

and nominated one of the best tickets ever offered to the electorate of North Dakota.

In their unanimous nomination of John Burke as candidate for Governor a particularly happy choice was made of a leader of the hosts of democracy. A plain man of the people, of sterling integrity and recognized ability, possessing a nature suggestive of the kindness of a Lincoln combined with the firmness of a Jackson, he proved indeed a tower of strength to the forces working for reform and good government. The strong speaking campaign which he made in nearly every county of the State has never been equaled in the history of North Dakota politics, and the "gang" came to fear the influence of a man whose name was a synonym for honesty and who impressed his hearers everywhere with his absolute sincerity and earnestness.

Acting upon the suggestion of the "insurgent" delegates at the Jamestown convention, and in full accord with their own desire and judgment, the Democrats named Judge Fisk as their candidate for Justice of the Supreme Court. The great majority of the Republican lawyers of the State refused to support Mr. Knauf and lent their influence toward the election of the Democratic nominee, regarding whose pre-eminent fitness and qualifications for the position not the slightest question could be raised.

+

The attitude of the reform Republicans, the "insurgents," centered the fight largely upon the offices of governor and judge; and, while the main objection made to the re-election of Sarles was his entire subserviency to the railroad interests, his personal character was to some extent made an issue by the action of the Congregational, Presbyterian and Lutheran church conventions and the W. C. T. U. These different religious bodies adopted resolutions condemnatory of the character and conduct of the governor and urged support of the People's candidate, "Honest John" Burke.

While the enthusiasm did not run high on either side during the campaign, it was very noticeable that for the most part the Democratic speakers were able to secure larger audiences and better attention than their opponents, and there was a quiet undercurrent of feeling which suggested a possible surprise for one side or the other. It came on November 6th, when the Republican majority of 31,000 for Sarles of two years ago, was changed to a majority of 6,000 for Burke. Fisk was elected over Knauf by nearly 10,000. The south and west "stood pat" for the "gang," while the north and east lined up solidly under the banner of reform and good government.

With only one Democratic daily newspaper in the State it would have been difficult to get the issues squarely before a large mass of the people had it not been for the splendid support lent by the independent Republican press, which refused its allegiance to "gang rule" and "bossism" masquerading under the name of the party founded by Lincoln. To the citizens of Scandinavian birth or parentage, who by the thousands took their stand for good government and refused to be misled by appeals to party prejudice, too much credit cannot be given in any summing up of the causes which produced such a splendid result. Upon the Republican side the

fight was made for the most part on national questions, while the Democrats discussed State issues and carried on a real campaign of education. The result is a people's victory rather than a party triumph, and it serves to give notice to the railway and corporation "gang" that North Dakota has awakened from her long slumber and proposes to take her place among her sisters as a free and independent State.

EDWARD PARKER TOTTEN.

NEWS NARRATIVE

To use the reference figures of this Department for obtaining continuous news narratives:

Observe the reference figures in any article; turn back to the page they indicate and find there the next preceding article on the same subject; observe the reference figures in that article, and turn back as before; continue until you come to the earliest article on the subject; then retrace your course through the indicated pages, reading each article in chronological order, and you will have a continuous news narrative of the subject from its historical beginnings to date.

Eight days ending Wednesday, Dec. 5, 1906.

Final Session of the 59th Congress.

The 59th Congress (p. 321) met in final session on the 4th.

+ +

The President's Message.

President Roosevelt's message to Congress was read in both Houses on the 5th. It is an unusually lengthy document, in the later free literary style of Presidential messages, and concerns itself chiefly with economic questions. Its principal recommendations relate to campaign contributions from corporations, appeals by the prosecution and other questions of practice in criminal cases, labor injunctions, the lynching of Negroes, conflicts between employers and employed, employers' liability for personal injuries to workmen caused by the negligence of other workmen in the same employment, the conservation of government coal lands, regulation of corporations, inheritance and income taxes, industrial training in schools, agricultural education, irrigation and forest reserves, marriage and divorce, subsidizing American shipping, currency reform, the Philippines, Porto Rico, Hawaii, Alaska, the anti-Japanese agitation in California, the Cuban situation, sealing in Alaska, and the maintenance of international peace by means of large national armament.

+

On the subject of campaign contributions the President recommends a law prohibiting all corporations from contributing to the campaign funds of any political party.

