

THIRTEEN YEARS IN AN ENGLISH PRISON.

I HAVE seen and talked with Florence Maybrick, the American woman who for thirteen years has languished in an English prison for a crime which she has protested from the first she never committed—the murder of her husband.

Mrs. Maybrick was condemned to be hanged, but five days before the time set for her execution her sentence was commuted to life imprisonment because (I quote from the court records) "the evidence does not exclude a reasonable doubt whether James Maybrick's death was in fact caused by the administration of arsenic."

The commutation of Mrs. Maybrick's sentence for the reason given by the English court attracted extraordinary attention and sympathy



Mrs. Maybrick. When She Was Sentenced.

for the American woman, and no prisoner accused of a capital offense has ever had such powerful friends exerting all their combined strength to effect release as she has had.

Florence Maybrick's unhappy fate has always lain heavily on my heart. So when I reached London, in May, I at once set at work to get permission to visit Aylesbury prison, where Mrs. Maybrick has for the past seven years been confined.

Mrs. Maybrick was about twenty-six years old, as I recollect it, when she was convicted of the murder of her husband. She has been in prison thirteen years and is therefore at least approaching her fortieth birthday.

Her face is an absolute blank except for that terrible sort of dumb protest felt in each feature. Florence Maybrick might be sixty or thirty, or any age between. She typifies dumb anguish as no other human being I have ever seen.

I stretched out my hand toward the poor woman and the frail little figure shrank back. "I am so sorry," she said, in a voice soft and low and utterly hopeless; "we are not allowed to shake hands or touch any one."

Mrs. Maybrick is a little over five feet in height. She cannot possibly weigh over ninety pounds. Her face has the deadly waxen look which long deprivation of sunlight and fresh air inevitably produce.

Her features are not regular, but very pleasing—very gentle. Her eyes are blue and large, and excepting when she looks one directly in the face, they are so expressionless as to make one wonder if there is any sight in them.

But I looked into Mrs. Maybrick's eyes determined to evoke a response—determined to send a little message to that poor hapless soul no matter what followed.

"I am from America," I said, and before I could be interrupted, "you have thousands of friends there. You must not think you are forgotten. We hope soon you will be free."

The blue eyes grew human and tender and looked into mine, still with the departing gaze. The colorless lips parted in a painful attempt to

smile, disclosing beautiful white teeth, and in a low, refined voice, very English in pitch and inflection, Mrs. Maybrick said:

"Thank you. Yes, I know I have friends in America. I had one great and noble champion in Miss Dodge-Gall Hamilton—and while she lived I had strong hopes. But she is dead—my dear unknown friend is dead."

I asked: "I there any message you have to send to America?"

"Only the same message," said Florence Maybrick—"my thanks, my prayers for the happiness of all who have given me a word of sympathy, and remember, I am innocent."

"How have you lived?" I ventured.

"I cannot tell," Mrs. Maybrick replied; "I often wonder how it is that

I have lived. I think it must be because my belief has never died that one day, sooner or later, my innocence will be proved. I am willing to die when that time comes. I must live till then."

"And your children?" I asked.

The blue eyes filled with big tears. "I know nothing of them for the past seven years. During the first six years of my imprisonment the Maybricks allowed me to see pictures of them twice a year and I was to keep the photographs in my cell for twenty-four hours each time."

"It was such a comfort to me! But they stopped without explanation seven years ago and I know nothing—nothing at all about them. My little girl is sixteen, my little boy a man about twenty. I have never seen them since they were taken away from me all those years ago."

"I believe they are told their mother is dead."

"What do you do, Mrs. Maybrick?" I asked. "How do you manage to live through these weary days and months?"

"And years," the prisoner said, concluding my sentence for me. "The prison routine never varies. The same, day and week, month and year."

I was told that Mrs. Maybrick has not only been a model prisoner herself, but has had an unparalleled influence for good on the other prisoners, who adore her. Several women convicts have offered and begged to be permitted to serve a life sentence if it would earn Florence Maybrick's release.

While Mrs. Maybrick was speaking the door opened and another attendant appeared. Once more I stretched forth my hand, a friendly woman's hand to Florence Maybrick, and she shook her head and threw me a sad little kiss from the tips of her waxen-like fingers.

In another instant the door had closed and I found myself in the cold stone corridor, free to leave this house of misery.

As soon as I reached London on my return from Aylesbury I got the address of Mrs. Maybrick's mother, the Baroness de Roques, and wrote her asking if she would see me if I went to Rouen, France, where she is living.

I received an answer saying I should be welcome.

