

resulted except the arousing of public opinion? No noted corruptionist has been punished. Hamilton and Fields are going about their business. No high official has been punished or even prosecuted. McCurdy and Hyde are enjoying life in Paris. No syndicating director has been punished. Harriman, Schiff and the rest were not even officially stigmatized. Ryan has succeeded Hyde—a dangerous change. McCall's son-in-law has succeeded him and Perkins' brother has succeeded Perkins. Peabody, a Harriman underling, has succeeded McCurdy—another dangerous change. The old presidents have gone. Three satellites of predatory financiers have taken their places. The policyholders are worse off. They get smaller dividends. The public are worse off. They have not the salve of ignorance. The state of New York is worse off. Its shame is self-confessed. And all because the law is not executed by the responsible head of the insurance department and the official representative of the honor and shame of the state of New York. Wherefore Otto Kelsey must be removed."

It is, indeed, a deplorable situation; and most people would conclude that Kelsey ought to go; but most people concluded that the two cent rate ought to be established in New York; but Governor Hughes, it will be remembered, thought the matter ought to be investigated.

It is strange that upon the very thing which gave Governor Hughes his national reputation he is so slow to act, but it must not be forgotten that after the noise made in connection with the Armstrong insurance committee, Mr. Hughes disappointed many of his friends by failing to insert the probe at promising spots and failing to follow interesting clues to their high terminals.

◆◆◆◆ "INCONCLUSIVE, THEATRICAL FURY"

Referring to the boast that the administration is about to proceed against the tobacco trust, the St. Louis Post-Dispatch says: "Suits like this have multiplied. Beef trust, coal trust, lumber trust, oil trust, sugar trust and railroad trusts innumerable—all these in turn have been made the butts of the administration's 'policy.' But, with all this fanfare of trumpets in the lists, the encounters have consisted of nothing but a spectacular splintering of lances. Not one trust has been unhorsed; not one has suffered more than a scratch; not one has even been made to breathe hard from exhaustion in the pretty tournament. One and all, these mock sufferers are blandly continuing at their old trade, and the prices of the products are steadily mounting. That is why the tobacco trust may smile. The people of the country would like to see one pitched battle to the death, with lance, sword and dagger—one good fight finished, instead of the inconclusive, theatrical fury in all quarters of the field at once, which has been the essence of the administration's loudly self-lauded 'policy.'"

Does the Post-Dispatch think that there can be anything but "inconclusive, theatrical fury" in a battle waged against the trusts by a president whose cabinet is composed of men not in sympathy with his fight or by a political party whose candidates are supported and whose campaign funds are provided by the special interests?

◆◆◆◆ A NEWSPAPER'S SIDE ISSUE

The New York World is devoting considerable space to the effort to prove that John D. Rockefeller's father still lives. The World says that for several years it has sought to locate the elder Rockefeller and it prints, with the younger brother of the oil magnate, an interview in which Frank Rockefeller is quoted as saying that the public may expect the unfolding at an early day of a scandal which will shock the civilized world. This scandal, it is said, will involve John D. Rockefeller and the treatment he has accorded his father. This is all very interesting, to be sure, and there are many people who would not be in the least surprised if it developed that the oil king has accorded to his own parent the same sort of injustice that has characterized his dealings with other of his fellowmen. But the World would be in better business if it devoted its great ability to an effort to persuade the authorities to call the oil king and other trust magnates to account for their offenses against the public and their defiance of the peoples' laws.

Nothing is needed to further inflame the public mind against the most arrogant monopo-

list of the age, but something is needed to nerve the arm of the authorities so that they will call John D. Rockefeller and offenders of that class to account. They should be called to account—not with injunctions that do not restrain, not with fines that do not prohibit future violations, not with official reports that do not tell the whole truth, but with prison cells. Then destroy, in tariff and in other laws, the shelter found by special interests and encourage a determination—on the part of the people, as well as on the part of the men in power—that in every act of the legislative and executive departments of government "equal rights to all and special privileges to none" shall be the controlling principle.

◆◆◆◆ INCOMPLETE

The Kansas City Star calls attention to the fact that the report of Commissioner of Corporations Herbert Knox Smith on Standard Oil prices, domestic and foreign, is not complete. The Star explains: "High prices are attributed solely to the Standard's monopolistic power, and the monopoly is attributed to preferential railroad rates and other favors exacted by the corporation. But Mr. Smith shows that Standard Oil demands about twenty-seven per cent more for its products in this country than it gets for the same products in Europe. Russia is the only country that can compete with the Standard, and Russian competition, in Europe, keeps down European prices. But Russia is estopped from competing in the United States by a tariff that gives Standard Oil about 150 per cent 'protection.'" But for the tariff Standard Oil would be compelled to make substantially the same prices at home as abroad. But this is a fact that a republican commissioner of corporations can hardly be expected to put into his report. Nevertheless a report without it is not complete. More than that, it is misleading and to a considerable extent ineffective."

