

they are behind the breastworks of corporate organization. I wish there to be no mistake on this point. It is idle to ask me not to prosecute criminals, rich or poor. But I desire no less emphatically to have it understood that we have undertaken and will undertake no action of a vindictive type, and above all no action which shall inflict a great or unmerited suffering upon the innocent stockholders, and upon the public as a whole. Our purpose is to act with the minimum of harshness compatible with obtaining our ends. In the man of great wealth, who has earned his wealth honestly and used it wisely, we recognize a good citizen worthy of all praise and respect. Business can only be done under modern conditions through corporations, and our purpose is to heartily favor the corporations that do well. The administration appreciates that liberal but honest profit for legitimate promoters and generous dividends for capital employed either in founding or continuing an honest business venture, are the factors necessary for successful corporate activity and therefore for generally prosperous business conditions. All these are compatible with fair dealing as between man and man, and rigid obedience to the law. Our aim is to help every honest man, every honest corporation, and our policy means in its ultimate analysis a healthy and prosperous expansion of business activities, of honest business men and honest corporations."

SECRETARY TAFT'S itinerary is given by the Columbus (Ohio) Press-Post in this way: "Columbus, Ohio, August 19; Cincinnati, August 20; Lexington, Ky., August 22; then to Louisville, then to St. Louis; Oklahoma for a speech August 24, Joplin, Mo.; then again to St. Louis, and from there to Kansas City and then to Denver, where he speaks August 29. He will spend the time between August 31 and September 3 in the Yellowstone Park, leaving there in time to deliver an address in Portland, Ore., October 6. He next speaks at Tacoma, October 7, and Seattle October 9, sailing from the latter place October 10 on the transport Minnesota. He reaches the other side of the world at Yokohama September 25 and spends eight days in Japan. October 4 he leaves for China, reaching Shanghai October 6, going to Hong Kong, from which port he sails to Manila, reaching the Philippine city October 11. He will remain on the islands twenty-two days, leaving November 4 for Vladivostok, Siberia, the Russian-Asiatic stronghold, crossing Siberia to Moscow, which he will reach November 23 and landing in St. Petersburg November 26. His next destination is Berlin November 29, after which he sails from Cherbourg, France, and arrives in New York between December 10-15. In this journey he will be accompanied by Mrs. Taft and his son, Charles Taft, aged twelve, General Clarence R. Edwards, his military aid and Fred W. Carpenter, his secretary."

HOW MANY men, if they were as candid as the editor of the Richmond Times-Dispatch, would join with him in this confession: "The Charlotte Observer is authority for the statement that all men sympathize with a culprit who is a fugitive from justice and hope that he will escape. We find much comfort in the Observer's assurance. We never read of a defaulter, for example, who runs away that we do not squeeze for him while he runs, and when we hear that a prisoner has been detected, just as his well laid plans for escape are maturing, we invariably have a sneaky feeling of regret that his plan failed. We have never confessed to this weakness until now, for we had supposed that it was a sort of latent criminal instinct, which no thoroughly honest man could have. It is comforting, we repeat, to be assured by the Observer that the instinct is psychological and not criminal, and that it is common to the human race."

SOME OF THE republican politicians at the national capitol, according to the Washington correspondent of the St. Louis Globe-Democrat, believe that in his Columbus, Ohio, speech Mr. Taft made at least two blunders. The Globe-Democrat correspondent says: "One of these blunders was in Mr. Taft's tariff utterances, and the other in advocating the changing of the anti-trust laws so as to provide for the control of those trusts in 'unreasonable' restraint of trade. On the whole it is realized that the speech, in its general terms, is a direct reflection of the administration view in most things. The war secretary read his speech of yesterday to the president and the president read his speech of

today to his war secretary and each indorsed the other. Relative to the use of the word 'unreasonable' in a revised trust law, it is pointed out that such an amendment would be, in a large measure, playing directly into the hands of the big corporations popularly believed to be operating in restraint of trade. In the trans-Missouri case, in the Joint Traffic association case, and still later, and of even more importance, the Northern Securities case, the defense claimed that the restraint of trade with which they were charged was not unreasonable, neither was it harmful or contrary to the public interest. The position was attacked strongly and successfully by the government. Mr. Knox, who was then attorney general, held that such construction placed on the statute would negate the efforts of the government."

ACCORDING TO this same authority some of the "standpatters" are not impressed with Secretary Taft's remarks on the tariff. The Globe-Democrat's correspondent explains: "For instance, they don't like this language: 'It is the duty of the republican party to see to it that the tariff on imported articles does not exceed substantially the reasonably permanent differential between the cost of production in the foreign countries and that in the United States. Whenever the tariff imposed is largely in excess of the differential between the cost of production in the two countries, there is formed at once a great temptation to monopolies.' It is especially the last sentence above quoted to which exception is taken by a prominent official whose name has become synonymous with 'standpattism,' a man whose voice has been raised in many states of the union in previous campaigns in behalf of the protective tariff, but who does not desire his identity known in this connection. He said of the sentence quoted: 'That is not true. We want to know that we have enough protection. Further, the free trade or non-protective policy of England is more conducive to monopoly than our high protective tariff.' This gentleman agrees with Mr. Taft that the republican party can well afford to wait until after another presidential election in order to make any possible revision of the tariff, which he does not admit is necessary. He thinks Mr. Taft has said something which the opponents of the republican party desired him to say, in a seeming admission that the protective tariff was conducive to monopoly, and which would be used against the party at every opportunity. This same gentleman differed with Mr. Taft in relation to his ideas of an income tax, saying that he believed the supreme court decision on that question was honest and based on honest and correct grounds. He added that he noticed Mr. Taft touched on inheritance and income taxes rather gingerly."