The Baroness de Roques lives on the outskirts of Rouen in a tiny house

of a few rooms of lilliputian dimensions, for which she pays about \$10 a month. In this poor little refuge for ten long years she has lived, attended only by a faithful Breton woman.

During these years Florence Maybrick's mother has devoted her every hour, her every energy, her last available penny, to an effort to secure a new trial or a release for her unfortunate daughter. A new trial, Baroness de Roques has always contended, would show conclusively that, as Sir Charles Russell, the Attorney General and Lord Chief Justice of England said repeatedly: "Mrs. Maybrick ought to be set free, for she was never legally convicted."

At the end of my visit the Baroness de Roques gave me the picture of Mrs. Maybrick, taken shortly before she was accused of the crime for which she was tried, which is here reproduced.—Harriet Hubbard Ayer in New York World.



Judge Harman.

Who Sentenced Mrs. Maybrick.

Possession may be nine-tenths of the law, but the remaining tenth occasionally makes trouble, especially in France. A man in Paris had two motor cycles, on which he paid the annual tax uncompromisingly until the motor cycles were stolen from him two years ago. The law insists he should go on paying the taxes indefinitely, as he cannot prove he no longer possesses the cycles by returning the taxing plaques which were attached to the machines, and, of course, vanished with them. As long as he does not return the plaques the law considers he is in possession of the cycles and insists on the taxes being paid.

Play Both Ends.

In Guatemala, the Indian population tries to double its chances for the efficacy of prayer by worshipping at a Christian altar with images of its heathen deities hidden behind it.

Where Are the Pennies?

Somewhere in the world there are 119,000,000 big copper pennies, but nobody appears to know where they are.

THE "PROPER TIME"

REPUBLICAN FALSITY ON QUESTION OF TARIFF REVISION.

Grosvenor and Other Leaders Reveal the True Attitude of the Party— Voters Have It in Their Power to Curb Protected Monopolies.

The question of a revision of the tariff is causing considerable anxiety to the Republican leaders. The speech of Representative Grosvenor at the convention which nominated him was on both sides of the question, as is usual with that political acrobat. He favored revision of the tariff when the "proper time" came, and of course only Grosvenor and the Republican party were capable of undertaking the revising. The Washington correspondent of the Boston Transcript, a sturdy Republican newspaper, says of this:

"Mr. Grosvenor did not say when the 'proper time' for tariff revision would arrive, but it is well known that he fully agrees with the other Republican leaders of the House that there probably will be no revision in which the House which is to be elected this fall will share. When, therefore, Republican politicians commend Mr. Grosvenor's remarks they mean that the men who rule the Republican party have not the slightest intention that the tariff shall be disturbed until they are compelled to revise it."

"Nobody here regards with any seriousness the recent declarations of Senator Cullom, Representative Tawney and other Republican members of Congress in favor of tariff reform. There are others who say the Republican 'tariff reformers' do not wish to be taken seriously by anybody outside their constituencies. They are tariff reformers of the Babcock variety, but whether they are sincere or not, there is not the slightest reason apparent to Washington politicians for expecting that any considerable movement for tariff revision will be developed in the Republican party next winter. Secretary Shaw, for example, thinks the Republicans of Iowa should not have made the declarations which embarrass the party at large. He says they know quite as well as he that the tariff is going to 'stay put' for several years to come unless the Republicans get tremendously shaken up in the fall elections, and in that way scared into making some revisions."

The tariff-protected trusts evidently have too firm a grasp on the leaders of the Republican party to permit any of the tariff subsidy they are now receiving to be disturbed. This is the attitude of the leaders. But what of the people who pay the tax? Will they vote for members of Congress or for members of the legislatures, who will select one-third of the members of the United States senate at the election this fall, who will continue the tariff tax on trust productions?

The opportunity to turn down the politicians who secretly, if not openly, favor the tariff subsidy is in the hands of the voters. They can indorse the Hanna-Grosvenor plan of letting well enough alone or they can vote for those who are pledged to lift the tariff burden of double prices on many of the necessities of life which the "letting well enough alone" program compels them to pay. In deciding this question, it is well to remember that the trusts are now selling their productions in this country for nearly double what they sell them for in other countries.

Republican Factions at War.

AL open schism between the warring factions of the Republican party on Cuban reciprocity, the tariff and the trust questions would seem to be inevitable.

On the one side is the president and his supporters; on the other the old and tried leaders of that party. The president said that Cuban reciprocity must be accomplished and would be "sure as fate." He is also supposed to favor a revision of the tariff and has, after a fashion, been trying to curb the trusts, though nothing in that line has yet been accomplished. On the other hand the Republican machine, headed by Senator Hanna as chairman of the Republican National committee and Mr. Babcock and the other members of the congressional committee, have just published the campaign book, which makes no mention of Cuban reciprocity and defends the trusts.

