

still, but he was yet asleep. "George" gently shook his shoulders and repeated the message sent to the senator. "George" was a black boy. The senator, finally awake, wheeled slowly from the couch, and "George" went to work with a sponge, bay-rum and coarse towel, in response to the injunction, "George, they've sent out again for the patent outside of the old democratic party; so get to work and freshen me up a bit."

Presently a freshly curried, grizzled old body o' brains, and God's purest manhood of truth and honesty, entered the senate and slowly went to Senator Bayard's desk. That gentleman's anxious face looked up and with a sigh of relief he handed his notes to Senator Thurman.

Soon Senator Edmunds closed his remarks and the Old Roman, with Senator Bayard's notes in his hand, rose. For an hour and forty minutes, the pure, simple Addisonian English, so easily at the command of Senator Thurman, poured out in a stream of convincing and convicting argument.

And then he started for the door of the senate at one end, as Senator Edmunds went out of the other. They met near the middle cloak room door and started, arm in arm, for the restaurant. Senator Edmunds remarked, "Senator, your argument was very strong, very strong; you met and answered me on every point."

And they went on to the restaurant.

Imagine Aldrich—hold on! I beg pardon of everybody!

"Nothing is ever forgotten," said Willie Winter lately, in writing of the career of Mary Anderson. Doubtless the purists may find fault with the words, even Winter himself if held down by the logic of languages. But to the sense: "Nothing is ever forgotten," and yet, seemingly, how little is remembered, how few remember!

The civil war was a wall between the then and now. Before, the honor of a man was the priceless asset of pure manhood, now it has become indistinguishable with the "guinea's stamp," and frequently the value is considered as less than the price. Principles no longer actuate the living of life, and policy dictates the motives of men to such an extent that profit argues the correctness of conduct.

Men are no worse, no better, but the methods that obtain to domination are ignobly base. The wealth of a Corcoran bespoke honorable method; the great fortune of the Astors provokes no sense of shame in the present methods of its gathering; but the temper of our people is tried by the lauding of the ways of a Rockefeller, and we are besought to give praise to conditions that have made a Carnegie possible. He has seen to it that he shall not be soon forgotten, by building his own library-monuments, with the taxes wrung from the people by the tariff schedules in which he wrote their taxes and his profits!

Truly, though "nothing is ever forgotten," so much do we fail to remember. "Befo' th' wab," and we smile; now, "Before God!"—and we fall upon our faces to the golden calf, our icon of purest worship! We are rushing so madly upon tomorrow, that yesterday is a century past and its lesson is not remembered. We smile patronizingly upon what we are conceitedly disposed to consider provincial (except New York, and that is her especial virtue!) and made heart deep in the cess-pool of worldly wisdom. And the contentment with the change in ourselves from honorable to dishonorable, is the most horribly astounding transposition ever observed in any people in the world.

That the virtues of men of two generations ago are not forgotten is quite true, but that we remember them with the least idea of their worthiness of emulation is all but absurd. Neither the contrast in men, manners, conditions of necessity nor opportunity of events justify the neglect on our part of the right principles of the Fathers; and yet, in all things, they are "old fogies," and we laugh and push on to exploit for profit the honor they heed so sacred.

In point, note the reply of Robert E. Lee, when solicited to accept the presidency of a great insurance company, after the civil war: "My name shall not be traded upon among the people at the South." Now, we see the practical owner of a great insurance company selecting as trustees, three prominent names—merged in one in the hope that the influence of that one name, as a mercantile asset, may be sufficient to protect from suspicion the future conduct of that company. True, he is not, to the extent of human nobility, a Lee; but stands in the place of the consecrated icon of the canary colored metal upon a pedestal almost as high.

Would it not be better, granting that "nothing is ever forgotten," that we should remember all that was worthy in those who have left a virtuous example of life?

W. S. RYAN.

Indianapolis, Ind.

LETTERS FROM THE PEOPLE

Francis O'Connor, Rochester, N. Y.—Your issue of January 25 contains the following:

Charles H. Hunter, Defiance, Ohio, submits this interesting inquiry:

"Apropos of your article on 'Popular Phrases,' the phrase, 'A government where all power is from the people and in the people and for the people,' appears in a speech by Douglas, found on page 169 of 'The Rhetorical Reader,' by Ebenezer Porter, published in 1831. Can you tell me what Douglas it was? 'Can any Commoner reader answer?'"

I find in a later edition of Porter's Rhetorical Reader than that referred to by Charles H. Hunter, on pages 196, 197 and 198 three selections from a book entitled "The Advancement of Society in Knowledge and Religion," by James Douglas, Esq., First American, from the second Edinburgh edition, Hartford, published by Cooke & Co., and Packard & Butler, 1830.

In the first of these selections, under the caption, New Social Order in America, are the words quoted above by Charles H. Hunter. Under the heading "Voluntary Association" the second selection reads like a prediction of the Commandite, Trust, and Corporation of today. The third offers this magical spirit of association to quicken the operations of the Bible Society.

The American edition presents strong commendations of the book and its author from learned and religious Americans of its time. The author is represented as a Scottish gentleman of good connections and estate.

John Crane, Logansport, Ind.—I notice that another man has resigned and come home from Panama, and they have had a banquet in New York city. Now it seems to an old 'codger,' like 'yours truly,' that that affair and the president's 'special message,' should about complete the big ditch. Maybe not though.

