

the frauds generally that have been committed under republican administration. They expect the people to forget the deficit for the last fiscal year and to overlook the prospective deficit for the current year.

Dietrich, Burton and Mitchell, United States senators, and the several representatives in congress who were required to answer to criminal indictments were elected to office by the republican party. But we must forget that fact.

Former Governor Odell, who has not clearly explained how he happened to be paid \$75,000 in the settlement of a suit pending against the Equitable Life Assurance society, is the present-day republican boss of New York. But we must forget that fact.

The frauds committed by the Machens and others in the postoffice department were committed by men who, in 1896, were either avowed republicans or were so zealous for the "national honor" that they rushed to the support of the republican ticket in that campaign, and held their offices under republican administration. But we must forget that fact.

The frauds committed in Cuba by the Neelys were perpetrated by distinguished republicans, and under republican administration. But we must forget it.

Loomis, whose official transactions in Venezuela were so discreditable that, although, plainly, he had the friendship of the administration, he was required to retire from the diplomatic service, was one of the noisiest pretenders in 1896; and his official existence was made possible by the republican party. But we must forget it.

Depew, the United States senator lately unmasked in various ways, pleaded in 1896, for what he called "the salvation of the country." He was elected and re-elected to the senate by the republican party, and with all his discreditable conduct still holds his official position without serious protest on the part of republican leaders. But we must forget these facts.

McCall, McCurdy, Hyde, Harriman and the other frenzied financiers into whose affairs Attorney Hughes has recently inserted the probe, were greatly exercised in 1896 lest the honor of the United States be tarnished. They are the men upon whose testimony the republican party has often relied to prove that it is, in fact and in deed, the party of "God and morality." But we must forget it.

Andrews, the Detroit banker who charged the democratic candidate in 1896 with being "the dishonest leader of dishonest men," and was subsequently shown to be an embezzler to the extent of \$1,600,000, was a champion of the republican party. But we must forget it.

Bigelow, the Milwaukee banker who recently defaulted to the extent of more than three million dollars, pleaded for the election of the republican ticket in 1896 in order that the "business interests" of the country might be preserved. But we must forget it.

Rockefeller and every one of his cheaper imitations—men who seek to pile up wealth at the expense of their helpless fellows—not only vote the republican ticket, but, from their ill-gotten gains, contribute liberally to republican campaign funds. But we must forget it.

"POTENT PROMOTERS"

Referring at length to the disclosures recently made concerning the so-called defenders of national honor, and the very apparent popular revolt against the impositions which these men have placed upon the people, the Chicago Tribune, a republican newspaper, says that this revolt is not to be put down by ridicule or epithets.

The Tribune adds:

The people have found that there are grave abuses, and while casting about for remedies they are putting on record their condemnation of the abuses. What policies they will ultimately favor—whether they will plunge the country from the frying pan of corporate graft and tyranny into the fire of socialism—will probably depend mainly on the vigor and success with which the men who are responsible for present conditions oppose the adoption of reasonable reforms. The most potent promoters of socialism in this country are not and will not be the Hearsts and the Debses, but the Morgans, the Rockefellers, the Depews, the Hydes, the McCurdys, and the McCalls. That there will be remedies for present conditions is certain. Whether they will be worse than the disease remains to be seen.

The Tribune's statement is similar to that

made by the New York World in commenting upon the same subject. While the World and the Tribune are eminently correct in saying that "the most potent promoters of socialism are the Rockefellers, the Depews, the Hydes, et al," may it not fairly be said that newspapers like the New York World and the Chicago Tribune, which habitually support the ticket favored by this same element, can not entirely escape responsibility?

Of what value is it to the public welfare—or, as may be added, to the high reputation of a newspaper—that that publication shall at one moment condemn the policies of the "Rockefellers," charging them with responsibility for present-day unrest, and then when election day rolls around give its support to the political party whose campaign funds are provided by the "Rockefellers" and whose candidates are, at least impliedly, under obligations to promote the "Rockefeller" policies.

The editors of the New York World and the Chicago Tribune must not forget that while among "the most potent promoters of socialism in this country" the names of the Rockefellers, the Morgans, the Depews and the Hydes are to be written high, the names of those newspaper editors who aid these representatives of special interests in placing their favorites in office will occupy somewhat conspicuous positions.

DISASTER TO WHOM?

An Associated Press report under date of Washington, November 22, referring to the deliberations of the senate committee on interstate commerce, says: "Informal discussions among republican members of the committee show that apprehension is felt that if a bill should be reported by republicans and democrats against the wish of a majority of the republican members it would create a division in the party that will work disaster in the future."

Disaster to whom? Disaster to the public interests which the president's policy seeks to promote, or disaster to the political organization which, while pretending to serve the people, makes it possible for the representatives of monopoly to abuse them?