Citing the Industrial commission's report as authority the book says, on the subject of trusts, "as far as statistics were available, the report shows in general a greater number of persons employed and higher wages paid in the same establishments after the combination than before." The argument based on this statement is hardly consistent with a policy hostile to trusts.

The whole spirit of the book is in conflict with the president's attitude as to reciprocity and his declarations on the subject of trusts. It is said that the president will not give his sanction to the avoidance of the Cuban reciprocity question in the campaign. The Republicans who opposed Cuban reciprocity during the session of Congress are extremely anxious to evade that question in the congressional fight, and some of them are apprehensive lest the president, during his tour this fall, should agitate the question.

The Washington Times of Aug. 14, says: "It is understood that the book has been withdrawn to be re-edited or, perhaps, rewritten on account of objections raised to it by close friends of the president. Its apparent con-

licts with the president's declarations with reference to trusts, and its silence on the subject of reciprocity doubtless furnish sufficient reason for the president's friends to be dissatisfied with it."

As the Times is good Republican authority and is noted as an organ of the administration, this extraordinary announcement is probably true. If it is, it is unparalleled in political history that a campaign book should be withdrawn on account of the protests of the head of a political party and his friends.

These be strenuous times and Republicans will have to decide where they stand. Democrats can view the disorganization of their opponents with a lively hope that when rogues fall out honest men may get their cues.

Spirit of Democracy.

Seldom have the truths and principles of Democracy been better stated in contrast to the greed, special privileges and plutocracy of the Republican party than in an editorial in the New York Journal of Aug. 4, 1902, from which we quote the following:

"The duty of the Democratic party, as well as its interests, is to fight the Republican party, not to compromise with it and imitate it."

"Republicanism, as we now see it, is a formidable foe. It is the party of wealth—not honest wealth, but predatory wealth, wealth founded on privilege and monopoly."

"Every eminently respectable thief in the country is a Republican."

"All the criminal trusts which make a business of plundering the people are offered and directed by men who make the cause of the Republican party their own."

"All the railroads which conspire with the trusts to kill off competition back the Republican party."

"All the 'protected interests' which fatten under the tariff and sell goods cheaper to foreigners than they do to Americans are ardently Republican."

"The food trust is Republican. The coal trust is Republican."

"The Republican party continues to employ the language of patriotism and to assert devotion to the people's welfare, but it has ceased to be moved by concern for the public good."

"The Republican party of 1902 represents only private interests."

"These private interests, organized to tax the people for private profit, possess in combination enormous power. They own the Republican party, dominate Congress, and have in their service most of the newspapers of the country, nearly all of the magazines, not a few pulpits and the majority of the colleges."

"The exploiters of the people need 'respectability' in their business, and they know how to get it now quite as well as they did a century ago, when about everything that was 'respectable' and 'conservative' lauded the centralizing and monarchical Hamilton, and exhausted the resources of hatred and calumny upon the Democratic Jefferson."

"Nevertheless Hamilton, who wanted government by 'property' and the 'better classes,' was abandoned by the people for Jefferson, who believed in equal rights to all and privileges to none, and thus a real republic was created."

"Equal rights to all and special privileges to none—that is the principle upon which whatever 'reorganization' the Democratic party of 1902 may need must proceed."

"War upon the trusts, war upon monopoly, war upon government by money without conscience or sense of patriotic obligation—that is Democracy."

"And that is the antithesis of modern Republicanism, which has become the political lackey of a plutocracy that has no respect for property until property has passed into its own possession and out of that of its rightful owners."

"Against this plutocracy, which has no purpose but to fill its pocket, no aim in politics save to get from government, through tariff and other class legislation, a continuing license to plunder the people, the Democratic party must battle ceaselessly if it is to be worthy of its name and mission."

"The Democratic masses understand the great, vital issue between the parties, if many of the advising sages do not."

What Democrats Need.

What we need is the leadership and the leaders that find reward in the work done, that pride themselves on something other than the cash accumulated and despise the common ambition of the average man. Until the Democracy can find such leadership it is spiritually dead, and the voter is justified in refusing to follow a funeral procession that preaches no resurrection. There is no hope in quitting a hospital merely to resume a march to the cemetery, and if this be treason, make the most of it. When we get together merely to win, we neglect the best of our fighting material—it is the soul of the Democracy that has kept her alive while all her rivals perished.—Florida Times-Union.

Issues and Arguments.

