

gone to visit a famous breeding farm of Arab horses, "carriages drawn by six horses, with drivers in picturesque Hungarian costume, conveyed the party through thatch-roofed villages, decorated with crude American flags, under hastily constructed triumphal arches, amid the shouts of the entire population. In each village the schools had been dismissed in order that the children might join in the acclamation of the American visitor." On the arrival of the party in Paris Mr. Roosevelt was welcomed by Mr. Bacon, the American Ambassador, M. Jusserand, the French Ambassador at Washington, and many others. Thursday and Friday were occupied with sightseeing visits; on Thursday evening Mr. Roosevelt and his party attended a performance of Sophocles's "Œdipus Rex" at the Comédie Française, where he occupied the Presidential box, and was greeted with extraordinary enthusiasm by the audience; on Friday evening Mr. Roosevelt was the guest of honor at a dinner and reception by President Fallières at the Élysée Palace. The event of the stay in Paris of the most serious public importance was the first of the three university lectures which Mr. Roosevelt had been invited to deliver. The lecture at the Sorbonne on Saturday was attended by many of the most distinguished literary and political men of France, and the occasion was recognized as one notable in the realm of letters and education. The subject of the address was "Citizenship in a Republic." It appears in full and in its authorized form in another part of this issue of The Outlook. The Sorbonne, before which this lecture was delivered, is one of the oldest universities in the world. It was founded a little more than seven hundred years ago by Robert de Sorbon, a theologian and ecclesiastic, who was at one time chaplain to King Louis IX. The college was originally called "La Communauté des pauvres maîtres étudiant en théologie," but within the century became familiarly known by the founder's name. From time to time the foundation was enlarged, the scope of studies increased, and it soon became famous, not merely as a place for theological learning, but as a center of intellectual activity. Its equipment and administration to-day are extensive and of

the first order; and the great edifice, "La Nouvelle Sorbonne," completed some twenty years ago, has been called the finest university building in the world. In modern times the faculty of theology, once the only teaching body, has yielded supremacy to the teaching of literature and science, while medicine and law also come within the scope of the University. The number of students is enormous. We have recently seen it placed at twelve thousand. The demand for admission tickets to Mr. Roosevelt's lecture was overpowering, but arrangements were made that a considerable body of students should be included in the audience. A description of the event in detail must be deferred until next week.



THE RETIREMENT OF SENATORS ALDRICH AND HALE

On the 4th of next March, just thirty years after their entrance into the Senate, of which they have since been continuously members, Senator Nelson Aldrich, of Rhode Island, and Senator Eugene Hale, of Maine, will retire. This fact was announced definitely on Wednesday of last week by the publication of two letters. One was from Senator Aldrich to Governor Pothier, of Rhode Island, the other was from Senator Hale to the Chairman of the Republican State Committee of Maine. Senator Aldrich states that he retires for personal reasons; but that he will remain in his position on the National Monetary Commission. Senator Hale gives as the reason for his retirement his disinclination toward a personal contest for re-election after being chosen for five terms without opposition. Other Senators have retired from public office without creating a stir; but these two men announce their forthcoming retirement and the news, flashed by telegraph over the country, starts comment that may continue for weeks. Why? Do these two men stand before the American people as eminent and admirable for great public service? Not at all. They are both recognized as possessing great knowledge of government, experience in legislation, skill in politics; but, justly or not, they are not recognized as great servants of the whole people. Both have acquired their

reputation as able representatives of special interests or combinations of special interests. They belong, with Senator Platt, who died a month and a half ago, and Speaker Cannon, whose political power is moribund, to an era that has virtually come to an end. During the time when these men have been ascendant, the accepted principle which has prevailed in the construction of legislation has been that of the bargain. One industry after another, one interest after another, one section after another, each with a petition for favors, came before Congress, and Congress, made up of representatives of different industries, interests, sections, worked out, by giving here and taking there, some kind of a compromise. Congress was unskillful when it created more discontent than satisfaction; it was skillful when it satisfied more than it disappointed. On this principle of legislation, that Representative, that Senator, was best who voiced most effectively the wants of the particular people he represented, and secured for them the most favors. Of course a member of Congress who on a particular measure had no special interest to represent was free to act on behalf of the public interest of the whole country without violating this principle of legislation by bargain; but when some interest among his constituents was opposed to the public interest, he was regarded as a doctrinaire, a theorist, an impractical man, if he still felt called upon to vote and work for the interest of the Nation. Now this principle has been exemplified in the careers of Messrs. Aldrich and Hale. Both have been powerful, both have secured for constituents great favors, both have reached places of commanding influence in the Senate. In other respects they are very different. Senator Hale has been an obstructionist. His power has been exerted in protecting special interests from injury. As a legislative smotherer he is an adept. In a generation no great constructive piece of legislation has come from him. In his course as head of the Senate Committee on Naval Affairs he has been a habitual opponent of progress and of all reform that would jeopardize any privileges of powerful private concerns. Again and again legislation needed in the public in-

terest or for the public honor has been kept under his stifling hand. On the other hand, Senator Aldrich has been an active and constructive legislator. The present tariff bill rightly bears his name, and is a good example of his influence and power. He works on behalf of legislation as a great adjuster. Other Senators have acknowledged their indebtedness to him. Even the President of the United States has credited him with a large share in leadership. His leadership, however, has been on behalf of special interests. That these two men are going is a sign of the new standards of legislation and public service that the people of America demand. It will be easier and more practical hereafter for the man in public life to work and vote on behalf of the interest of all.



TESTIMONY FOR MR. BALLINGER

Subordinates of Mr. Ballinger have been testifying before the Committee of Congress that is investigating the Pinchot-Ballinger controversy, and other subordinates will follow these. Possibly the word subordinate might be resented by one of these witnesses, Mr. Frank Pierce, who is Assistant Secretary of the Interior, for on the stand he likened Mr. Ballinger to the Chief Justice and himself to an Associate Justice of a Court. He declared with vigor that he had sole charge of the matter of the Cunningham claims. He asserted that in this matter no one could appeal from his decision to that of the Head of the Department. He did not deny that the Secretary could overrule him; he simply said that the Secretary in practice does not overrule the assistant. It was in this way that Mr. Pierce met the assertion of those who criticise Mr. Ballinger on the ground that he could not, even if he would, escape the responsibility laid on him for protecting the people's property against those who would take it by fraud or favor. Mr. Pierce, moreover, made it perfectly clear that in his opinion his decision on a question of patenting land would be final, and that no court could review his action if it were favorable and that no authority could force him to pass any claims of patent which he rejected. This testimony of Mr. Pierce's is interesting in view of the opinion his colleague,