+

Regarding labor injunctions he recommends laws against judicial abuse of labor injunctions, while retaining them for the restraint of violence or intimidation, especially by conspiracy.

+

The question of Negro lynching draws out from the President a recommendation of capital punishment for rape.

When he comes to consider the labor question in broad outline, he finds "one matter more important to remember than aught else, and that is the infinite harm done by preachers of mere discontent;" although he regards as "equally base but no baser" "that other creature" "who in a spirit of greed, or to accumulate or add to an already huge fortune, seeks to exploit his fellow Americans with callous disregard to their welfare of soul and body."

✦

The most significant, perhaps, of the President's economic recommendations is that with reference to government coal lands. On this subject he says:

It is not wise that the nation should alienate its remaining coal lands. I have temporarily withdrawn from settlement all the lands which the geological survey has indicated as containing, or in all probability containing, coal. The question, however, can be properly settled only by legislation, which in my judgment should provide for the withdrawal of these lands from sale or from entry, save in certain special circumstances. The ownership would then remain in the United States, which should not, however, attempt to work them, but permit them to be worked by private individuals under a royalty system, the government keeping such control as to permit it to see that no excessive price was charged consumers. It would, of course, be as necessary to supervise the rates charged by the common carriers to transport the product as the rates charged by those who mine it, and the supervision must extend to the conduct of the common carriers, so that they shall in no way favor one competitor at the expense of another. The withdrawal of these coal lands would constitute a policy analogous to that which has been followed in withdrawing the forest lands from ordinary settlement. The coal, like the forests, should be treated as the property of the public and its disposal should be under conditions which would inure to the benefit of the public as a whole.

✦

But the most revolutionary of the recommendations are those with reference to inheritance and income taxes:

There are many kinds of taxes which can only be levied by the general government so as to produce the best results, because, among other reasons, the attempt to impose them in one particular State too often results merely in driving the corporation or individual affected to some other locality or other State. The national government has long derived its chief revenue from a tariff on imports and from an internal or excise tax. In addition to these there is every reason why, when next our system of taxation is revised, the national government should impose a graduated inheritance tax, and, if possible, a graduated income tax. The man of great wealth owes a peculiar obligation to the state, because he derives special advantages from the mere existence of government. Not only should he recognize his obligation in the way he leads his daily life and in the way he earns and spends his money, but it should also be recognized by the way in which he pays for the protection the state gives him. On the one hand, it is desirable that he should assume his full and proper share of the burden of taxation; on the other hand, it is quite as necessary that in this kind of taxation, where the men who vote the tax pay but little of it, there should be clear recognition of the danger of inaugurating any such system save in a spirit of entire justice and moderation. Whenever we as a people undertake to remodel our taxation system along the lines suggested we must make it clear beyond peradventure that our aim is to distribute the burden of supporting the government more equitably than at present; that we intend to treat