If the Democratic congressional committee is well advised it will devote a large share of its energy to the dissemination of information respecting the workings of protection as shown in the fact that the protected manufacturer charges the American consumer 40 per cent more than the foreign purchaser.

People may differ respecting the colonial policy of the country, but every man who is being robbed by the Republican tariff can appreciate the 40 per cent larceny without argument.

LABOR DAY.

Another Labor Day has come and gone, and its lessons have been learned. Who, watching the parades that took place in most of the cities, was not impressed anew with the dignity of labor? Who would not prefer to have his son employed as a wage-earner in some honorable occupation than to have him waste his time on the streets spending the money of his parents? The day also gave opportunity for the discussion of those questions which concern the laboring man, and what important question does not

Commoner Comment.

Extracts From W. J. Bryan's Paper.

ROOSEVELT ON TRUSTS.

President Roosevelt has progressed far enough in his campaign tour to show that he appreciates the seriousness of the trust issue and his discussion of the subject gives evidence of a complete change in his method of treatment since his elevation to the presidency. It was quite certain from his Minneapolis speech, delivered just before President McKinley's assassination, that he expected the administration to have a pro-trust candidate and that he (Roosevelt) expected to make his fight against the trusts and appeal to the anti-monopoly sentiment in his party. But he was suddenly ushered into the White house and given a chance to "shackle cunning" and he has ever since been apologizing for rather than denouncing trusts. Take his Providence speech as an illustration; he spent more time in trying to pacify those who criticize the trusts than in pointing out a remedy. Speech will be found on another page. Through it runs the idea that the enormous fortunes wrung from the people by monopoly are a natural and necessary result of good times—a result that we can not prevent. "We may like this or not, just as we please, but it is a fact, nevertheless, and as far as we can see it is an inevitable result of the working of certain causes, prominent among which has been the immense importance which steam and electricity have assumed in modern life"—that is the way he announces his submission to the man-made inequalities which have grown up under republican rule. Again he says: "For some of the evils which have attended upon the good changed conditions we can at present see no complete remedy," and in the next breath he finds fault with those who try to find a remedy, saying: "Much of the complaint against combinations is entirely unwarranted." He even tries to confuse the private monopoly with the labor organization in order to soften the laboring man's hostility to trusts. He says: "Exactly as labor organizations, when managed intelligently and in a spirit of justice and fair play, are of great service, not only to wage-earners, but to the whole community, as the history of many labor organizations has shown, so wealth, not merely individual, but corporate, when directed aright is not only a benefit to the community as a whole, but indispensable to the upbuilding of the conditions, which at the present the country has grown not only to accept, but to demand as normal." The president fails entirely to distinguish between an association of God-made men, with bodies to feed, families to provide for and with consciences to guide them and a fictitious person called a corporation organized for gain, having no heart to restrain it here and no soul to punish hereafter. He fails to discriminate between the labor organizations which have not yet succeeded in securing living wages and reasonable conditions and the overgrown corporations which declare enormous dividends on watered stock and enable the managers to become multi-millionaires from enforced contributions collected from the people. This hiding behind the labor organization is a favorite device of the monopolist and the president betrays his leanings when he falls into the same habit. A careful reading of the president's speech will convince any candid man that the executive is more alarmed lest the people may injure themselves morally by hating the trusts too much than he is lest they be hurt by the trusts. Note his solicitude: "We are passing through a period of great material prosperity and such a period is as sure as adversity itself to bring mutterings of discontent." Again: "If in a spirit of sullen envy they (the people) insist in putting down those who have profited most by the years of fatness, they will bury themselves in the crash of common disaster." And still again: "Probably the most serious harm resulting to us, the people of moderate means, is when we harm ourselves by letting the dark and evil vices of envy and hatred toward our fellows eat into our natures."

No trust magnate could have made a more abject and servile plea for lawless wealth and heartless greed. When we see great corporations violating the laws of the land and riding roughshod over the rights of the people, instead of applying a remedy we must constantly restrain our indignation for fear "the dark and evil vices of envy and hatred will eat into our natures." Instead of trying to catch the horse thief would he lecture the man who lost his horse? And does he think the horse raising industry would be jeopardized by the complete extermination of the horse thief?

No one finds fault with wealth that results from honest toil whether it be toil of the hand or toil of the head, and no one but an apologist for the trusts would confuse such wealth with the illegitimate accumulations that come from monopolizing trade, strangling competition and cornering the markets. Every honest man is benefited, not injured, by the prosecution of dishonest men; every legitimate industry is helped, not hindered, by the elimination of the illegitimate concern organized not to furnish a fair product at a fair price, but to prey on the people at large.

