

opinions. When he is ready, after his return, to declare his views on current political questions, whether through a public address or through The Outlook, it will be so done that there will be no possible question as to their authenticity.

**MR. FOSS'S
ELECTION**

As showing how strong the current of popular feeling is running against the Aldrich-Cannon wing of the Republican party, the election held last week in the Fourteenth Massachusetts Congressional District is of interest to the whole country. It was necessary to fill the unexpired term of the late William C. Lovering, long an honored Representative in Congress. Mr. Lovering was a Republican. His district had always been Republican. Yet not only did Mr. Eugene Noble Foss, running as a Democrat, overturn the plurality of over fourteen thousand votes given in 1908, but he won the election by a plurality of more than five thousand votes. The district, known as The Old Colony, embraces that part of Massachusetts lying east of the Rhode Island line and south of Boston. It includes such important manufacturing towns as Brockton, Taunton, and Attleboro. Mr. Foss, a man of marked ability and energy, and the brother of Representative Foss of Illinois, is a manufacturer. The latter fact had weight in a manufacturing district. For years Mr. Foss has told the Massachusetts manufacturers just why they would be better off if we had tariff reform in general and Canadian reciprocity in particular. But when he twice made a fight for Congress as Republican candidate in another district, he failed, although then, and since, he urged his election, not only because he stood for lessened cost of living to the consumer and greater economic advantage to the manufacturer, but also because he wanted to rebuke the political oligarchy which in the House has ruled Republican Representatives there. What he could not get from the Republican party in Massachusetts he tried to get from the Democratic. As a Democrat, he became last year the candidate for Lieutenant-Governor. But he was again defeated. Thus he had been unable to win official political place until the present agitation concerning the high cost of living

afforded an unequalled opportunity. As he says, "My campaign was fought on the tariff issue, demanding reductions to lower the cost of living." Senator Lodge, of Massachusetts, claiming that the tariff had nothing to do with high prices, and that increases had occurred chiefly in articles on which the tariff had been lowered, supported by his speeches the Republican candidate, Mr. Buchanan. Although Mr. Buchanan was defeated primarily by the cost-of-living issue, he was also defeated because of local causes. While Mr. Foss is now affiliated with the Democrats, by a curious coincidence Mr. Buchanan, who six years ago had helped to elect a Democrat, Governor Douglas, is now affiliated with the Republicans. Much dissatisfaction and consequent "knifing" existed in the district because of the means used in the Republican Convention to defeat Judge Harris, who had been expected to be the regular Republican nominee, and who was regarded by many as the most appropriate representative of that district.



**MR. GARFIELD'S
WARNING**

Another political event in Massachusetts was significant. For the first time in its history, a Democratic State Senator was elected in the District of Springfield. Political events in the Central States have also been interesting. In Indiana, for instance, we find the Republicans of the Indianapolis District so far at variance as to be unable to adopt a platform. In Missouri the recent election to fill the unexpired term of the late David De Armond, a Democrat, resulted in an increase of several thousand Democratic votes, to a majority twice as large as the normal Democratic majority, though the new Representative, compared with Mr. De Armond, was practically unknown. What is the main reason for all this? It is popularly supposed to be the cost of living. Many causes contribute to that condition. Two of these causes, say the

Democrats, are, first, the Republican failure to enact a tariff adequately meeting President Taft's ideal—to measure the difference in the cost of production here and abroad, and thus to lower prices—and, second, the Republican failure properly to supervise the food trusts. This was doubtless meant by the Hon. James R. Garfield, ex-Secretary of the Interior, in his speech last week at Cleveland, when he declared that we must provide for such regulation over corporations as will safeguard the public interest, prevent abuses, and make easier the enforcement of law against illegal or unfair business. "We are again preparing for a general election. The party and men responsible for the conduct of National and State affairs will be called to give an account of their stewardship." As a Republican, Mr. Garfield rightly declared that his party owed its success to the fact that all its great achievements have been progressive and aggressive. But "whenever any party fails to be progressive, that moment its usefulness begins to wane." The non-progressive is the "stand-patter." As Mr. Garfield says, the "stand-patter" is content to rest upon the fight that has been made, and to deceive himself with the belief that further contest is unnecessary; on the other hand, the "progressive" recognizes in the good obtained a fraction of what ought to be obtained. Finally, any advantage gained is but a single step of the many to be taken in the long contest for securing those objects for which our Nation was created. We believe, with Mr. Garfield, that "the people will not be satisfied with inaction, or with makeshift legislation." If the present Federal legislative programme comprises makeshift legislation, as it did in the Withdrawal of Lands Bill, then it ought to be instantly amended, as was that bill at Mr. Garfield's timely suggestion to the Senate Committee on the Public Lands. To control legislation one party must control both branches of Congress. The Republicans can keep that control, if they will. To do so they must heed Mr. Garfield's warning in his Cleveland address; they must be known no longer as "stand-patters," but as progressives; no longer as representing makeshift legislation—to use Mr. Garfield's apt phrase—but as

representing constructive legislation; no longer as representing special interests, but the whole people.



MR. BALLINGER
AS ADMINISTRATOR

In the hearing before the so-called Pinchot-Ballinger Investigating Committee on March 19, Mr. F. H. Newell, who has gained a wide reputation as Director of the Reclamation Service, was called upon to testify. In general he corroborated the testimony already given by Mr. Davis, the Chief Engineer of the Service, regarding the withdrawals of water power sites, the water-users' certificates, the exoneration of an engineer who while in the employ of the Service received a retainer from a railway company, and other administrative matters. One of the criticisms of Mr. Ballinger relates to the demoralization in the Reclamation Service that is alleged to have resulted from his administration. An important point brought out regarding this matter for the first time was, strangely, elicited on cross-examination by Mr. Ballinger's counsel. One of the projects of the Reclamation Service involved the building of a dam in Arizona. The engineer in charge, exercising the authority which Mr. Newell said was reposed in him, suspended the work on the building of the dam during the hot months last summer. The action on the part of the engineer was supposed to be justified by a clause in the contract with the builder of the dam. There were two reasons for this action—one that the excessive heat would interfere with proper construction, and the other that it was desirable at that time to reduce expenditure. Naturally, the first reason only was announced to the contractor, as that was sufficient. The contractor protested against this decision; in fact, came on to Washington to ask the Department that the engineer be overruled. In conference with the contractor, Mr. Newell insisted on consulting the responsible engineer on the ground as to whether, by wetting the stones and rocks, the contractor could safely go on with the construction. In spite of the fact that the engineer in charge, in reply to a telegram, said that he did not recommend continuing the work, Mr. Pierce, Acting Secretary,