rich man and poor man on a basis of absolute equality, and that we regard it as equally fatal to true democracy to do or permit injustice to the one as to do or permit injustice to the other. I am well aware that such a subject as this needs long and careful study in order that the people may become familiar with what is proposed to be done, may clearly see the necessity of proceeding with wisdom and self-restraint and may make up their minds just how far they are willing to go in the matter; while only trained legislators can work out the project in necessary detail. But I feel that in the near future our national legislators should enact a law providing for a graduated inheritance tax by which a steadily increasing rate of duty should be put upon all moneys or other valuables coming by gift, bequest or devise to any individual or corporation. It may be well to make the tax heavy in proportion as the individual benefited is remote of kin. In any event, in my judgment, the pro rata of the tax should increase very heavily with the increase of the amount left to any one individual after a certain point has been reached. It is most desirable to encourage thrift and ambition, and a potent source of thrift and ambition is the desire on the part of the breadwinner to leave his children well off. This object can be obtained by making the tax very small on moderate amounts of property left, because the prime object should be to put a constantly increasing burden on the inheritance of those swollen fortunes which it is certainly of no benefit to this country to perpetuate. There can be no question of the ethical propriety of the government's thus determining the conditions upon which any gift or inheritance should be received. Exactly how far the inheritance tax would, as an incident, have the effect of limiting the transmission by devise or gift of the enormous fortunes in question it is not necessary at present to discuss. It is wise that progress in this direction should be gradual. At first a permanent national inheritance tax, while it might be more substantial than any such tax has hitherto been, need not approximate, either in amount or in the extent of the increase by graduation, to what such tax should ultimately be. This species of tax has again and again been imposed, although only temporarily, by the national government. It was first imposed by the act of July 6, 1797, when the makers of the Constitution were alive and at the head of affairs. It was a graduated tax; though small in amount, the rate was increased with the amount left to any individual, exceptions being made in the case of certain close kin. A similar tax was again imposed by the act of July 1, 1862; a minimum sum of \$1,000 in personal property being excepted from taxation, the tax then becoming progressive according to the remoteness of kin. The war revenue act of June 13, 1898, provided for an inheritance tax on any sum exceeding the value of \$10,000, the rate of the tax increasing both in accordance with the amounts left and in accordance with the legatee's remoteness of kin. The Supreme Court has held that the succession tax imposed at the time of the Civil War was not a direct tax, but an impost or excise, which was both constitutional and valid. More recently the court, in an opinion delivered by Mr. Justice White, which contained an exceedingly able and elaborate discussion of the powers of the congress to impose death duties, sustained the constitutionality of the inheritance-tax feature of the war revenue act of 1898. In its incidents, and apart from the main purpose of raising revenue, an income tax stands on an entirely different footing from an inheritance tax, because it involves no question of the perpetuation of fortunes swollen to an unhealthy size. The question is in its essence a question of the proper adjustment of burdens to benefits. As the law now stands it is undoubtedly difficult to devise a national income tax which shall be constitutional. But whether it is absolutely impossible is another question; and if possible it is most certainly desirable. The first purely

income-tax law was past by the Congress in 1861, but the most important law dealing with the subject was that of 1894. This the Court held to be unconstitutional. The question is undoubtedly very intricate, delicate and troublesome. The decision of the Court was only reached by one majority. It is the law of the land, and of course is accepted as such and loyally obeyed by all good citizens. Nevertheless, the hesitation evidently felt by the court as a whole in coming to a conclusion, when considered together with the previous decisions on the subject, may perhaps indicate the possibility of devising a constitutional income-tax law which shall substantially accomplish the results aimed at. The difficulty of amending the Constitution is so great that only real necessity can justify a resort thereto. Every effort should be made in dealing with this subject, as with the subject of the proper control by the national government over the use of corporate wealth in inter-State business, to devise legislation which without such action shall attain the desired end; but if this fails, there will ultimately be no alternative to a constitutional amendment.

+

The President's recommendation as to marriage and divorce is a Constitutional amendment relegating the whole question to the authority of Congress.

+

Without making any specific recommendation on currency reform, the President urges the "need for the adoption of some system which shall be automatic and open to all sound banks, so as to avoid all possibility of discrimination and favoritism," whereby money stringency may be relieved when it occurs. To emphasize this belief he directs attention to the plan of Secretary Shaw of the Treasury Department, according to which "national banks should be permitted to issue a specified proportion of their capital in notes of a given kind, the issue to be taxed at so high a rate as to drive the notes back when not wanted in legitimate trade."

+

The recommendation regarding the Philippines calls for "a lower tariff or else absolute free trade in Philippine products," with the explanation that—

No harm will come to any American industry; and while there will be some small but real material benefit to the Filipinos, the main benefit will come by the showing made as to our purpose to do all in our power for their welfare. So far our action in the Philippines has been abundantly justified, not mainly and indeed not primarily because of the added dignity it has given us as a nation by proving that we are capable honorably and efficiently to bear the international burdens which a mighty people should bear, but even more because of the immense benefit that has come to the people of the Philippine Islands. In these islands we are steadily introducing both liberty and order to a greater degree than their people have ever before known. We have secured justice. We have provided an efficient police force and have put down ladorism. Only in the islands of Leyte and Samar is the authority of our government resisted, and this by wild mountain tribes under the superstitious inspiration of fakirs and pseudo-religious leaders. We are constantly increasing the measure of liberty accorded the islanders, and next spring, if conditions warrant, we shall take a great stride forward in testing their capacity for self-government by summoning the first Filipino legislative assembly; and the way in which they stand this test will largely determine whether the self-government thus granted will be increased or decreased; for if we have erred at all in the Philippines it has been in proceeding too rapidly in

the direction of granting a large measure of self-government. We are building roads. We have, for the immeasurable good of the people, arranged for the building of railroads. Let us also see to it that they are given free access to our markets. This nation owes no more imperative duty to itself and mankind than the duty of managing the affairs of all the islands under the American flag—the Philippines, Porto Rico and Hawaii—so as to make it evident that it is in every way to their advantage that the flag should fly over them.

