

tain Republicans. For thirty years our national affairs have been corrupted by Big Business interests of the type that Archbold represents, and naturally there must be many fragile reputations among surviving statesmen of both parties.



The Great Corruption had its seed planted in Protectionism while the nation was at war. It sprouted with the bankers' combines against debtors in the '70's. It was in bud when McKinley constructed his tariff bill, with its rich favors for some and its promised plunder for all. It cast a shadow upon Cleveland's administration. It flowered out under Hanna's gardening. McKinley was twice elected President by corruption so gigantic as by comparison to make Archbold's story a mere commonplace. It was still in bloom when Roosevelt inherited the Presidency from McKinley, and small wonder if it made him shudder at times. It had only begun to wither under La Follette's blasting exposures when it was used for the first nomination and the election of Taft. Roosevelt's connection with the Great Corruption—whether enthusiastically, ignorantly, reluctantly, or resistantly—is of little public importance except as one set of details may go to make or modify a whole. So of all the others who are involved, as business men, professional men, politicians or officials.



To Roosevelt, and to that large body of earnest people who have recently confided in his integrity, it is due that he have early and fair opportunity to vindicate his personal honor, subject to that thorough cross-examination which none of the apparent beneficiaries of the Great Corruption should be allowed to escape. Any obstruction thrown in the way of his doing that, should tell for him—or, at any rate, against his enemies who do it. As an individual, every reasonable doubt should be resolved in his favor; as a public leader, all reasonable doubts should be resolved in his favor, unless there be too many of them. But the really important consideration for the American people is the Great Corruption itself. This is important not alone for the verity and the lessons of history. It is important chiefly because it must be understood by the people in order that they may crush it out of their national life, now that they have the chance.



Borrowing from "Big Business" Ethics.

President Taft's present attitude toward the question of Panama tolls may possibly be con-

sistent with his previous one, but it is amazing none the less. He argues that if the exemption of American shipping from tolls were construed as in violation of the treaty, it would be a reading into the treaty of "a surrender by the United States of its right to regulate its own commerce in its own way and by its own method." Of this right, he adds that it is one "which neither Great Britain herself nor any other nation that may use the Canal has surrendered or proposes to surrender." What does this mean? Unless we are greatly mistaken, it means that inasmuch as other nations may subsidize their own shipping out of their own treasury, we may subsidize ours out of the treasury of the Panama Canal.



But that reasoning can be valid only upon one assumption. Unless the Panama Canal is to be regarded as American, Mr. Taft's reasoning is unsound; and not only as American in point of sovereignty and administration, but in the sense also of a government revenue-raiser. Does Mr. Taft intend to claim that the United States would have the right, as matter of international amity, to make the Panama Canal more than fairly self-supporting? Does he mean that we have the right to put tolls high enough to yield a net income to the domestic revenues of the American government? If that is not his meaning, his reasoning would seem to be fatally at fault. For, unless we may fairly draw national income from Panama Canal tolls, if we wish to, we may not fairly subsidize our shipping by remitting tolls which we compel the shipping of other nations to pay.



Any other nation may indeed "regulate its own commerce in its own way and by its own method," *provided* it pays the expense out of its own treasury. Nor does anyone deny our nation that right. What is denied is the right of any nation to pay the expense of regulating its own commerce out of the maintenance-tolls of an international highway. Public utilities in the United States have been conducted in accordance with the ethics Mr. Taft seems to appeal to, but shall our government borrow from the ethics of Big Business?



Judicious Discrimination.

From his own view-point regarding politics, J. Pierpont Morgan has discriminated with characteristic good judgment if, as he is reported this