

corrupt and infamous republican political machine." But what about the facts Mr. Cleveland might have told about the reorganization of the Equitable under Ryan? The World said that Grover Cleveland's testimony was important, but Mr. Hughes did not call that witness, and so far as Mr. Hughes' efforts are concerned the Ryan management of the Equitable remains today, in the very language of the New York World, "a public menace" even as its predecessor, the Hyde management, had been "a public scandal."

But the World tells us that "Mr. Hughes' investigations destroyed Platt politically, Depew politically, Odell politically, and utterly wrecked the old, corrupt and infamous political machine." We believe the World refers to the Odell political machine in New York state, which was already wrecked by being superseded by an even more dangerous machine because it parades under a guise of respectability which the Odell affair hardly dared to assume.

Hughes' investigations did wreck Depew politically. They might have affected Platt, although he was politically wrecked before the committee began its sessions. But, granting that they wrecked Odell, Platt and Depew politically they left unharmed Cortelyou, chairman, and Bliss, treasurer of the republican national committee and Root. These republicans were not even put to the humiliation of being required to take the witness stand and testify as to the part they had played in the misappropriation of funds belonging to the widows and orphans in whose behalf republican managers are wont to shed so many tears.

Platt and Depew and Odell were "wrecked politically" but we read in the Washington dispatches of recent days that Cortelyou, who is now—as he was at the time of the misappropriation of these trust funds—chairman of the republican national committee, is to be given the treasury portfolio as a reward for his "fidelity to duty!" He has not been "wrecked politically." On the contrary the man who should have been driven from the cabinet because of the part he played in the misappropriation of these trust funds, is to be advanced to, perhaps, the most responsible position in the cabinet—a position which has to deal with the money of the nation.

Does any one imagine that if Mr. Hughes had discharged his duty in accordance with the suggestions made to him by the New York World—calling George B. Cortelyou to the witness stand—the man who acted as chairman of the republican national committee at the time the stolen money was traced to the republican party's treasury, would be advanced to the most responsible office in the president's cabinet, while Platt, Depew, Odell and others who were not shielded are destroyed?

#### WHOM?

The Wall Street Journal, which is opposed to Mr. Hearst, printed the following editorial: "The taxpayers of New York are concerned in the pending campaign more deeply than usual on account of the vast amount of funds that are going into public works. In the form of canal construction \$100,000,000 is to be spent, the earliest contracts for which have been awarded. Besides this \$50,000,000 more is to go to improvement of highways. Whom are you going to put in charge of these funds?"

Yes, "whom are you going to put in charge of these funds?"

Will you put these funds in charge of the candidate who has the enthusiastic support of the money gamblers and the trust magnates, or in charge of the candidate who is bitterly opposed by these elements, because they fear he will enforce the laws of the state?

#### "MARK THE PREDICTION"

At Alexandria, Ind., on the night of September, 18, 1906, Congressman James E. Watson, republican, of the Sixth Indiana district, said in a public speech: "Mark my prediction; before the end of the Roosevelt administration the strong arm of the United States will reach out and take over Cuba, as we did in the Philippines."

Ask the fathers and mothers whose sons have been sacrificed in the Philippines on the altar of imperialism and sordid commercialism if they want the sons of other fathers and mothers similarly sacrificed in Cuba for the benefit of the sugar and tobacco monopolies. Do the people of the United States want to annex another bunch of trouble in violation of solemn pledges and in violation of common justice?

## "Bossism" Again the Issue in Ohio

Columbus, Ohio, October 29.—The sensation of the week in political circles was the handing down by the supreme court of the state of its decision in what is known as the Cincinnati Lexow case. The republican house of representatives in the last general assembly refused to join with the democratic senate in the creation of a committee charged with an investigation into the affairs of the city of Cincinnati and county of Hamilton, so long under the absolute domination of Boss Cox. The refusal of the republican house of representatives to join with the democratic senate in this movement is directly chargeable to the republican speaker of the house of representatives, Carmi Thompson, who is now the republican candidate for secretary of state and as such heads the republican state ticket in Ohio this year. His nomination for that place was procured by Boss Cox of Cincinnati as a reward for Thompson's preventing the passing of a joint resolution creating an investigating committee.

