

WAS THE 1896 CAMPAIGN ONLY A DREAM?

In 1896 the democratic national convention adopted a platform, one of the planks of which follows: "But for this decision by the supreme court (the adverse decision on the income tax) there would be no deficit in the revenue under the law passed by a democratic congress in strict pursuance of the uniform decisions of that court for nearly one hundred years, that court having in that decision sustained constitutional objections to its enactment which had previously been overruled by the ablest judges who had ever sat on that bench. We declare that it is the duty of congress to use all the constitutional power which remains after that decision, or which may come from its reversal by the court as it may hereafter be constituted, so that the burdens of taxation may be equally and impartially laid, to the end that wealth may bear its due proportion of the expenses of the government."

That plank was denounced by republican editors and republican orators, and democrats were called "anarchists" because they presumed to "criticise the courts."

The editorial remarks of the New York Tribune made after the election of 1896 were fairly representative of the tone employed by republicans generally in the treatment of the Chicago platform, and particularly that plank above quoted. The Tribune said that the democratic movement of 1896 was "a malicious conspiracy against the honor and integrity of the nation," and added:

"Its nominal head was worthy of the cause. Nominal, because the wretched, rattle-pated boy, posing in rapid vanity and mouthing resounding rottenness, was not the real leader of that league of hell. He was only a pup-

pet in the blood-imbrued hands of —, the anarchist, and —, the revolutionist, and other desperadoes of that stripe. But he was a willing puppet, Bryan was, willing and eager. Not one of his masters was more apt that he at lies and forgeries and blasphemies and all the nameless iniquities of that campaign against the Ten Commandments. He goes down with the cause, and must abide with it in the history of infamy. He had less provocation than Benedict Arnold, less intellectual force than Aaron Burr, less manliness and courage than Jefferson Davis. He was the rival of them all in deliberate wickedness and treason to the republic. His name belongs with theirs, neither the most brilliant nor the most hateful in the list. Good riddance to it all, to conspiracy and conspirators, and to the foul menace of repudiation and anarchy against the honor and the life of the republic."

On April 18, 1906, Theodore Roosevelt elected to the presidency of the United States as a republican, sent to congress a special message dealing particularly with the decision of Federal Judge J. Otis Humphrey in the beef trust case. Mr. Roosevelt referred to the judgment in the beef trust case as "a miscarriage of justice." Mr. Roosevelt also said "I can hardly believe that the rule of Judge Humphrey will be followed by other judges." Referring to the tendency of the times, Mr. Roosevelt said: "The danger nowadays is, not that innocent men will be convicted of crime, but that the guilty man will go scott free. This is especially the case where the crime is one of greed and cunning perpetrated by a man of wealth in the course of those business operations where

the code of conduct is at variance not merely with the code of humanity and morality, but with the code as established in the law of the land." Referring to Judge Humphrey's decision Mr. Roosevelt said: "Such interpretation of the law comes measurably near making the law a farce."

The plank in the democratic national platform of 1896 for the adoption of which democrats were denounced as anarchists is decidedly tame in comparison with the language used by the president, elected as a republican, in commenting upon the decision in the beef trust case.

In 1896 democrats pointed in a mild way to the fact that the court's decision in the income tax case was out of harmony with the uniform decisions for nearly one hundred years, and expressed the hope, by implication, that the court as thereafter constituted might reverse the decision. But Mr. Roosevelt was not at all mild in his arraignment of Judge Humphrey's decision. "A miscarriage of justice," he called it, and he added "such interpretation of the law comes measurably near making the law a farce."

Yet some of the very republican editors who in 1896 denounced as "anarchists" democrats who had indulged in the very mild reference to the income tax decision are now enthusiastically commending the president of the United States, who was elected as a republican, for the plain language he used when, in a special message to congress, he condemned Judge Humphrey's decision.

Recalling the terrible accusations made against them in 1896 by the very men who are today "out Heroding Herod," a democrat must vigorously pinch himself to be assured that he is not dreaming.

WILL MR. ARMOUR REPLY?

Mr. J. Ogden Armour, head of the Armour Packing company, and looked upon as the head and front of the beef trust, recently published in the Saturday Evening Post a series of articles defending the beef packers. He very earnestly denied that there is a beef trust and was especially emphatic in his denials of a private car trust and also that there is unspeakable filth in the preparation of packing house products. While he did not refer to Upton Sinclair by name, it was quite evident that Mr. Armour had Mr. Sinclair's book, "The Jungle," in mind when he so strenuously denied that every law of health and cleanliness was violated in the packing houses.

In the May issue of Everybody's Magazine Mr. Sinclair makes reply to Mr. Armour's denials, and Mr. Sinclair has much the better of the argument.

Mr. Armour makes much of government inspection, but he fails to make mention of the fact that this inspection refers only to export meat, and that carcasses condemned by government inspectors are subject only to the laws of the state and municipality in which the packing house is located. The Chicago inspector who tried to inject kerosene into the condemned carcasses in order that the meat could not be palmed off on the public, suddenly found himself out of a job.