We have often been told that the sole purpose of republican leaders is to advance the public welfare. But now we are told that the long sought reform must not be accomplished by a combination of democrats and republicans because such a course would result in "a division of the (republican) party that will work disaster in the future."

Does not every intelligent man know that if Mr. Roosevelt and his associates are sincere in their advocacy of railway rate regulation there must come, sooner or later, a break with those members of the republican party who are representatives of corporate interests. Does not every intelligent man know that on a vital issue such as the regulation of railroads there can be no compromise between the railroad magnate or his representative who is determined upon retaining special advantages, and men who stand solely for public interests? If there is a "compromise" the advocates of railroad regulation will do the yielding.

HAVE THEY BEEN PUNISHED?

In an article written for Harpers Magazine, Grover Cleveland says: "United States senators and representatives in congress, who, relying on the loose ideas of honesty pervading their environment, have betrayed the trust of the people, find that no perverted sentiment and no disguise or dazzle of high position avails to save them from the fate of common malefactors."

Has any one heard of any one of the several senators and members of congress who have "betrayed the trust of the people" resigning? Has any one observed any serious move on the part of those in authority to lead Chauncey M. Depew to the fate of the "common malefactor?"

Senators and representatives who engage in a cheap form of wrong-doing, such as Mitchell, Burton and Dietrich engaged in, are proceeded against; yet Dietrich served out his term in the senate, while Burton and Mitchell are yet holding office.

But there are many men in the senate and house who have notoriously "betrayed the trust of the people" and who, notoriously, are the representatives of special interests rather than the champions of the public welfare. These men hold their heads high, draw their salaries from

the government regularly and even yet seek to pose as the representative of all that is pure and upright in public affairs.

Is it not strange that the public sentiment which, unquestionably, does not intentionally give sanction to wrong-doing has not been strong enough to force the retirement from the senate of the senators against whom indictments have been brought? Is it not strange, also, that public sentiment tolerates the presence in the United States senate of men who, like the Aldriches and the Platts are representatives of special interests rather than spokesmen for a free people?

"VERY FAR FROM DEAD"

Several weeks ago the New York World intimated that the democratic party is dying. The World based its reasons for that impression upon the facts that a democratic city convention praised President Roosevelt for his part in the peace conference; that Mr. Bryan supports Mr. Roosevelt in his railway rate program; that the Massachusetts democrats commended Mr. Roosevelt for his services in establishing peace between Russia and Japan; that the Rhode Island democrats indorsed Mr. Roosevelt's rate regulation policy; that the republicans of Massachusetts demanded a revision of the tariff.

But now the World, admitting that it "recently asked if the democratic party was dying," confesses "it is very far from dead." The World bases its present day conviction on the following statement of fact:

Roosevelt's plurality of 505,000 in Pennsylvania has been overturned and the democratic candidate for state treasurer is elected by 88,000. Roosevelt's plurality of 250,000 in Ohio is likewise overturned. The republican candidate for governor was elected in Massachusetts, but the candidate for lieutenant-governor has a beggarly 2,000 on the face of the returns. Roosevelt had 92,000 in Massachusetts last year.

The World exclaims "What a political revolution it was! Who would have believed that such amazing changes could take place within a year?"

Well, any one but the provincial editor of a provincial newspaper would have known that such changes could take place. The World concludes: "That they could take place proves that no party is safe, no boss is safe, no party tradition is safe, in the face of the growing spirit of political independence on the part of the American voter."

The very facts upon which the World based its notion that the democratic party is dying should have indicated to its editor that the democratic party is "very much alive." The World editor imagined the democratic party was dying because representatives of that party made bold to formally give their support to honest republicans who were seeking to put into effect policies for which democrats had long contended.

Some newspaper editors have peculiar methods of reaching conclusions. The editor of the New York World concluded, a few weeks ago, that the democratic party was dying because democrats individually and in conventions, were showing enough independence of party spirit to indorse democratic policies even where an effort was being made by republican leaders to put those policies into effect. Now the editor of the World concludes that the democratic party "is very far from dead" because of "the growing spirit of political independence on the part of the American voter."

RATIER TALL

A correspondent for the New York World suggested the erection of a statue of Mr. Roosevelt in the attitude of Colossus of Rhodes at each end of the Panama canal. Another correspondent referring to this suggestion says:

The Rhodes Colossus "straddled" the roadstead. Galleys passed out to sea between the parted legs. With ocean steamers at their present size a statue to bestride the Panama canal would have to be over 600 feet tall.

Maybe, after all, it will be just as well not to erect these statues.

One statue "six hundred feet tall" might not be objectionable, but two of them of that height, would seem to be "spreading it on a bit thick."

Indeed, there are some old fashioned people who might object to the erection even of a single statue "six hundred feet tall" in honor of a human being.