When the president finally gets through with his multiplied warnings against "ignorant meddling," and ap-

proaches a remedy he exhausts his energy in pointing out the difficulties in the way and has no strength left to urge effective means for meeting these difficulties.

He insists that it is "highly undesirable to attempt too much or to begin by stringent legislation." Those who are looking for "strenuousness" in dealing with the trust evil will not find it in the president's speech. It is weak and puerile. Instead of a warrior leading his men up San Juan Hill we see the politician anxious for a renomination and afraid either to ignore the subject or to deal with it firmly and aggressively. He need not have protested against "stringent legislation," his failure to enforce the criminal law against the beef trust while his marshals scour the country for petty offenders is proof positive that he will not err on the side of severity when influential law breakers are to be dealt with.

The only definite suggestion he makes is in regard to publicity and even this must be "non-inquisitorial." Publicity as an aid to other remedies would be useful, but publicity alone would be of no benefit. To expect any real relief to come from mere publicity is as absurd as it would be to propose the repeal of laws against larceny and the substitution of a law, simply requiring the thief to file a schedule of the things stolen—and then keep them. Publicity would give some protection to the stockholders, but none to the consumers of trust-controlled articles.

Not only does he fail to propose any real remedy, but he advocates a constitutional amendment that would take from the states the power they already have. While state remedies are woefully insufficient they must not be surrendered, for if they are surrendered the people will then have to depend entirely upon the federal government for protection.

The federal remedy should be added to, not substituted for, the state remedy. The republicans two years ago attempted to pass through the house of representatives a resolution submitting such an amendment as the president now advocates and the democrats opposed it on the ground that congress already has power to exterminate the trusts and should exercise that power instead of trying to rob the states of their power. In the summer of 1900 the republicans brought an anti-trust bill to a vote in the house of representatives and the democrats supported it, but it died in the senate. This year congress adjourned without getting an anti-trust bill through the house. Why talk about an unnecessary constitutional amendment when the republicans in congress refuse to use the power they already have?

The republicans are in absolute control of the federal government; they have the president, the senate, the house and the supreme court. They have it in their power to enforce existing laws and to make new ones, but the trusts grow rich while the attorney general, whom they selected, goes through the farce of enjoining two combinations. The rest of the trust: enjoy immunity from all attack and the two referred to are not disturbed by criminal prosecution. While the injunction suits languish the trusts go on making money and use the railroads, the mails and the telegraph lines to control interstate commerce.

A republican must be dull indeed if he cannot discover from the president's recent speeches that he has come to an agreement with the trust magnates. From now on republican speakers and republican editors will devote their energies to praising the benevolence of trust-made millionaires, to asserting the necessity for great combinations of capital and to threatening dire calamity if radical action against the trusts is attempted.

The republican leaders went through the same maneuvers on the money question and on imperialism. They first denounced the gold standard, then apologized for it, and then denied it; they at first denied that anybody wanted imperialism, then defended it as a necessity, and now they are preparing to praise it as a good thing.

To be a republican today one must sleep in his fatigue uniform and be ready to march in any direction at the command of the officers temporarily in charge.

It was not always so, and it is only a question of time when farmers, laboring men and small business men will demand of the republican party fidelity to the people's interests and, failing to compel fidelity, will desert the party.

It seems that Secretary Shaw believes in tariff revision that does not revise anything.

It is said that Mr. Morgan refuses to tip waiters, but Mr. Morgan is so rich he can afford to do it.

When the editors of Manila Freedom get out of jail their first act will be to change the name of their paper.

A large number of Iowa republican organs are frightened lest the Iowa republican tariff plank be taken in earnest.

If American naval vessels, officered and manned by Americans, failed to effect a landing on American shores it is useless for any other nation's vessels to try it.

It is not sufficient to say that labor organizations make mistakes—all people and all organizations makes mistakes. "To err is human," but those who insist upon living wages and reasonable hours are not as likely to err as those who are endeavoring to collect dividends upon watered stock.

The labor organization has been of service to those outside of its ranks as well as to those within, for the former get the benefit of the rate of wages fixed and the hours prescribed by the organization.

proaches a remedy he exhausts his energy in pointing out the difficulties in the way and has no strength left to urge effective means for meeting these difficulties.

He insists that it is "highly undesirable to attempt too much or to begin by stringent legislation." Those who are looking for "strenuousness" in dealing with the trust evil will not find it in the president's speech. It is weak and puerile. Instead of a warrior leading his men up San Juan Hill we see the politician anxious for a renomination and afraid either to ignore the subject or to deal with it firmly and aggressively. He need not have protested against "stringent legislation," his failure to enforce the criminal law against the beef trust while his marshals scour the country for petty offenders is proof positive that he will not err on the side of severity when influential law breakers are to be dealt with.