+

In the same general connection American citizenship for Porto Ricans, small land holdings in Hawaii, and fair trade across the Pacific, are recommended; and Cuba is warned that if insurrections are continued her independence will no longer be recognized.

+

An extraordinary commotion, especially in the Pacific Coast States, has been caused by the President's recommendation regarding the treatment of Japanese in the United States, of which his message says:

It is a mistake, and it betrays a spirit of foolish cynicism, to maintain that all international governmental action is and must ever be based upon mere selfishness, and that to advance ethical reasons for such action is always a sign of hypocrisy. This is no more necessarily true of the action of governments than of the action of individuals. It is a sure sign of a base nature always to ascribe base motives for the actions of others. Unquestionably no nation can afford to disregard proper considerations of self-interest any more than a private individual can so do. But it is equally true that the average private individual in any really decent community does many actions with reference to other men in which he is guided, not by self-interest, but by public spirit, by regard for the rights of others, by a disinterested purpose to do good to others and to raise the tone of the community as a whole. Similarly, a really great nation must often act, and as a matter of fact often does act, toward other nations in a spirit not in the least of mere self-interest, but paying heed chiefly to ethical reasons; and as the centuries go by this disinterestedness in international action, this tendency of the individuals comprising a nation to require that nation to act with justice toward its neighbors, steadily grows and strengthens. It is neither wise nor right for a nation to disregard its own needs, and it is foolish—and may be wicked—to think that other nations will disregard theirs. But it is wicked for a nation only to regard its own interest, and foolish to believe that such is the sole motive that actuates any other nation. It should be our steady aim to raise the ethical standard of national action just as we strive to raise the ethical standard of individual action. Not only must we treat all nations fairly, but we must treat with justice and good will all immigrants who come here under the law. Whether they are Catholic or Protestant, Jew or Gentile, whether they come from England or Germany, Russia, Japan or Italy, matters nothing. All we have a right to question is the man's conduct. If he is honest and upright in his dealings with his neighbor and with the state, then he is entitled to respect and good treatment. Especially do we need to remember our duty to the stranger within our gates. It is the sure mark of a low civilization, a low morality, to abuse or discriminate against or in any way humiliate such stranger who has come here lawfully and who is conducting himself properly. To remember this is incumbent on every American citizen, and it is of course peculiarly incumbent on every government official, whether of the nation or of the several States. I am prompted to say this by the

