

IN THE SPIRIT OF 1896

The Lincoln (Nebraska) Journal, republican, says: "No one denies that the Chicago platform contained one or two helpful suggestions. It was also loaded heavily with radical propositions for which a very respectable element of the party could not stand at the time and would not endorse now. It is therefore impolitic and unwise to the last degree for the Commoner to indorse the virtues of that platform as a whole. Now that Missouri, Indiana, Illinois and other states have endorsed Mr. Bryan as the next nominee of a reunited democracy; now that Henry Watterson has become reconciled, and affectionate things are being said of him in the enemy's country, it behooves the Commoner to say nothing that will arouse ancient animosities and start another factional controversy. The best thing the Commoner can do with the Chicago platform is to forget it. There are so many other and better things to think of that it isn't worth while."

Of course "ancient animosities" should not be aroused and "factional controversy" should not be encouraged; but the brethren who went away and have returned to the fold are mindful of the fact that faithful adherence to principles, the correctness of which has been confirmed in recent years, does not mean the cultivation of "ancient animosities" or "factional controversy."

Harmony at the sacrifice of democratic principles would not be worth having. Democrats who have insisted that their party be, in fact, as well as in theory, the servant of the people did not enlist for a sham battle. If the skies are brightening for the democratic party today it is because the people now recognize as patriotic sentiment the things which in 1896 republican editors freely denounced as "anarchical doctrine." If there is a disposition on the part

of the people to return to the democratic party it is because the people have faith that the party will fulfill its pledges.

Democrats have no disposition to forget the Chicago platform, for that platform represented in 1896, even as it does today, the real conservatism of the country. Owing to the unprecedented production of gold the money question is not and will not be discussed in detail as it was in the Chicago platform; but the underlying principle of bimetallism—the quantitative theory—has been amply vindicated and is now generally recognized. Other features of the platform have likewise been vindicated. While it is true that present day problems will call for the construction of new platforms, the democratic platform for 1908 will be written in the same spirit which controlled the men who drafted the much abused, yet largely vindicated declaration of political principles prepared by the democrats at Chicago in 1896.

The democratic party in 1908 will be perfectly "safe" and thoroughly "sane." Perfectly safe as a medium through which the American people—demanding equal privileges for all and protesting against special favors to any one within the law or without the law—may register their decree, confident that that decree will be faithfully executed. It will be thoroughly sane because, while demanding the adoption of policies that will result in the greatest good to the greatest number, it stands between the radicalism of the republican party on the one hand, and the radicalism of the socialist party on the other—between the radicalism that administers government for the benefit of a coterie of men at the expense of the competitive system, and the radicalism that contemplates an impossible form at the expense of individualism.

vocated by the democratic party in 1896 are now regarded as "exploded vagaries" and that that defeat was "so complete as to be crushing." But that defeat was not nearly so "complete" as the defeat of 1894, when the democracy under the leadership of the element that forsook it in the 1896 campaign, met disaster.

Is it possible that this republican editor fails to understand that but for the Chicago platform the democratic party could not have mustered a corporal's guard in 1896. It was, in truth, the honest, straightforward declaration of principles by the democrats in convention assembled at Chicago, that made it possible for the democratic party to figure as a living force in the politics of America, where, otherwise, it would have gone to the third or fourth place had it not, indeed, been obliterated altogether.

There is nothing in the Chicago platform that can be pointed to as "exploded vagaries." The essential principles of that platform stand vindicated in the court of public opinion, and the American people show a disposition to return to the democratic party, because, although woefully deceived in 1896, their eyes have been opened.

Why should any one be surprised that the people's eyes have been opened? Why should any one be surprised that the people turn in disgust from the party that so grossly deceived them in 1896? Have not the revelations been sufficient to bring about this awakening? What more do the people need to show the utter folly of putting their confidence in the party which in 1896 posed as the "party of God and morality," but in whose interests hundreds of thousands of dollars belonging to policy holders and other helpless victims, were misappropriated?

ONE "CAPTAIN OF INDUSTRY"

Newspaper dispatches from Reno, Nevada, say that Mrs. William Ellis Corey, wife of the president of the steel trust, has filed a petition for divorce on the ground of desertion. The couple were married in 1883, and Mrs. Corey charges that her husband deserted her in May, 1905.

Corey was one of those high minded gentlemen who in 1896 were greatly alarmed lest the honor of the nation be soiled. If memory is not at fault Schwab, Corey's predecessor as president of the steel trust, lost his position because he dallied at the gaming table. When, something more than a year ago, it was announced that Corey had deserted his wife, the newspaper dispatches said that he would be forced from his position. Then came intimations that Corey would not submit to discipline at the hands of his superiors. At one time we were told that Mr. Carnegie, who builds libraries for the edification of his countrymen and for the perpetuation of the Carnegie name, was so indignant because of Corey's conduct that he had bluntly told the steel trust president that he must return to his family or surrender his position. But later Mr. Carnegie gave a party to the employes of the steel trust and the dispatches said that William Ellis Corey, the president of the great corporation and the wife deserter, held the "seat of honor" at Mr. Carnegie's side.