THE GLOBE-DEMOCRAT, which is a "standpatter" and a trust defender generally speaking editorially approves the Taft speech, saying: "The secretary's program will strike a majority of the members of his party favorably." The Milwaukee Sentinel, another "standpat," pro-trust partisan, approves the Taft speech, saying: "It will strengthen Mr. Taft's position with the country in general, we have no doubt. It is an earnest that should Mr. Taft be nominated and elected president there will be in the main a continuance of 'Roosevelt policies' by a broad, able, experienced, fair man of judicial training, who is markedly without what some are disposed to regard as the defects of the Roosevelt temperament."

THE WARDEN of the Newcastle county, Delaware, workhouse—A. S. Meserve—declares that the whipping-post is a failure. A Wilmington, Delaware, dispatch to the New York World follows: "Meserve, who is from Wellsboro, Mass., took charge of the workhouse six years ago. Coming in the wake of almost general condemnation of the Delaware whipping-post, the attitude of Meserve will probably result in the abolition of lashing. The warden said today: 'I have made a very careful and unbiased study of the effect of the whipping post on men of this class, and have come to the conclusion that it is all bad. It brings out in a man all that is revengeful and hurtful, and he arrays himself against law, order and society.' Mr. Meserve has lashed hundreds of negroes and white men. He has repeatedly stated that the principle was wrong and has strongly advo-

cated the repeal of the mediaeval law. Meserve has always had the unanimous support of the workhouse trustees in his management of the institution and leaves the position with the regrets of every member of the board. He has obtained an official position with the Pauley Jail company, of St. Louis, and will superintend the construction of prisons in Burlington, Vt., and Winnipeg, Manitoba. His salary at the Delaware institution was \$1,200 a year, while his wife was paid \$600 as matron. There are now 316 prisoners at the workhouse. The legislature authorized the incarceration therein of all long term prisoners throughout the state, as it is Delaware's sole penitentiary. The whipping post has been a Delaware institution more than a century, but of late there has developed a widespread sentiment against it. At the last session of the legislature the wisdom of abolishing it was fully discussed. The general assembly retained the lashes, but abolished the pillory."

SEVERAL DAYS after Mr. Taft's Columbus speech Senator Foraker gave out an interview which the Associated Press sums up in this way: "That Secretary Taft is losing ground in Ohio, although if nominated all republicans will support him. That his controversy with the president is over the question whether a public servant shall do his own thinking. That if Secretary Taft is correct in saying that there are evils in the tariff they ought to be removed at once, without waiting eighteen months. That the secretary is wrong in saying that another great body of republicans desired the tariff revised either now or eighteen months hence. That the rate bill instead of strengthening the Elkins bill weakens it. That through an amendment inserted by Senator Lodge, a friend of the administration, the harm was done as his amendment required proof that an offense was 'knowingly' done. That if the Standard Oil rebate offenses had been committed after this amendment the word 'knowingly' would have cost the United States \$29,000,000 in fines in Judge Landis' court. That the 'unfortunate circumstances' which Judge Taft speaks of in describing the elimination of imprisonment from the Elkins law was made at the suggestion of the interstate commerce commission itself."

REFERRING TO the judge who imposed upon the Standard Oil trust the \$29,240,000 fine the Washington correspondent for the St. Louis Globe-Democrat says: "Judge Landis is only forty years old. His father was wounded in the battle of Kenesaw Mountain, hence his name. Landis was born nearly two years after the civil war had ended. Judge Landis is picturesque in appearance and manner. He was private secretary to Walter Q. Gresham from 1893 to 1895. Judge Gresham had commanded the regiment in which Judge Landis' father served. Young Landis, prior to that, had been a republican, but turned democrat to accompany Gresham to Washington. While Landis was in the state department the Alliance 'affair' occurred. The Alliance, an American vessel, was overhauled by a Spanish gunboat outside the three-mile limit of Cuban jurisdiction and searched on suspicion of being loaded with munitions of war for the Cuban insurgents. There was a great hubbub developed in favor of demanding an apology. About that time Landis came near running the state department. Secretary Gresham was ill and President Cleveland had gone down the Potomac. Edwin H. Uhl of Michigan was acting secretary of state. He yielded to the popular cry and wrote a telegram to Hannis Taylor, the United States minister at Madrid, instructing Mr. Taylor to demand an apology of the Spanish government. He signed it, 'Uhl, acting.' By the merest accident Secretary Landis saw the telegram. He withdrew it from the department's telegraph operator and hurried with it to Mr. Gresham. Under Landis' advice Mr. Gresham scratched out 'Uhl, acting,' and signed his own name. A few days later the text of his telegram got into the newspapers, with Mr. Gresham's name attached, and the dying secretary of state was praised from one end of the country to the other. When President Cleveland returned home and learned what had occurred he was furious. He declined to sanction the demand for apology and redress, and it looked for a while as if he would haul Landis over the coals. Later Mr. Cleveland became attached to the young private secretary and offered to send him to Venezuela as minister. But Landis had seen enough of diplomacy and declined. He preferred law to politics."