J. W. Lockhart, St. Johns, Wis.—I like The Commoner very much indeed. The opposition "well may dread the lightning of its blow;" but when even my best friend indulges in such extravagant and misleading sentimentalism as that under the caption of "Sacrificing the Children," I feel that it is my duty to call for saner statements of facts. Mr. Spargo's sentimentalism is of that foolish type that seeks to carry its point by an assault upon the sympathies rather than by an appeal to reason and to facts. Admitting that the child labor problem is a very serious one, and that the condition of the children working in our factories should be ameliorated or prohibited, none will deny that the results can be better attained by a strict adherence to facts than by unsupported flights of fancy. Our sympathies should never be permitted to control our judgment.

If the readers of The Commoner will turn to page 300 of the Compend of the Twelfth U. S. Census, they will discover that the average number of children under sixteen years of age employed in the manufacturing establishments of the United States during the census year was 168,583, while on page 64 they will find that the total number of children between the ages of five and fifteen years was, approximately, 17,000,000. These 168,583 children under sixteen years of age earned wages amounting to \$25,661,692, or an average of about fifty cents per day. The number of manufacturing establishments in operation was 512,276. And yet in the face of the best obtainable statistics Mr. Spargo imagines himself to be within the bounds of reason when he guesses the number of children under fourteen years of age employed in the factories of the United States to be, 'not less than 2,250,000.' Quite a wide difference, let it be observed.

There is another side of the child labor problem that deserves serious consideration, and that is the "Mother Labor" side of the question. There is some reason to believe that in, at least, nine cases out of every ten where children work in the factories necessity compels them to do so as a means of subsistence. With them it is either work or starve, and when the children cannot or will not work the mothers are compelled to take their places. And it is greatly to be feared that the motherless homes might be productive of more and greater evils than child labor confined within its present limits. When the mothers are condemned to hard labor for the support of the family, including, possibly a drunken brute of a husband, as is only too often the case, who would care for the moral well being of the children? In the face of the dens of iniquity that curse our large cities, and the sleuth-hounds of vice and crime forever on the trail of innocence and virtue it requires no prophetic vision to see the final results when young girls and boys are turned loose to seek their own associates. But to my mind the strangest thing is this: That those who most vehemently denounce child labor are as silent as

the grave in regard to the most prolific cause of the evil—they denounce. It requires no savant to understand that the heartless avarice of a licensed liquor traffic is more the cause of child labor than all other causes combined. I believe that W. E. Gladstone was right when he said: "The traffic in intoxicating liquors causes more misery and human suffering than war and famine and pestilence combined."

Henry S. Fargo, Hartford City, Ind.—There are large and increasing numbers of members of both parties, that see in government ownership a sure remedy for the extortionate charges, and for the unfair discrimination and rebate system now practised, and used in railroad management. Government ownership and operation is objected to by some, on account of the vast political power that might be placed in the hands of the political party that should be in power; that it might result in the building up of a political machine, such as was never before known in the history of the country; a power too great to be entrusted to any political party, and a greater menace to the rights and liberties of the people, than the wrongs that this movement seeks to redress. We may expect all manner of scarecrows suggested by the railroad people, to frighten, scare, and to direct public attention away from this proposition. But if government ownership of railroads should obtain in this country, would it be necessary for the government to engage in the transportation business as such? Would not the government ownership of the right of way, in fee-simple, together with the road bed and track, with all terminal facilities, give to the government sufficient control for all purposes? And could not this principle be applied to lines operating wholly within a state, as well as to lines engaged in interstate commerce? The government being the owner, could have these lines of railroad operated by transportation companies under leases of reasonable duration, wherein could be embodied every precaution against unfair discrimination, and this unjust system of rebates, as well as the extortionate charges for the transportation of freight and passengers. I for one do not believe that it would be necessary for the government to acquire the rolling stock, or the motive power, or to otherwise engage in the railroad business. Our railroads, like our rivers and lakes are now great public thoroughfares over which the supplies, and productions of eighty-five millions of people are to be transported and should be owned exclusively by the government. If the government ownership proposition should be confined to the ownership of the right of way, road bed and track, with terminal facilities, the movement would be hailed with great satisfaction by the common people of this part of the country I feel assured. Republicans and democrats all talk alike, when speaking of government ownership along these lines. There is also another reason why the government should own the railroads; because railroad corporations have not seen fit to furnish sufficient facilities for handling the traffic, that has been increasing with the development of the country; a shortage of cars, for the transportation of freight, is the cry, people almost everywhere suffering for want of coal, and no coal can be had, because the railroads cannot furnish the transportation. The trouble seems rather to be that the railroads own the coal mines and by being short of cars, they are able to raise the price of coal. We are living in an age when single track railroads, ought to be a thing of the past; railroad accidents are occurring every day, resulting in great loss of human life, and can only be accounted for, on the theory, of overcrowding, and inadequate facilities for handling the business. Government ownership, seems to offer the only remedy for the many evils of which we complain, and if confined within the limits suggested herein, ought to receive a great public endorsement.

The rights of the children are entitled to more consideration than most of the so-called vested rights

Milking by machinery is not so new. Just think how the public has been "milked" by the tariff machine.

Of course \$85,000,000 river and harbor bills are not calculated to disturb the rest of the "standpatters."

The interstate commerce commission's report on Standard Oil sounds like rank plagiarism of Ida M. Tarbell.

People who predict a horseless age because of the automobile should bear in mind that the highest priced automobile yet built cost only one-sixth of the amount paid for the highest priced horse.