The only definite suggestion he makes is in regard to publicity and even this must be "non-inquisitorial." Publicity as an aid to other remedies would be useful, but publicity alone would be of no benefit. To expect any real relief to come from mere publicity is as absurd as it would be to propose the repeal of laws against larceny and the substitution of a law, simply requiring the thief to file a schedule of the things stolen—and then keep them. Publicity would give some protection to the stockholders, but none to the consumers of trust-controlled articles.

Not only does he fail to propose any real remedy, but he advocates a constitutional amendment that would take from the states the power they already have. While state remedies are woefully insufficient they must not be surrendered, for if they are surrendered the people will then have to depend entirely upon the federal government for protection.

The federal remedy should be added to, not substituted for, the state remedy. The republicans two years ago attempted to pass through the house of representatives a resolution submitting such an amendment as the president now advocates and the democrats opposed it on the ground that congress already has power to exterminate the trusts and should exercise that power instead of trying to rob the states of their power. In the summer of 1900 the republicans brought an anti-trust bill to a vote in the house of representatives and the democrats supported it, but it died in the senate. This year congress adjourned without getting an anti-trust bill through the house. Why talk about an unnecessary constitutional amendment when the republicans in congress refuse to use the power they already have?

The republicans are in absolute control of the federal government; they have the president, the senate, the house and the supreme court. They have it in their power to enforce existing laws and to make new ones, but the trusts grow rich while the attorney general, whom they selected, goes through the farce of enjoining two combinations. The rest of the trust: enjoy immunity from all attack and the two referred to are not disturbed by criminal prosecution. While the injunction suits languish the trusts go on making money and use the railroads, the mails and the telegraph lines to control interstate commerce.

A republican must be dull indeed if he cannot discover from the president's recent speeches that he has come to an agreement with the trust magnates. From now on republican speakers and republican editors will devote their energies to praising the benevolence of trust-made millionaires, to asserting the necessity for great combinations of capital and to threatening dire calamity if radical action against the trusts is attempted.

The republican leaders went through the same maneuvers on the money question and on imperialism. They first denounced the gold standard, then apologized for it, and then denied it; they at first denied that anybody wanted imperialism, then defended it as a necessity, and now they are preparing to praise it as a good thing.

To be a republican today one must sleep in his fatigue uniform and be ready to march in any direction at the command of the officers temporarily in charge.

It was not always so, and it is only a question of time when farmers, laboring men and small business men will demand of the republican party fidelity to the people's interests and, failing to compel fidelity, will desert the party.

It seems that Secretary Shaw believes in tariff revision that does not revise anything.

It is said that Mr. Morgan refuses to tip waiters, but Mr. Morgan is so rich he can afford to do it.

When the editors of Manila Freedom get out of jail their first act will be to change the name of their paper.

A large number of Iowa republican organs are frightened lest the Iowa republican tariff plank be taken in earnest.

If American naval vessels, officered and manned by Americans, failed to effect a landing on American shores it is useless for any other nation's vessels to try it.

It is not sufficient to say that labor organizations make mistakes—all people and all organizations makes mistakes. "To err is human," but those who insist upon living wages and reasonable hours are not as likely to err as those who are endeavoring to collect dividends upon watered stock.

The labor organization has been of service to those outside of its ranks as well as to those within, for the former get the benefit of the rate of wages fixed and the hours prescribed by the organization.

proaches a remedy he exhausts his energy in pointing out the difficulties in the way and has no strength left to urge effective means for meeting these difficulties.

He insists that it is "highly undesirable to attempt too much or to begin by stringent legislation." Those who are looking for "strenuousness" in dealing with the trust evil will not find it in the president's speech. It is weak and puerile. Instead of a warrior leading his men up San Juan Hill we see the politician anxious for a renomination and afraid either to ignore the subject or to deal with it firmly and aggressively. He need not have protested against "stringent legislation," his failure to enforce the criminal law against the beef trust while his marshals scour the country for petty offenders is proof positive that he will not err on the side of severity when influential law breakers are to be dealt with.

The only definite suggestion he makes is in regard to publicity and even this must be "non-inquisitorial." Publicity as an aid to other remedies would be useful, but publicity alone would be of no benefit. To expect any real relief to come from mere publicity is as absurd as it would be to propose the repeal of laws against larceny and the substitution of a law, simply requiring the thief to file a schedule of the things stolen—and then keep them. Publicity would give some protection to the stockholders, but none to the consumers of trust-controlled articles.