The Drake committee, appointed by the senate, consisting of three democrats and two republicans (the latter two declining to serve) sat in Cincinnati eleven days. More corruption and graft were never uncovered by any committee in the same length of time. The henchmen there were so frightened that in less than two weeks they voluntarily confessed that they had stolen \$211,000 and returned it to the county treasury. The cashier of a Cincinnati bank had been subpoenaed to appear before this committee and testify as to the amount of graft his bank had turned over to the official henchmen in return for the use of public funds. The cashier refused to testify. He was arrested and officers of the senate started to convey him to the bar of the senate on contempt proceedings. The Cox courts got busy and he was rescued from the senate officers on a writ of habeas corpus. The matter was taken before a Cox judge and that judge discharged the cashier on the ground that the senate committee was illegally constituted and had no power. This judge was shortly afterwards nominated for a judgeship in a higher court to succeed a republican judge who had testified before this investigating committee that Cox had attempted to dictate his decision in a case between the city of Cincinnati and a public service corporation involving a quarter of a million dollars. A bill for the rent of the room in which this committee had sat eleven days was presented and a warrant drawn upon the state auditor for the amount. The state auditor declined to issue a warrant upon the state treasurer for the same, basing his action upon the decision of the Cox court in Cincinnati. The case was immediately taken to the supreme court and argued last spring. The court adjourned for its summer vaca-

tion without handing down a decision. The fall term began and dragged along two or three weeks before the decision was rendered. On Tuesday of last week, by a vote of four to two, the supreme court upheld the decision of the Cox judge and the Cincinnati Lexow committee was put to sleep. It is needless to say that this action of the court did more to dispel apathy in the minds of voters than anything else that could have been done. The court has been criticised from one end of the state to the other. Not a single newspaper in the state is there which speaks less mildly than to regret that the court took such action, and the majority of the newspapers have called attention to the fact that there is not a judge on the supreme bench of the state today who does not owe his nomination to the place to the Cox vote in Cincinnati.

After forcing the return of \$211,000 that had been stolen from the people, after but eleven days of investigation, this committee is declared without power or authority. If an illegal committee can force the return of \$211,000 in eleven days, what would a legal committee be able to do if they were to be permitted to sit, say thirty days? That is the question the electors of Ohio are asking of each other. If an illegal committee forced them to disgorge \$211,000, have not they a right to insist that the plunder be restored to them. That is another question that the voters of Ohio are asking each other. Granting that the decision of the court may be a just interpretation of the law, the question arises, who prevented a legal committee from doing the work that this illegal committee has done; and the answer is given above—Speaker Carmi Thompson is the man. He prevented the appointment of a joint committee which the supreme court says would have been legal, and forced the appointment of a senate committee which the supreme court says is illegal. It was his technical maneuvering that saved Cox from making complete restitution to the people of Cincinnati. Is there any wonder that he should be rewarded by Cox with the nomination which he sought?

It is last year's fight over again. It is a fight against bossism and grafters. The accident of death and one branch of the legislature lost by a very slender margin prevented the people from reaping the rewards which they claimed last year. The work is all to be done over again; and even the casual observer in Ohio today is convinced that a determined electorate is ready to repeat its action of last year. The only thing that can possibly forestall a triumph of the people is a lack of interest amongst democrats. If democrats will take advantage of the opportunities presented this year there is no question but what victory awaits them. J. G. H.

## Serving God At The Ballot Box

In a sermon delivered several years ago, Rev. L. A. Crandall, of Chicago, said: "Duty is not transferrable. We can not worship God by telephone or fight the battles of righteousness by substitutes. Religion reaches into every detail of life, and includes our duty as citizens. We may serve God at the ballot box as certainly as in the church. The man who evades his duty by leaving the conduct of affairs in the hands of the professionals is guilty before God. Suffrage is not only a privilege, but an obligation; and the man who holds himself too good to vote is too bad for the kingdom of heaven."

It must be admitted that the reverend gentleman stated the case in very vigorous fashion; and yet who will contend that he did not speak with authority?

With evils existing and growing all about us, who will say that we can not serve God at the ballot box as certainly as in the church?

The man who, on the Sabbath day, sings "Lead, kindly light," and then, on election day casts his ballot in support of policies advanced in the interests of those who oppress the weak and the helpless, is by no means discharging his duty.

Doubtless there are many conscientious Christian men who vote with the trust magnates through ignorance; and yet as much as it is the duty of the Christian to search the scriptures in order that he may not be misled, so it is his duty

to observe carefully the events of the day and study thoughtfully the policies advanced by political organizations calling for his vote.

As much as it is the duty of the Christian to refrain from doing evil in the ordinary affairs of life, to withhold his indorsement from questionable transactions, to hurt nobody and to give every one his just due, it is also his duty, to withhold his indorsement from political parties or political candidates who would so arrange the policies of the government that the few may live in luxury while the many must struggle for bare existence. It is not only his duty to vote, but it is his duty to vote right; and voting right means that he must make an intelligent and patriotic study of the principles and policies advocated by the respective political parties and, without regard to the prejudices of the past, cast his vote with those who seem most willing and most likely to bring about the best government and to establish policies that will result in the greatest good to the greatest number.

We may, indeed, serve God at the ballot box as certainly as in the church; and when the majority of the American people come to appreciate this clear-cut statement, whenever God is as faithfully served at the ballot box as He is in the church, it may be depended upon that the era of trusts, of imperialism, of spoliation and of corruption will be at an end, and the probability of evils in our public life will be reduced to the minimum.