attitude of hostility here and there assumed toward the Japanese in this country. This hostility is sporadic and is limited to a very few places. Nevertheless, it is most discreditable to us as a people, and it may be fraught with the greatest consequences to the nation. The friendship between the United States and Japan has been continuous since the time, over half a century ago, when Commodore Perry, by his expedition to Japan, first opened the islands to western civilization. Since then the growth of Japan has been literally astounding. There is not only nothing to parallel it, but nothing to approach it in the history of civilized mankind. Japan has a glorious and ancient past. Her civilization is older than that of the nations of northern Europe—the nations from whom the people of the United States have chiefly sprung. But fifty years ago Japan's development was still that of the middle ages. During that fifty years the progress of the country in every walk in life has been a marvel to mankind, and she now stands as one of the greatest of civilized nations; great in the arts of war and in the arts of peace; great in military, in industrial, in artistic development and achievement. Japanese soldiers and sailors have shown themselves equal in combat to any of whom history makes note. She has produced great generals and mighty admirals; her fighting men, afloat and ashore, show all the heroic courage, the unquestioning, unflinching loyalty, the splendid indifference to hardship and death, which marked the Loyal Ronins; and they show also that they possess the highest ideal of patriotism. Japanese artists of every kind see their products eagerly sought for in all lands. The industrial and commercial development of Japan has been phenomenally greater than that of any other country during the same period. At the same time the advance in science and philosophy is no less marked. The admirable management of the Japanese Red Cross during the late war, the efficiency and humanity of the Japanese officials, nurses and doctors, won the respectful admiration of all acquainted with the facts. Through the Red Cross the Japanese people sent over \$100,000 to the sufferers of San Francisco, and the gift was accepted with gratitude by our people. The courtesy of the Japanese, nationally and individually, has become proverbial. To no other country has there been such an increasing number of visitors from this land as to Japan. In return, Japanese have come here in great numbers. They are welcome, socially and intellectually, in all our colleges and institutions of higher learning, in all our professional and social bodies. The Japanese have won in a single generation the right to stand abreast of the foremost and most enlightened peoples of Europe and America; they have won on their own merits and by their own exertions the right to treatment on a basis of full and frank equality. The overwhelming mass of our people cherish a lively regard and respect for the people of Japan, and in almost every quarter of the Union the stranger from Japan is treated as he deserves—that is, he is treated as the stranger from any part of civilized Europe is and deserves to be treated. But here and there a most unworthy feeling has manifested itself toward the Japanese—the feeling that has been shown in shutting them out from the common schools in San Francisco and in mutterings against them in one or two other places, because of their efficiency as workers. To shut them out from the public schools is a wicked absurdity when there are no first-class colleges in the land, including the universities and colleges of California, which do not gladly welcome Japanese students and on which Japanese students do not reflect credit. We have as much to learn from Japan as Japan has to learn from us, and no nation is fit to teach unless it is also willing to learn. Throughout Japan Americans are well treated, and any failure on the part of Americans at home to treat the Japanese with a like courtesy and consideration is by just so much a confession of inferiority in

our civilization. Our nation fronts on the Pacific just as it fronts on the Atlantic. We hope to play a constantly growing part in the great ocean of the orient. We wish, as we ought to wish, for a great commercial development in our dealings with Asia, and it is out of the question that we should permanently have such development unless we freely and gladly extend to other nations the same measure of justice and good treatment which we expect to receive in return. It is only a very small body of our citizens that act badly. Where the Federal government has power it will deal summarily with any such. Where the several States have power I earnestly ask that they also deal wisely and promptly with such conduct, or else this small body of wrongdoers may bring shame upon the great mass of their innocent and right-thinking fellows—that is, upon our nation as a whole. Good manners should be an international no less than an individual attribute. I ask fair treatment for the Japanese as I would ask fair treatment for Germans or Englishmen, Frenchmen, Russians or Italians. I ask it as due to humanity and civilization. I ask it as due to ourselves because we must act uprightly toward all men.

The President thereupon recommends to Congress the enactment of a law "specifically providing for the naturalization of Japanese who come here intending to become citizens," and announces that under the laws as they stand he will do everything in his power to protect Japanese residents, adding that—all of the forces, military and civil, of the United States, which I may lawfully employ, will be so employed. There should, however, be no particle of doubt as to the power of the national government completely to perform and enforce its own obligations to other nations. The mob of a single city may at any time perform acts of lawless violence against some class of foreigners which would plunge us into war. That city by itself would be powerless to make defense against the foreign power thus assaulted, and if independent of this government it would never venture to perform or permit the performance of the acts complained of. The entire power and the whole duty to protect the offending city or the offending community lies in the hands of the United States government. It is unthinkable that we should continue a policy under which a given locality may be allowed to commit a crime against a friendly nation, and the United States government be limited, not to preventing the commission of the crime, but, in the last resort, to defend the people who have committed it against the consequences of their own wrongdoing.

* *

Changes in the Cabinet.

At the opening of Congress the President nominated to the Senate, William H. Moody for Associate Justice of the Supreme Court; and the following cabinet officers: George B. Cortelyou for Secretary of the Treasury; Charles J. Bonaparte, for Attorney General; Geo. L. Von Meyer, for Postmaster General; Victor H. Metcalf, for Secretary of the Navy; James R. Garfield, for Secretary of the Interior; and Oscar L. Straus, for Secretary of Commerce and Labor.

* *

Cuban Elections Annulled.

Governor Magoon (p. 678) announced on the 2d to twenty-five of the forty-three Cuban congressmen elected last year, that a decree is to be issued shortly under the specific authority of President Roosevelt, declaring vacant from October 12, 1906, all seats of members of congress elected September 1, 1905.