

community, we find leading citizens in the ring to rob their own neighbors, managers of corporations bribing law-makers, lawyers for pay helping their clients to bribe safely, jurors refusing to render just verdicts.

These men—bribers of voters, voters who are bribed, bribers of aldermen and legislators, and aldermen and legislators who are bribed, men who secure control of law-making bodies and have laws passed which enable them to steal from their neighbors, men who have laws non-enforced and break laws regulating saloons, gambling houses, and, in short, all men who pervert and befool the sources of law—these men we have called Enemies of the Republic.

They are worse—they are enemies of the human race. They are destroyers of a people.

They constitute a class of criminals very different from ordinary criminals who break laws; these men destroy law.

Then the symposium concludes:

Our governments—city, county, and state—are inefficient and sometimes criminal. Under inefficient government the strong individual oppresses the weak. Take, for example, the extraordinary story of the Standard Oil company, with its years of successfully crushing competition, that practically deprived men of their property and their business, with its control and selfish use of railroads that were given their franchise by the state for the good and equal use of all. A despotic government could do no worse.

It is well for public interests that publications like McClure's undertake the task of impressing truths upon the people even though those truths are unpalatable. The remedy lies in the enforcement of law—the enforcement of law against the strong as well as against the weak; and law will be enforced in this way whenever the good citizen pays proper attention to his duties as a citizen, casting his vote for those principles which, after careful study, he believes will best serve the public interests and voting for candidates for public office whose character and record justify the belief that they will be servants of the people rather than the tools of designing men.

Sneers For Faithful Servants

It has been charged that the Atchison, Topeka and Santa Fe railroad, during the time that Paul Morton, now secretary of the navy, was one of its vice presidents, violated the law by giving rebates and that the action of the railroad's traffic manager in this respect has been publicly approved by Mr. Morton.

Representative Baker of New York introduced in the house a resolution quoting that portion of the president's message which declared that it is necessary to put a stop to rebates, and providing for an investigation as to Mr. Morton's responsibility.

The Washington correspondent for the Chicago Tribune, a republican paper, refers to the Baker resolution as "this piece of impertinence," and says that Mr. Baker has so "exceeded the bounds of common decency that some of the republican leaders favor his expulsion, or at least a public reprimand."

Walter Wellman, Washington correspondent for the Chicago Record-Herald, also a republican paper, says:

The author of these resolutions is known far and wide as "Baker, the anti-pass crank." He attracted much attention a year ago by refusing to accept passes from railroad companies. In the house he has been a well-meaning, but eccentric, member, with a penchant for objecting to everything in sight and a habit of making the most passionate speeches denouncing somebody or something, whilst his fellow members stand around and roar with laughter. No one except Baker takes him seriously, and of course his resolutions will be laughed out of court.

Is it or is it not significant that a man, who, being elected to represent the people in congress, was so conscientious that he refused to accept railroad passes, brings upon himself the sneers and the jeers of republican newspapers?

When these newspapers have no word of criticism for the public official who accepts favors at the hands of these great corporations, should not a conscientious official who refuses to accept such favors, be at least exempt from the attacks of newspapers whose editors claim to be striving for the elevation of the country's moral tone?

It would seem that Mr. Morton and his friends should be anxious for the widest publicity concerning Mr. Morton's connection with the rebates given by the railroad company with which he was formerly associated. Mr. Roosevelt has formally declared that rebates must cease and we are told that he is about to enter upon a great campaign on these lines with Mr. Morton, because of his great railroad experience, as his chief advisor. To say the least, the confidence men may have in Mr. Roosevelt's sincerity on this point is not increased by the knowledge that his chief advisor is a railroad man himself, and one who is charged with having publicly sanctioned, if not privately engineered, the bad practice against which Mr. Roosevelt has inveighed.

It will occur to a great many people that Mr. Baker is not the man under trial and that he owes no apology to the people because he refused to accept corporation favors or because he took steps toward an inquiry into the conduct of a high public official. Whatever explanation may be due, is due from Mr. Morton.

These sneering references to Representative Baker do no credit to their authors. No word has ever been uttered affecting Mr. Baker's integrity. The only thing ever charged against him has been that when he entered his official duties he refused to accept favors at the hands of men who were seeking special privileges from congress and that he has been active in his efforts to bring about reforms in public affairs.

In the senate and the house are many men whose pockets are filled with railroad passes and other forms of corporation favors. Whatever these men do in an official way it seems to please the corporation managers. These men are conservative—"eminently conservative." They have spent sleepless nights in the effort, generally successful, to strangle measures that have been framed in the public interest. Day after day and year after year these men have voted in favor of corporation measures; they have, with cheerful abandon, voted public money into private pockets; they have publicly supported measures, some of which even the most truculent of republican newspapers have not dared openly to defend. Yet we do not find in the columns of republican newspapers any sneering allusions to these men; they are not "anti-pass cranks;" they are "statesmen!"