Mr. Armour also offered as a defense the claim that if such things as Mr. Sinclair relates actually happen, the packers would be subjected to unlimited blackmail. Mr. Sinclair retorts by offering a sample case wherein Mr. Armour did pay a man \$5,000 to make an affidavit contradicting a former affidavit setting forth some disgusting details of the meat packing business as conducted in the Armour plants, and follows it up with the charge that Mr. Armour is constantly paying blackmail in order to prevent exposure. Then, to clinch the matter, Mr. Sinclair offers in evidence the court records wherein the Armour Packing company has entered a plea of guilty and paid fines for adulteration of meat products. At Shenandoah, Pa., on June 16, 1905, the Armour Packing company pleaded guilty to adulterating "blockweirst" and paid a fine of \$50. It paid a fine of \$50 at Greenburg, Pa., for selling "preserved" minced ham. And in addition to the court records, Mr. Sinclair quotes the Tenth Biennial Report of the Minnesota State Dairy and Food Commissioner, in which report on page 173, the "Shield Leaf Lard" of the Armour company is officially branded as illegal; and again on page 176, the "Vegetol," and on page 182 the "Shield Lard," both Armour products are branded the same way.

Replying to Mr. Armour's denial of the ex-

istence of a beef trust Mr. Sinclair says: "I know that he (Mr. Armour) gets up and stands at the telephone every morning at 7 o'clock, and fixes the prices which are to be paid for live stock throughout the markets of the United States on that day; I know this from men who have stood at the other end of the telephone when he did it."

"The Jungle" was of itself a terrific indictment of the whole packing house business, but Mr. Armour, in view of Mr. Sinclair's reply in the May issue of Everybody's Magazine, would have done well to remain quiet in the hope that the people might forget.

THE REBUILDING OF SAN FRANCISCO

No one acquainted with American pluck and enterprise—especially with western pluck and enterprise—doubts for a moment that the new San Francisco will be greater and better than the old. Earthquakes have happened before in that section of the country, but they did not deter the people from building.

It will be a greater, cleaner, safer San Francisco; a monument to the pluck and determination of a race that is never conquered. It will add another chapter to the story of indomitable courage written of American enterprise, of which Chicago, Boston, Johnstown, Galveston and Baltimore are other chapters. The spirit of the 'Forty-niners still exists, and will continue to exist as long as the western world stands. Men who want to catch an inspiration to renewed courage should keep their eyes on the city by the Golden Gate.

SUSPENDING THE RULES

Referring to the San Francisco situation the Kansas City Journal, a zealous opponent of the trades unions, says: "But San Francisco's troubles are not over. Think of the labor strikes when the work of rebuilding gets well under way."

On the day that the Journal printed the above paragraph the wires carried the announcement that the building trades unions of San Francisco, in order to facilitate the work of rebuilding, had decided to suspend all union rules, allowing union men to work with non-unionists. Now if the men who employ labor will act as fairly as the labor unions, there will be no trouble in San Francisco.

PROSECUTE

At the time Judge O'Sullivan of New York called District Attorney Jerome to account in the matter of insurance companies' contributions to campaign funds, Mr. Jerome intimated that he might have warrants issued not only for

George W. Perkins, but for George B. Cortelyou, postmaster general, and for Cornelius N. Bliss, treasurer of the republican national committee. Now that Justice Greenbaum of the New York supreme court has decided that because of these contributions George W. Perkins should be prosecuted for larceny, Mr. Jerome might call Messrs. Cortelyou and Bliss to account. If the funds were stolen republican committee officials were receivers.

THE BLIND MAY SEE

Referring to the several bills introduced in congress providing for the removal of the tariff for the benefit of San Francisco, the Chicago Record-Herald says: "The question is not one of opening the tariff controversy, but for giving the earthquake cities the help they need." But it ought at least to serve to open the eyes of some of those who have been blinded by the false pleas of republican standpatters.

CAMPAIGN CONTRIBUTIONS

The Baltimore Sun says: "There will never be an end of corrupt practices in New York or in any other state until campaign committees are required to make public the amount of every contribution they may receive, whether \$1 or \$10,000, and to give publicity under oath to every expenditure, however great or small the same may be."

The Sun's suggestion is a good one. Publicity should be given to every contribution, however small, and it is also of the highest importance that the publicity be made before the vote is cast. If the publicity is given before the people go to the polls they will have an opportunity to learn the character of the influences behind the several candidates. It is to be greatly regretted that many who are seriously advocating the publicity program with respect to campaign contributions do not lay proper emphasis upon the desirability of giving the information to the public prior to election day.

BUT HE TOLD THE TRUTH

The Washington Post hastens to say that when Mr. Roosevelt referred to "fortunes swollen beyond all healthy limits" in his recent address he "spoke more as an individual than as chief magistrate."

In whatever capacity Mr. Roosevelt spoke he told the truth when he said that there are in this country a number of "fortunes swollen beyond all healthy limits." He missed an opportunity when he failed to suggest that one of the remedies for these "swollen fortunes" is the destruction of special privileges under the law, and that another is the income tax.