

pendent, and his success depends not upon whether the masses want him, for they do, but whether they will take the pains, regardless of their party affiliations in other respects—whether Democrat, Republican or Socialist—to scratch their tickets for Lindsey. If the masses of Denver do not respond, the classes there will gain their point, and the important social work which Judge Lindsey has begun will either stop or be perverted.

* * *

The Panama Canal Scandal.

The Chicago Daily Journal throws down a challenge to President Roosevelt and the Taft family, which cannot be ignored without exciting reasonable suspicions that certain very disquieting gossip is true. For several years this gossip has trickled into all kinds of circles,—business, social and political. It is to the effect that Mr. Taft's brother and financial backer, Mr. Charles P. Taft, together with Nelson Cromwell and Pierpont Morgan, acting in collusion with powerful persons in the Federal government, carried through, with reference to the Panama Canal, a particularly neat specimen of Morganistic financiering, to the detriment of the French investors and the American people and to the profit of one or more of the gentlemen named above. The trick consisted in buying up the French interests in the Panama Canal for a trifle and selling them to the United States for \$40,000,000, the profit being estimated at many millions. Replying to this gossip, Mr. Charles P. Taft denies all connection with and all knowledge of the Panama Canal deal. That denial must be accepted, of course, unless contrary evidence appears; even if Mr. Taft's friends, including President Roosevelt, are on record in the Haskell case against accepting denials of unproved gossip. But now the Chicago Journal comes forward with a perfectly fair challenge. Suggesting that the whole controversy can easily be settled, it says in its issue of October 14:

It must be very unpleasant to have such rumors floating about, and if Charles P. Taft will make a very simple request of his brother, the candidate for President, they can be disposed of effectively. June 3 last the new Panama Canal Company, whose stocks are the subject of these rumors, after dragging along in liquidation for four years, suddenly wound up its affairs, closed its offices, and handed over all its archives to the United States Government. June 18 Judge Taft was nominated for President. If Charles P. Taft will urge Judge W. H. Taft to urge Theodore Roosevelt to open these archives to the public, of course they will be opened. And by revealing the identity of the owners and directors of the canal company all these unpleasant rumors will be laid

by the heels. The remedy is very simple, and The Journal suggests that this plan be followed, the facts be made public, and the American people be trusted to act accordingly.

A refusal of that fair and proper challenge puts all concerned—the Republican President and the Republican Presidential candidate, as well as the candidate's brother and backer, in worse plight than they claim that Governor Haskell has dropped into. Governor Haskell has, at any rate, offered to submit his denials with reference to the Standard Oil Co. to the ordinary tests. Will President Roosevelt and Mr. Taft do as much with reference to the Panama Canal deal? If not, what shall the inference be?

* * *

The Possibility of a Judicial Murder.

In the case of Herman Billek (p. 274), the Supreme Court of the United States has dismissed the appeal to it, for lack of jurisdiction. This was to have been expected. No one could have supposed that there was jurisdiction. The appeal was fully justified, however, as a resort to technicalities to save a presumably innocent man from the gallows when the deadly noose was literally about to fall upon his shoulders and the State courts and the Governor refused to consider the merits. We say "presumably innocent" because, although Billek has been convicted of a series of murders, the principal witness for the prosecution has since confessed that under fear of official threats he committed perjury. This confession may or may not be true; and if Billek's pardon in this case would let him go scot free, the pardoning authorities might fairly hesitate. But a pardon would have no such effect. There are other indictments against him, for other deaths in the series of murders charged to his account. These have not been tried. They depend upon precisely the same evidence as that upon which he has been convicted. If he is guilty in one case he is guilty in all. Consequently a pardon in this case would have the effect virtually of giving him a new trial; for a trial for another murder, depending upon the same facts and the same evidence, would virtually be a new trial. Since the courts have decided that they cannot interfere, Billek's would seem to be of all cases one of the kind which should especially appeal to the discretion of the pardoning power—unless indeed pardons go by favor. This man ought not to hang until a jury has had opportunity to weigh the evidence against him, with the testimony of the confessed perjurer who claims to have been improperly influenced by the police and the prosecutor's office omitted. It would be a black