

syndicate profits of "James H. Hyde and associates." Mr. Alexander is now ill, and the money was turned over by his son, Henry M. Alexander. The New York correspondent for the Baltimore Sun says: "The restitution of the syndicate profits was absolute and unaccompanied by any condition or reservation. Henry M. Alexander sent to Mr. Morton a letter enclosing a check for \$25,053.22 and a release of the \$40,790.54, which his father deposited with Cashier Murray, of the Equitable on February 1 last, pending decision as to the propriety of retaining the money. The restitution is considered the most important victory won by the state officials who are moving to compel the restoration of money alleged to have been obtained improperly by officers and directors of the Equitable by virtue of their connection with the society. Moreover, the statement is made in authoritative quarters that Attorney General Mayer and his advisers would not be largely surprised if the restitution of other sums should follow within the next few days or weeks."

IDA M. TARBELL has written for McClure's an interesting description of the Standard Oil magnate. Miss Tarbell says: "John D. Rockefeller, measured by our national ambition, is the most successful man in the world—the man who has got the most of what men want. How did he get it, the eager youth asks, and, asking, strives to imitate him as nearly as ability and patience permit. Thus he has become an inspirer of American ideals, and his methods have been crystallized into a great national commercial code. Nor is this all. Mr. Rockefeller distributes money in charity and in endowments. If not our first, he is certainly our second philanthropist; the amount of the money given being the standard. All over the land those who direct great educational, charitable and religious institutions are asking: 'Can we not get something from him?' Receiving his bequests, they become at least the tacit supporters of the thing for which he stands—that is, John D. Rockefeller exercises a powerful control over the very sources of American intellectual and religious inspiration. Now a man who possesses this kind of influence can not be allowed to live in the dark. The public not only has the right to know what sort of a man he is; it is the duty of the public to know. How else can the public discharge the most solemn obligation it owes to itself and to the future, to keep the springs of its higher life clean? Who, then, is this John D. Rockefeller? Whence did he come? By what qualities did he grow to such power? Has he proved his right to the power? Does he give to the public whence he has drawn his wealth a just return in ideas, in patriotism, in devotion to social betterment, in generous living, in inspiring personal character? Has John D. Rockefeller made good? From time immemorial men who have risen to power have had to face this question. Kings, tyrants, chieftains, since the world began have stood or have fallen as they have convinced the public that they were giving or not giving a just return for the power allowed them. The time is here when Mr. Rockefeller must face the verdict of the public by which he lives."

WILLIAM COURT GULLY has retired from the office of speaker of the house of commons and his successor is James William Lowther. A writer in the London Mail says: "Lord Russell, Mr. Herschell, and Mr. Gully were contemporaries on the northern circuit more than thirty years ago, and all three at one time contemplated emigrating and becoming colonial barristers, despairing of obtaining remunerative work in this country. Mr. Gully had, when an undergraduate, been president of the Union at Cambridge, and has now lived to receive both Oxford and Cambridge honor degrees, besides the freedom of Carlisle. What a change has come over the tenor of his life in the last thirty years! He might have lived and led an unknown barrister at Lagos or Bermuda; he will now, having been speaker of the house of commons for ten years, be presented with a viscounty and the well-earned pension of £4,000 a year. Many long sittings has Mr. Gully seen in his time. Possibly the longest was on an occasion when the house met on a Tuesday at 3 o'clock—this was before the rules were changed—and sat until 10:30 on Wednesday morning. On that day at 12 he resumed his seat in the chair, and sat until 5:30 that same afternoon, with the additional burden of an official dinner which followed. It may, therefore, be said that he was on duty on that occasion for twenty-four and a half hours."

REFERRING to Mr. Lowther the Mail writer says: "He has been chairman of committees since 1895, and has won increasing respect in the house for his impartiality and valuable work both as chairman of committees and deputy-speaker of the house, and by his invariable good temper in the chair. I venture to prophesy that he will be a great success when invested with the full degree of authority and power of the speaker, and he will find the preservation of order more easy and the attention which the house gives him more complete. Mr. Lowther's training has been totally different from that of Mr. Speaker Gully. Brought up as the son of a country gentleman, he has taken part in all field sports and is devoted to the country and country life. On the other hand he has had no special legal training like Mr. Gully, who was Q. C. and Recorder of Wigan when he was elected to the chair."

ONE week's happenings pertaining to "graft" are presented by the New York World in this way: "Tuesday, June 20—President Roosevelt dismisses Minister Bowen for 'graft' in connection with Venezuelan mission, but refuses to remove Assistant Secretary of State Loomis, involved in the same transaction. Wednesday, June 21—President Roosevelt, in an open letter, lauds Secretary of the Navy Morton, a self-confessed violator of the law, and the new head of the Equitable Life Assurance society. Wednesday, June 21—New York state legislature convened in special session to investigate charges of 'graft' against Supreme Court Justice Warren B. Hooker. Wednesday, June 21—Superintendent of Insurance Hendricks reported that the charges of 'graft' made against the Equitable directors and officials had been established and sent the evidence to the attorney general of the state and the district attorney of New York county. Thursday, June 22—Attorney General Mayer announced proceedings against Equitable officials and directors to compel restitution of the company's money illegally diverted to personal uses. Friday, June 23—President Roosevelt despatches Assistant Secretary of State Loomis on a confidential foreign mission, although the latter had been reprimanded for his connection with the Venezuelan 'graft' by Secretary Taft, the executive head of his department."

