

sir, it's to hide the dirt on the wall!" That is precisely the reason why the flag is flaunted now. What the secretive investigating committee of the Senate could not do by suppression, the flag and a choice assortment of patriotic epithets are expected to do by intimidation.

One of the characteristic things about the Philippine controversy has been the disposition on the part of the imperialists not only to suppress testimony calculated to open up sources of information, but to fill the record with one-sided stories. The most remarkable instance of this is the publication by the war department a few days ago, of documents alleged to indicate that Aguinaldo began the present war, while the Senate "investigating" committee refuses to allow him to be a witness. The Lodge-Roosevelt-Root coterie patterns after the judge who always disliked hearing both sides of a case because it confused him. But even without Aguinaldo's testimony, an unbiased mind cannot be influenced by these documents. To begin with, they purport to be in Aguinaldo's handwriting. Since forgery is one of the arts of war practiced and defended by American military officers in the Philippines, the genuineness of the handwriting comes at once into serious question. And suspicion is not allayed by the fact that the documents are said to have been captured by Gen. Funston. But even if the documents prove, in spite of these questionable circumstances, to be genuine, they cannot cast the onus of beginning the war upon Aguinaldo or his government. For they bear date as late as January, 1899. If the war had opened in February, when the fighting began, they might have some significance, if not forged. But the beginning of the war antedates the beginning of the fighting by several weeks. War was declared by the president of the United States as early as December, 1898. This is the record evidence. When President McKinley, by his proclamation of that time, asserted American sovereignty over the

Philippine archipelago and announced his intention of enforcing his proclamation with arms, he virtually declared war against the Filipino republic, which was then, and this also is record evidence, peaceably governing everywhere in the Christian islands except in Manila. Whatever the Filipinos did between then and the outbreak of hostilities was purely defensive. Responsibility for beginning the war in January, 1899, cannot be placed upon Aguinaldo and his followers so long as American official documents exist which prove that it was begun by Mr. McKinley in December, 1898.

The meat trust prosecution suggests to the Red Wing Argus, that watchful and bright Democratic weekly of Minnesota, the advisability of utilizing the "water cure," as discovered and applied by Americans in the Philippines, for domestic purposes. Since much difficulty is experienced in getting evidence against the trust, owing to the secretiveness of its members, the Argus asks—

Well, then, why not try the water cure?

Witnesses from the Philippines say it is harmless and refreshing. When they suspected natives of having guns, they applied it, and, they add, "we got the guns" The government suspects these men of using instruments of warfare against the people of the United States, but the evidence is concealed. Imagine one of Knox's lieutenants coming in to report: "We applied the water cure," and grinning, "we got the evidence."

You can't imagine it; it is unthinkable? Thank God it is unthinkable. And yet the police in the large cities use daily devices of that sort, what they call the sweat-box method, against vulgar criminals. Where they know a man is guilty, but have no evidence, where they suspect he is guilty, where they believe he ought to be guilty if he isn't, they put him in the sweat box. Wherein is it worse before the law to apply the sweat box method to Morgan or Rockefeller or Armour or Swift, than to Red Leary or Six-Fingered Jake? Are they not equal before the law, are they not presumed to be innocent until they are proved guilty?

If the gravity of the offense is to measure the severity of the means employed to gain evidence, the argument is all on the side of applying it to the

conspirators, against the people. Red Leary snatches a pocketbook; the beef trust takes the meat out of the mouths of whole communities. Six-Fingered Jake pilfers a handkerchief; the great robbers loot a continent.

Out of all the futile fuss in connection with the prosecution of the beef trust, one encouraging fact emerges. The officers of the government announce their intention of proving that for many years the trust has enjoyed an almost prohibitory advantage under secret rebate agreements with the railroads. The existence of these agreements has been disclosed by the Interstate Commerce Commission, which attributes to them the very possibility of the trust. And the commission is right. It is by means of monopoly privileges, held directly as in the case of railroads and other owners of valuable public franchises, or held indirectly as in the case of the meat trust under secret contracts with railroads, that trusts can exist. That is the key to the whole trust problem. No oppressive trust can be made by combinations of competitive businesses. If such combinations were to become dictatorial, they would be met at once by new competitors. But when combinations include special privileges, created by law, then competition is checked and ceases to have its normal power of regulating business. If the attorney general has in good faith set about exposing the privileges which the meat trust enjoys, his success in the court may be followed by the collapse of the trust. But, unless it can be deprived of special privileges, any court victory he may gain will be barren.

While the United States Senate pigeon holes the proposed constitutional amendment for the election of senators by popular vote, the people of Oregon are about to test a device for effecting the same object without the consent of the federal government. A recent law of that state provides that any state convention may make a nomination for United States senator, and that such nominee shall be entitled to have his name on the