There were rumors that Corey had made threats to his steel trust associates that if they undertook to discipline him, he would retaliate. Some powerful influence seems to have kept him in his position. Can it be that the members of the steel trust regard gambling as a more serious offense than wife-desertion? Or can it be that Corey knows more of the secrets of the steel trust than Schwab knew? Maybe the explanation is that Schwab was more tractable than Corey and that while Schwab, the gambler, consented to abdicate, Corey, the wife deserter, refused to be retired from the head of one of the world's greatest trusts.

Perhaps, however, he will no longer be posed, in the editorial columns of republican newspapers, as a faithful defender of national honor, as an American citizen conspicuous for his personal virtues and one who may serve as a model to the rising generation.

SENATOR DRYDEN'S ANNOUNCEMENT

Senator Dryden, of New Jersey, has taken time by the forelock and announces that he will be a candidate for re-election. The people of New Jersey should proceed to lay plans for the defeat of this senator, who represents selfish interests instead of the people.

The Court Review Clause In Two Important Measures

In his letter to Chairman Wadsworth of the house committee on agriculture, and complaining about the meat inspection bill, President Roosevelt said: "I can not even promise to sign it, because the provisions (about the court, as well as about other matters) are so bad that, in my opinion, if they had been deliberately designed to prevent the remedying of the evils complained of, they could not have been worse."

The court provision in the meat inspection bill is similar to the court provision in the railway rate bill, and the protest by President Roosevelt with respect to the meat inspection bill, is similar to the protest which democrats made respecting the railway rate bill. In the opinion of democrats "the provisions about the courts" in the railway rate bill, are so bad that "if they had been deliberately designed to prevent the remedying of evils complained of, they could not have been worse." In fact it is generally believed that this court provision in the railway rate bill was "deliberately designed" to protect the special interests rather than the public interests. Evidently Mr. Roosevelt did not agree with the democrats on that proposition when it affected the railway rate bill. Evidently he does entertain that opinion with respect to the meat inspection bill.

Replying to President Roosevelt's criticism of the court review clause, Chairman Wadsworth says: "The worst that can be said of the clause is that it is, perhaps, unnecessary, that it is already covered by existing laws. I have been taught always to honor the judiciary of my country. I have been taught always to respect the rights of its citizens, and to respect the right of property, and I can not believe that the mere repetition of a provision which guarantees to the citizen the privilege of the courts of the land when he believes his property rights are threatened can be justly or properly objected to." In language almost identical with this Senator Aldrich and his associates—with the apparent approval of President Roosevelt—answered the criticism made by democrats on the court review clause of the railway rate bill.

In his reply to Chairman Wadsworth, Mr. Roosevelt reiterates his criticism of the court provision. He says "the court provision is the one to which I most object," and referring to that provision, he repeats: "If deliberately de-

signed to prevent the remedying of the evils complained of, this is the exact provision which the friends of the packers and the packers themselves would have provided." He protests that in the framing of the meat inspection bill "you would put on the judge who had no knowledge whatever of the conditions, the burden of stating whether or not the secretary was right." He also says: "In Chicago, for instance, you would make any judge whom the packers chose to designate, and not the experts of the department of agriculture, the man to decide on any question of any kind which the packers thought it worth while to dispute." The president also says "You may possibly remember the recent judicial decision in Chicago, in which the packers were concerned;" and concerning the court review clause, he repeats: "This provision is, in my judgment, one which by enactment into law will nullify the major part of the good which can be expected from the enactment of this law."

Mr. Roosevelt's objections to the court review clause of the meat inspection bill are substantially the same as the objections that the friends of railway rate legislation raised to the court review clause advocated by Messrs. Aldrich, Allison and their associates and supported generally by the republicans, and, apparently, endorsed by Mr. Roosevelt himself. The effect of that provision was to make the judges and not the interstate commerce commission, the men to say practically when and how the orders of the commission were to go into effect and when and how, if ever, the people were to obtain relief from excessive railroad rates.

If Mr. Roosevelt had shown one half of the determination with respect to the court review clause of the railway rate bill that he has shown in connection with the court review clause of the meat inspection bill, a much better railroad measure would have been assured.

THE DRIFT TOWARD DEMOCRACY

Many republican newspapers express surprise because of the ample evidence of the growing disposition on the part of the American people to turn to the democratic party. One republican paper says that this tendency is all the more surprising because the principles ad-