Not only does he fail to propose any real remedy, but he advocates a constitutional amendment that would take from the states the power they already have. While state remedies are woefully insufficient they must not be surrendered, for if they are surrendered the people will then have to depend entirely upon the federal government for protection.

The federal remedy should be added to, not substituted for, the state remedy. The republicans two years ago attempted to pass through the house of representatives a resolution submitting such an amendment as the president now advocates and the democrats opposed it on the ground that congress already has power to exterminate the trusts and should exercise that power instead of trying to rob the states of their power. In the summer of 1900 the republicans brought an anti-trust bill to a vote in the house of representatives and the democrats supported it, but it died in the senate. This year congress adjourned without getting an anti-trust bill through the house. Why talk about an unnecessary constitutional amendment when the republicans in congress refuse to use the power they already have?

The republicans are in absolute control of the federal government; they have the president, the senate, the house and the supreme court. They have it in their power to enforce existing laws and to make new ones, but the trusts grow rich while the attorney general, whom they selected, goes through the farce of enjoining two combinations. The rest of the trust: enjoy immunity from all attack and the two referred to are not disturbed by criminal prosecution. While the injunction suits languish the trusts go on making money and use the railroads, the mails and the telegraph lines to control interstate commerce.

A republican must be dull indeed if he cannot discover from the president's recent speeches that he has come to an agreement with the trust magnates. From now on republican speakers and republican editors will devote their energies to praising the benevolence of trust-made millionaires, to asserting the necessity for great combinations of capital and to threatening dire calamity if radical action against the trusts is attempted.

The republican leaders went through the same maneuvers on the money question and on imperialism. They first denounced the gold standard, then apologized for it, and then denied it; they at first denied that anybody wanted imperialism, then defended it as a necessity, and now they are preparing to praise it as a good thing.

To be a republican today one must sleep in his fatigue uniform and be ready to march in any direction at the command of the officers temporarily in charge.

It was not always so, and it is only a question of time when farmers, laboring men and small business men will demand of the republican party fidelity to the people's interests and, failing to compel fidelity, will desert the party.

It seems that Secretary Shaw believes in tariff revision that does not revise anything.

It is said that Mr. Morgan refuses to tip waiters, but Mr. Morgan is so rich he can afford to do it.

When the editors of Manila Freedom get out of jail their first act will be to change the name of their paper.

A large number of Iowa republican organs are frightened lest the Iowa republican tariff plank be taken in earnest.

If American naval vessels, officered and manned by Americans, failed to effect a landing on American shores it is useless for any other nation's vessels to try it.

It is not sufficient to say that labor organizations make mistakes—all people and all organizations makes mistakes. "To err is human," but those who insist upon living wages and reasonable hours are not as likely to err as those who are endeavoring to collect dividends upon watered stock.

The labor organization has been of service to those outside of its ranks as well as to those within, for the former get the benefit of the rate of wages fixed and the hours prescribed by the organization.

proaches a remedy he exhausts his energy in pointing out the difficulties in the way and has no strength left to urge effective means for meeting these difficulties.

He insists that it is "highly undesirable to attempt too much or to begin by stringent legislation." Those who are looking for "strenuousness" in dealing with the trust evil will not find it in the president's speech. It is weak and puerile. Instead of a warrior leading his men up San Juan Hill we see the politician anxious for a renomination and afraid either to ignore the subject or to deal with it firmly and aggressively. He need not have protested against "stringent legislation," his failure to enforce the criminal law against the beef trust while his marshals scour the country for petty offenders is proof positive that he will not err on the side of severity when influential law breakers are to be dealt with.

The only definite suggestion he makes is in regard to publicity and even this must be "non-inquisitorial." Publicity as an aid to other remedies would be useful, but publicity alone would be of no benefit. To expect any real relief to come from mere publicity is as absurd as it would be to propose the repeal of laws against larceny and the substitution of a law, simply requiring the thief to file a schedule of the things stolen—and then keep them. Publicity would give some protection to the stockholders, but none to the consumers of trust-controlled articles.

Not only does he fail to propose any real remedy, but he advocates a constitutional amendment that would take from the states the power they already have. While state remedies are woefully insufficient they must not be surrendered, for if they are surrendered the people will then have to depend entirely upon the federal government for protection.

