

ducted "in a formal sense this war may never cease." Those who desire that by a spirit of conciliation on reasonable terms it may cease now and forever must look for that end in other paths and by other men.

ROOSEVELT ON VESTED WRONG.

Roosevelt got off a lot of good things in his message that were never appreciated.

"Now he's going to be satirical," said Mrs. Dillingham. "He never says anything nice about the republicans but that he follows it with something that he thinks is real smart. If you say anything mean about the president I shall never speak to you again."

However, I wasn't going to say anything nasty about Roosevelt. I admire him. He does things. He is not ashamed to be a tory. If he was he wouldn't be a tory. He is a positive sort of a man.

"Go on," said Mrs. Dillingham, with warning. "Be just as mean as you please."

His message had a lot of good things that were not appreciated, and I am going to be absolutely respectful. Cross my heart and hope to die.

"If you think it is so clever," she said, "it would be a pity not to let you say it."

He said in one place that a fellow couldn't make a fortune in legitimate business without conferring on society vastly greater benefits than what he reaped for himself.

He's right. He's dead right. I agree with him exactly. No better test of the justice of social arrangement could be devised than that. If a man heaps up a fortune without benefiting society, he didn't get it in legitimate business.

For example, there is a man who never did a tap of work. His father never did a tap of work. His grandfather the same. His great-grandfather left a fortune of \$1,000,000, some of which was earned and some was stolen, but so long as it was stolen honestly that doesn't matter. This man confers no benefit on society, nor his father before him nor his grandfather before him. Yet he has \$100,000,000.

One million dollars was left to his grandfather. The other \$99,000,000 was not got by any legitimate business.

Thrift? He wastes more every year than his grandfather had in all. They have always spent more than the income of what the old man left them.

A gift? Of course it is a gift. It is

given them by the people who earn what they enjoy.

It was never got in legitimate business.

"He means the Astors," she said. "He is always harping on the Astors."

Mrs. Dillingham has a few of my hobbies definitely located.

By the same token when I get started on one of my hobbies I am not easily dismounted.

Roosevelt says further that in the arid states the only right to water is the right to use, the only right that should be recognized.

According to that if a man claims to own the water by which alone the next man's farm may be made fruitful, the claim doesn't count. It doesn't matter how many deeds he has nor how many dead-and-forgotten men gave him title to the water. His claim to it need not be recognized. The only right is the right to use it.

One of these days, Roosevelt says, people will recognize that the community has no more right to give away water privileges than to give away municipal franchises for public utilities.

Some of the states already recognize, he says, that the state must have perpetual ownership of water rights. Claims to the contrary, he says, must give way to the paramount claims of the whole people.

The doctrine of private ownership of water, he says, cannot prevail without working enduring wrong.

He's right. He's dead right. So long as you allow private ownership of water in arid regions, no man can keep his own.

"I'll take half your crop, if you please—or if you don't please—it's all one."

"What for?" says the other fellow, "I raised it, I planted it, I tended it, I harvested it. What for must I give you half of it?"

"I furnished the water—give me half your crop."

"You—why, the water fell from heaven. You never touched it."

Roosevelt says such an absurd claim need not be recognized. If it is not to be recognized, it may be ignored. That is to say, if anybody claims such a right, we take it away from him.

That's in regard to water. The reason he holds that is because the man who controls the water owns the land. The man who owns the land owns the man who lives on it. He must pay blackmail to the owner of the water before he can get his living.

He's right. He's dead right. The same thing exactly is true of the ownership of land. The man who owns the land can make the other fellow pay him tribute before he gets himself a living. He has to pay the landlord half his crop for the privilege of living on his land.

According to Roosevelt's reasoning, nothing but perpetual state ownership is tolerable. We are not to recognize any right but the right to use.

The railroads control a man's earnings as much as irrigation ditches do. The man who owns the railroad can take all but a bare living and let the farmer have what's left. Some railroads have done this.

According to Roosevelt the community has not the right to give that power to any private citizen. Perpetual state ownership of the railroad monopoly is the only tolerable arrangement.

No claims to private rights over another man's earnings need be recognized. Men can't establish homes, he says, when such rights of exacting tribute are held over them.

He's right. He's dead right.

No fortune is legitimately earned, he says, unless the fellow gives society more than he takes from society. Private ownership of the means of subsistence, he says is intolerable and its claims need not be recognized.

Now have I said anything mean?

"No more than usual," she graciously admitted.

Well, I could. I could insist that Roosevelt should try to apply some of these truths he has uttered. Of course, that wouldn't be fair.

It would break up the republican party.—John Stone Pardee, in *The Argus*, of Red Wing, Minn.

AMERICAN IDEALS.

Portions of a speech delivered by Hon. John P. Altgeld before the Good Government club of the University of Michigan at Ann Arbor, December 14, 1901.

A century and a quarter ago there was established on this continent, not simply a new government, not simply an independent government, not simply a government free from the political control of foreign powers, but there was established a new theory of government. A new principle. The principle of the equality of men before the law. The principle that governments derive their just powers from the consent of the governed.

It was a government based upon liberty, based upon foundations of freedom. It was a recognition of the idea