THE strangest quest on record is referred to by the Johnstown Democrat in this way: "One Jimmie Click has departed for the darkest depths of Africa on perhaps the strangest mission that ever induced a man to dare death in the jungle. Click is an animal catcher of varied experience and great skill. He has trapped lions and captured fierce tigers. He has made many trips into the wilderness. He has always been successful. He has always come back with the thing he went for. This time Click has departed in search of a very small but ferocious animal. He is searching for a flea. Baron Rothschild, the London millionaire, has a vast collection of fleas. He keeps them in a glass case and has spent a fortune in gathering from all parts of the globe specimens of his favorite man-eater. Rothschild finds no pleasure in the display, however. He is unhappy because there is still one stray flea, one kind that he does not have in his collection. This flea is missing, and the baron will not be happy until he gets it. Ever since the world began the poor have envied the rich. It now appears that there has been no cause for such a feeling. The poor have always had plenty of fleas and without price. In spite of this fact a multi-millionaire longs for a single flea that with all of his money he has been unable to buy. Scientists have searched the world for it. An expedition went to Alaska seeking it. And now Click proposes to rake Africa with a fine-tooth comb. The rare and exclusive flea is known as the 'simmy' and the price offered for it by Rothschild is \$15,000. The difficulty of catching a flea is proverbial. But the sending of an expert into Africa to catch one is something new. Generally there is not the slightest objection when a flea gets lost and stays lost. The spectacle is a peculiar one. Here is a man with money, position, rank—everything. He has all that the ordinary mortal ever desires in his dreams. Yet he is not happy. He is pining for a flea. Evidently there is no such thing as contentment in the world."

WRITING in McClure's for July Henry Beach Needham says: "At West Point in 1904 football cost only \$5,721.88, as against \$15,346.51 at Harvard and \$26,996.06 at Yale. West Point

defeated Yale at football, therefore a comparison between the two of expenses in this branch of athletics is reasonable. Yale expended for 'merchandise and sporting goods, shoes and repairs,' \$4,924.52—double the amount, \$2,074.16, which West Point expended for 'material' (includes medicines as well as athletic goods and shoes.) At Yale it is insisted that 'a man can't play the football of today on ordinary grub;' that the food provided at the university commons, costing about \$5 per week, will not 'sustain' a football warrior. His board costs about \$15 per week, of which he himself contributes a third—or less; hence the net charge to the Yale association for the football training table of \$1,811. As against this sum West Point expended just \$60. Thus Yale squanders about \$9,000 a year on extravagant living for her athletes in all branches of sport, and Harvard and Princeton are not far behind in this extravagance. In the Yale financial statement there is a charge of \$1,549 for 'trophies.' Trophies include gold and silver footballs and large photographic groups of teams and individuals, handsomely framed; these are the spoils of the 'star' athlete. There is no corresponding item in the report of the Army Athletic association. They are very old-fashioned at West Point. The cadets are content with the laurel."

THERE is just now considerable discussion as to a general increase in the salaries paid public officials. The Sioux City (Iowa) Journal says: "The president of the United States receives a salary of \$50,000 a year; the members of his cabinet, \$8,000 each—total for the bunch, \$122,000. This looks small in comparison with what is paid in the insurance business, and there are patriots who are disposed to take the matter up in behalf of the president and the cabinet officers. The government does not have to pay more. If a man does not want to be president of the United States, on account of the salary, he can make the struggle of his life to be president of an insurance company and to get the policyholders where they can not help themselves. There will be men left who will prefer to be president of the United States, and men, too, who will be willing to sit up nights to see how the grafters can be headed off. A man in the public service ought not to have his salary so high that he is tempted to forget all about the public service. If he does not care about the public service then he ought not to be tempted to enlarge himself in hypocrisy by baiting the hook with an extravagant salary. An increase in the salary of the president and in the salaries of the cabinet officers would touch the whole line of officialdom with unrest. Senators and representatives would brood over the discrimination against them, and janitors in the public buildings would be found with stubs of lead pencils figuring on various propositions as to where they ought to come in. The government ought to spend less money and not more on salaries. The list is larger than is required and it should be pruned. The public service is no place to exploit frenzied salaries, and tendency in that direction is a block to reform and an encouragement to graft everywhere."

FRANCIS W. BROWN

The democratic congressional convention for the First Nebraska district nominated Francis W. Brown, now mayor of Lincoln, to be the democratic candidate at a special election to be held July 18.

The convention adopted an admirable platform and Mr. Brown has explicitly committed himself to that platform.

It is to be hoped that every democrat in the First congressional district—as well as every other citizen who desires that the people of that district shall be represented in congress by a man who is free to act in the public interests—will attend the special election July 18 and cast his vote for Mr. Brown.

Mr. Brown has told the people exactly where he stands upon the questions at issue. He is a man of high character and ability, and, in the event of his election, may be depended upon to represent the people. Attention is directed to a speech delivered by Mr. Brown at Nebraska City, which speech is reproduced in another column of this issue.

Ora Knapp of East Dummerston, Vt., writes—that there are in Vermont several good locations for democratic weeklies. He says "a democratic, up-to-date newspaper man" will learn something to his advantage by looking over the Vermont field.