◆◆◆◆ THE GREATEST MAN

William C. Channing paid a high tribute to the common people when he said: "The greatest man is he who chooses the right with invincible resolution; who resists the sorest temptations from within and without; who bears the heaviest burdens cheerfully; who is calmest in storms and most fearless under menace and frowns; whose reliance on truth, on virtue, on God, is most unfaltering. I believe this greatness to be most common among the multitude, whose names are never heard."

◆◆◆◆ ELKINS AND CORTELYOU

The Kansas City Star says: "If Secretary Cortelyou is really a candidate for the presidency it is unfortunate for him that his candidacy should be launched by Senator Elkins."

Does the Star imagine that the people did not have a fairly accurate idea of the forces behind the Cortelyou boom even before Mr. Elkins spoke?

◆◆◆◆ THE TARIFF IN 1896 AND 1900

A Commoner reader directs attention to the fact that the New York World charges that the democratic platforms in 1896 and 1900 dodged the tariff question. The World has often made this charge although its error has, as often, been pointed out.

The Chicago platform said: "We hold that tariff duties should be levied for the purpose of revenue, such duties to be so adjusted as to operate equally throughout the country, and not discriminate between classes or sections, and that taxation should be limited by the needs of the government, honestly and economically administered." The Chicago platform denounced the proposition of the republicans to restore the McKinley law, and declared that that law "enacted under the false plea of protection to home industry, proved a prolific breeder of trusts and monopolies, enriched the few at the expense of the many, restricted trade and deprived the producers of the great American staples, of access to their natural markets."

Not only did the platform of 1900 "condemn the Dingley tariff law as a trust-breeding measure, skilfully devised to give the few favors which they did not deserve and to place upon the many burdens which they should not bear," but it also declared that "tariff laws should be

amended by putting the products of trusts upon the free lists to prevent monopoly under the plea of protection."

The Kansas City platform further said: "We reaffirm and indorse the principles of the national democratic platform, adopted at Chicago in 1896."

While it is true that in 1896, as in 1900, the tariff question was not a conspicuous issue, and while the Chicago platform objected to "any agitation for further changes in our tariff laws, except such as are necessary to meet the deficit in the revenue caused by the adverse decision of the supreme court on the income tax," the party did not abandon its time-honored position on the tariff question in either 1896 or in 1900. Nor were these platforms evasive upon the tariff question. It is absurd to say that the democratic position was evasive in 1900 with a platform that denounced the Dingley law, promised the amendment of the tariff laws by putting the products of trusts upon the free list to prevent monopoly under the plea of protection and reaffirmed the platform of 1896 in which platform it was plainly said: "We hold that tariff duties should be levied for the purposes of revenue."

◆◆◆◆ "PERSONS" OR "PEOPLE"

Recently the talented editor of the Washington, D. C., Herald took his pen in hand and wrote: "After a two weeks' trance, an Iowa girl woke up unable to speak the English language."

Subsequently the talented editor of the New York Herald took his pen in hand and wrote: "Purists, noting that our Washington namesake uses the word 'people' instead of 'persons,' will doubtless insist that among the 'millions who wake up every morning' there are also a few who are unable to 'write' the English language."

A few what, "persons" or "people?" If we are going into this purist business we must insist on our esteemed contemporaries being purists from law. By the way, will the "persons" or "people" responsible for the language flung at "people" or "persons" in general through the New York Herald's columns please explain: If a hen, engaged in the process of incubation is "setting," is a hen that merely rests upon her nest "setting" or "sitting?" Proper elucidation of a few of these seemingly minor points may be of material assistance to the rest of us "persons" or "people" in furthering the campaign for purism.

AS A LITTLE CHILD

As a little child they are leading him,
For his hair is white and his eyes are dim;
As a little child he is whispering low
To the phantom friends of long ago;
As a little child he is wandering back
In fancy over the golden track;
In the years that were and the days that fled
He is dreaming the dream of the dreamless dead!

As a little child they must humor him.
When the hair is white and the eyes are dim.
Ah, do not jeer at his peevish ways
That try one's patience through dreary days—
He's living over the life he knew
In boyhood's valley of gold and blue;
As a little child on a mother's breast,
His heart is weary; he wants to rest!

As a little child he must have his way,
In this thought of youth and his dream of play;
He has forgotten his time and place
And lives in the joy of an olden grace;
As a little child in the childheart spell
He hears the chime of the fairy bell,
And thinks he is young as a boy again
In the rosy weather and country lane!

As a little child with his hand in theirs
They lead him forth as his fancy fares;
His hair is white and his form is bent,
And his voice is soft as a sacrament
When he calls the names that are on the tomb
As if they were sweet in the living bloom;
He has forgotten, he does not know
He isn't a child in the long ago!

Second childhood they call it. Yea!
Old heart grown young in the dream of play,
Feeble footstep and palsied hand
Are lost in the vision of childhood land!
He hardly sees and he seldom hears,
But ever the voices of vanished years
Are singing sweet as they sang of old
In the gates of youth and the fields of gold!

—Baltimore Sun.