejected in both places, and rejected, it is pretty well understood, on account of government pressure. If Turkey is to side with Austria and Germany, those countries, not France or England, must supply her the money. They could easily do it, one would suppose, considering the object; and if they do, we shall again see diplomacy concerning itself actively with "the balance of power in Europe."

After languishing for two years, the project of an English university at Hongkong seems about to be realized. The minimum sum regarded as necessary, £100,000, has been virtually raised, and the promoters now appeal to the British public to add enough to make the institution worthy of its title. Just at this point, however, a plan is announced for another university in China, under mission auspices. Among the 400,000,000 of Chinese even two universities would hardly be too many, but a supporter of the Hongkong idea is at some pains to point out in the *London Times* the advantages of this scheme. Its location in a British colony, he thinks, will promote continuity of policy, besides assuring exemption from Chinese official interference, especially in the department of medicine. A second point of difference lies in the fact that the proposed Han-kau University adopts Chinese, the Hongkong University, English, as the medium of instruction. But the crucial point, in the opinion of the *Times* correspondent, is the hope of affiliating the Hongkong University with some British university, for the purpose of giving weight to its degrees with the Chinese. This, the writer argues, the degrees of a purely Chinese university could not have, even though its standard was identical with that of Europe, or, he is kind enough to add, America. Both universities have for their main object the developing of a moral discipline strong enough to withstand the prevailing corruption.

DEAR MARIA AND THEODORE.

Mrs. Bellamy Storer's return to her controversy with Mr. Roosevelt in 1906 is marked by the publication in the *Springfield Republican* of fresh documents. Into the subsidiary questions we will not here go. We will not ask whether President Roosevelt's treatment of Mr. and Mrs. Storer was such as his deep personal obligations to them made either generous or honorable. We will say nothing of the propriety of the President of the United States meddling in Vatican politics, and seeking to influence the choice of a Cardinal of the Catholic Church. We wish rather to focus attention upon the comparison of Mr. Roosevelt's deliberate and written assertions with the contemporary and also written evidence supplied by the hitherto unpublished letters of Archbishop Ireland. It is easy to challenge the veracity of a newspaper, it is easy for some men to accuse a woman of untruthfulness, but a Catholic prelate is not to be so lightly disposed of.

In order to make the issue sharp and clear, we shall print what Mr. Roosevelt wrote and what Archbishop Ireland wrote, side by side. Mr. and Mrs. Storer had asserted that President Roosevelt had given Mr. Storer verbal authority to use his good offices at the Vatican in behalf of Archbishop Ireland's elevation to the Cardinalate. Of this President Roosevelt, in his public letter to Secretary Root, December 2, 1906, made the flattest possible denial. The parallel follows:

THEODORE ROOSEVELT.

As for Mr. Storer's assertion that I authorized him to make such a statement as he says he was authorized to make to the Pope, it is untrue. I gave him no such authorization.

JOHN IRELAND.

The President also told me that he had commissioned Mr. Storer to speak for him *viva voce* at the Vatican. He seemed rather proud of having done so. The President said to me: "Mr. Storer has told you what I said to him about you, archbishop?" "Well," I replied, "I do not remember." "About his going to Rome?" the President then asked. I said "No." "Well," he said, "I told him I would not write a letter to the Pope, asking for honors for you; but I said that he could go to Rome and say—*viva voce*—to the Pope, how much I wish you to

be cardinal, and how grateful I personally would be to him for giving you that honor." I am most clear in my memory as to every word. . . .

At the time of Mr. Storer's intercession at the Vatican, some wind of the affair got into the dispatches. We subjoin what President Roosevelt wrote and what Archbishop Ireland wrote about that matter:

ROOSEVELT TO MR. STORER.

The mere fact of the report in the newspapers about your calling at the Vatican has had a very unfortunate effect. . . . Think of the effect if your letter were made public.

IRELAND TO MR. STORER.

Your two letters were read and burnt. However, you need have no anxiety whatsoever about the whole affair which was the chief subject matter of those letters. . . . The President had no occasion to feel ruffled in the least, but you know his impulsiveness. When I saw him he of his own accord told me of his writing to you, and asked me how publicity was given to the matter. . . . I said the Scripps-McRae agency had merely made a guess (as to Mr. Storer's coming to Rome), and that the few unfavorable comments that followed amounted really to nothing. . . . He calmed down completely; remarked that he had every confidence in you, and hoped that the outcome of your mission would be what all desired. . . .

To complete this confrontation of witnesses, we add a parallel on another subject. In his letter to Secretary Root, President Roosevelt referred to the expectation of the Storers that he would send them to the Embassy at London or Paris. His own account and the Archbishop's account follow:

ROOSEVELT.

She [Mrs. Storer] wrote me on October 17 suggesting the embassies at London and Paris. . . . There is a certain element of the comic in their attempt thus to get me to remove Mr. Choate or Mr. Porter.

IRELAND.

I have had two most pleasant meetings with the President at the White House. He is decidedly your friend, and resolved to give you the best there is. "Even," said he, "if Berlin comes first, and Bellamy wished it for a little while, pending Choate's retention of London, I

would give it to him and change him shortly afterward to London. Let him trust me." . . . He promised me that the next ambassador to Paris would be Mr. Storer, and furthermore expressed the belief that Gen. Porter would soon retire.

We merely remark that this is a fearful showing for a man who has recently been so free with his epithets of "liar" and "peculiar baseness" and "mendacious journalism." Any journalist who should be caught in the coils of such peculiarly deadly parallels would feel like hanging himself. He would certainly go out of business—or be put out. And this leads us to ask the immediate and serious attention of the *Outlook* to the plight of its Contributing Editor. It was credulous enough to say that Mr. Roosevelt had never asked for any office, except that of lieutenant-colonel of the Rough Riders. When it reads his pleading letter to Bellamy Storer, written in 1896, asking his help with President McKinley in securing the office of Assistant Secretary of the Navy, it will get needed instruction. But that is a trifle compared with this new and terrible impeachment of Mr. Roosevelt's veracity. Mr. Roosevelt himself declines to have "any further controversy with Mrs. Storer." He speaks of the letters published four years ago as making "a record against which no recollections of verbal conversations can stand." Hence, he says, "the question of veracity cannot be raised." But this is to dodge the issue as now made by Mrs. Storer. She publishes *new* letters by Archbishop Ireland, absolutely confirming what she had before asserted on her own word, and absolutely destructive of Mr. Roosevelt's public statement when he was President. For a man so directly impeached merely to say now that he will not "reopen" the case, is in reality a confession that he is unable to meet the damaging charges.

VOX POPULI.

There is a strain of sadness, almost of bitterness, in the comments of the Chicago "Progressives" on the disappointing results of the recent primaries in that city and in Illinois. Such high-minded men—*pace* the *Inter Ocean*—as the leaders of the Legislative Voters'