In the senate as in the house there are men who have repeatedly been branded as the special representatives of great corporations but no word of criticism concerning this form of representation in our national body has found its way into republican newspapers.

New York will re-elect one railroad senator, Minnesota will re-elect another railroad senator, Nebraska will elect a senator who was chosen by the railroads and one will search republican newspapers in vain to find any sneers at these men. They will go to Washington, not as the faithful representatives of the people but as the pliant tools of special interests. All the world knows this to be true. No one knows it better than the republican editors who seek to place the brand of infamy upon Baker, the conscientious public servant, while they place the halo of purity above the heads of those men who, chosen for the senate and the house by the corporation lobbyists, are to become the representatives of the corporations, rather than the champions of public interests.

Why Do They Dodge

The Sioux City, Ia., Journal, a republican paper, seeks to make light of Bourke Cockran's bill providing for the establishment of a commission to inquire into and ascertain the amounts of money expended by the democratic and the republican parties at all presidential elections from 1892 to 1904, inclusive. The Journal refers to the fact that Mr. Cockran supported the republican candidate for president in 1896 and makes certain references to "Cockran's campaign earnings." Certain republican leaders, Mr. Dalzell of Pennsylvania among the number, as well as several republican editors have insinuated that Mr. Cockran was paid for his services to the republican party in 1896. Mr. Cockran indignantly denied these charges and he has shown that he is not only perfectly willing but anxious for an investigation. This is all to Mr. Cockran's credit. But it will be observed that the objections to the Cockran resolution comes from republican leaders and republican editors. What are these gentlemen afraid of? Would they have the public understand that the record of the "party of God and morality" will not bear inspection? Would they have the public imagine that there is any truth in the charge made by Thomas W. Lawson that a few days prior to the election day of

1896 a "hurry-up call" was made and answered for \$5,000,000, the same to be used for the purpose of "buying a bunch of states?"

A Poor Excuse

The New York Times has refused to publish Thomas W. Lawson's advertisements, which advertisements have been admitted to the columns of many other newspapers. In an editorial the Times explains:

As a justifying reason for their exclusion from its columns it is sufficient to say that the Times is not that kind of newspaper; those responsible for its character and contents do not care to make that kind of newspaper. The Times does not believe the charges which Mr. Lawson makes against some of the greatest corporations in the country, corporations managed by boards of trustees including many of the chief men in the country, men in whom the public has entire confidence, men who are the custodians of hundreds of millions of the people's savings. If the Times did believe Mr. Lawson's charges it would itself begin a rigorous investigation, and it would print the results, not in its advertising columns, but upon its news pages, as information which it would be a newspaper's duty to lay before its readers.

But Mr. Lawson has been very explicit in his statements. He has given the Times all information necessary to the commencement of "a rigorous investigation." Why does not the Times act upon this information? Why does it not take the hints furnished by Mr. Lawson and begin that investigation, printing the results as it says, "not in its advertising columns but upon its news pages."

It is true that "that would be information which it would be a newspaper's duty to lay before its readers." Then why does not the New York Times discharge its duty to its readers? It is not a question of whether the Times believes that Lawson's charges are true. If those charges are false it is no less the Times' duty to expose their falsity than it would be the duty of the Times to present the fact that the charges were true. Mr. Lawson's statements have been so clear and explicit that a newspaper would have little difficulty in finding a basis upon which to rest "a rigorous investigation." The Times should make that "rigorous investigation" to the end that if its opinion that Lawson has misrepresented the facts be sustained, the Times readers may learn the truth and so, also, if the result shall be that Lawson's accusations are confirmed the Times readers will not remain in ignorance.

Railroads Oppose Regulation

President Marvin Hughitt of the Northwestern railroad announces his unalterable opposition to President Roosevelt's plan of giving the interstate commerce commission power to fix railroad rates. Mr. Hughitt, speaking to a committee of the Sioux City Economical club, said:

We are always interested with the wishes of people on our lines, and try to meet every demand of business, but you gentlemen do not realize, Congress does not realize, the country does not realize, the tremendous seriousness of the questions the president raises in his message. This proposal of the government making our rates means, if it be carried into effect, that the capacity of the railroads to make extensions and improvements will depend on the willingness of a commission to allow them to earn the wherewithal.

It means that all competition will be done away with, for there can be no competition when uniformity is enforced by government. It means that there will be no use for cities to seek advantages or to keep their eyes open to extend their trade territory opportunities. Because under the arbitrary system proposed every city would be confined to its own little garden plot of trade territory and there would be no chance of extending it.

The country does realize the tremendous seriousness of the question and it is because of the tremendous tax levied upon the country by the railroads that the question has become tremendously serious. President Hughitt is trying to scare the people by threatening to withhold improvements, extensions, etc., but the people know it is not necessary to pay dividends upon watered stock in order to secure the necessary railroad facilities.

President Hughitt also brings out another