The federal remedy should be added to, not substituted for, the state remedy. The republicans two years ago attempted to pass through the house of representatives a resolution submitting such an amendment as the president now advocates and the democrats opposed it on the ground that congress already has power to exterminate the trusts and should exercise that power instead of trying to rob the states of their power. In the summer of 1900 the republicans brought an anti-trust bill to a vote in the house of representatives and the democrats supported it, but it died in the senate. This year congress adjourned without getting an anti-trust bill through the house. Why talk about an unnecessary constitutional amendment when the republicans in congress refuse to use the power they already have?

The republicans are in absolute control of the federal government; they have the president, the senate, the house and the supreme court. They have it in their power to enforce existing laws and to make new ones, but the trusts grow rich while the attorney general, whom they selected, goes through the farce of enjoining two combinations. The rest of the trust: enjoy immunity from all attack and the two referred to are not disturbed by criminal prosecution. While the injunction suits languish the trusts go on making money and use the railroads, the mails and the telegraph lines to control interstate commerce.

A republican must be dull indeed if he cannot discover from the president's recent speeches that he has come to an agreement with the trust magnates. From now on republican speakers and republican editors will devote their energies to praising the benevolence of trust-made millionaires, to asserting the necessity for great combinations of capital and to threatening dire calamity if radical action against the trusts is attempted.

The republican leaders went through the same maneuvers on the money question and on imperialism. They first denounced the gold standard, then apologized for it, and then denied it; they at first denied that anybody wanted imperialism, then defended it as a necessity, and now they are preparing to praise it as a good thing.

To be a republican today one must sleep in his fatigue uniform and be ready to march in any direction at the command of the officers temporarily in charge.

It was not always so, and it is only a question of time when farmers, laboring men and small business men will demand of the republican party fidelity to the people's interests and, failing to compel fidelity, will desert the party.

It seems that Secretary Shaw believes in tariff revision that does not revise anything.

It is said that Mr. Morgan refuses to tip waiters, but Mr. Morgan is so rich he can afford to do it.

When the editors of Manila Freedom get out of jail their first act will be to change the name of their paper.

A large number of Iowa republican organs are frightened lest the Iowa republican tariff plank be taken in earnest.

If American naval vessels, officered and manned by Americans, failed to effect a landing on American shores it is useless for any other nation's vessels to try it.

It is not sufficient to say that labor organizations make mistakes—all people and all organizations makes mistakes. "To err is human," but those who insist upon living wages and reasonable hours are not as likely to err as those who are endeavoring to collect dividends upon watered stock.

The labor organization has been of service to those outside of its ranks as well as to those within, for the former get the benefit of the rate of wages fixed and the hours prescribed by the organization.

proaches a remedy he exhausts his energy in pointing out the difficulties in the way and has no strength left to urge effective means for meeting these difficulties.

He insists that it is "highly undesirable to attempt too much or to begin by stringent legislation." Those who are looking for "strenuousness" in dealing with the trust evil will not find it in the president's speech. It is weak and puerile. Instead of a warrior leading his men up San Juan Hill we see the politician anxious for a renomination and afraid either to ignore the subject or to deal with it firmly and aggressively. He need not have protested against "stringent legislation," his failure to enforce the criminal law against the beef trust while his marshals scour the country for petty offenders is proof positive that he will not err on the side of severity when influential law breakers are to be dealt with.

The only definite suggestion he makes is in regard to publicity and even this must be "non-inquisitorial." Publicity as an aid to other remedies would be useful, but publicity alone would be of no benefit. To expect any real relief to come from mere publicity is as absurd as it would be to propose the repeal of laws against larceny and the substitution of a law, simply requiring the thief to file a schedule of the things stolen—and then keep them. Publicity would give some protection to the stockholders, but none to the consumers of trust-controlled articles.

Not only does he fail to propose any real remedy, but he advocates a constitutional amendment that would take from the states the power they already have. While state remedies are woefully insufficient they must not be surrendered, for if they are surrendered the people will then have to depend entirely upon the federal government for protection.

The federal remedy should be added to, not substituted for, the state remedy. The republicans two years ago attempted to pass through the house of representatives a resolution submitting such an amendment as the president now advocates and the democrats opposed it on the ground that congress already has power to exterminate the trusts and should exercise that power instead of trying to rob the states of their power. In the summer of 1900 the republicans brought an anti-trust bill to a vote in the house of representatives and the democrats supported it, but it died in the senate. This year congress adjourned without getting an anti-trust bill through the house. Why talk about an unnecessary constitutional amendment when the republicans in congress refuse to use the power they already have?

The republicans are in absolute control of the federal government; they have the president, the senate, the house and the supreme court. They have it in their power to enforce existing laws and to make new ones, but the trusts grow rich while the attorney general, whom they selected, goes through the farce of enjoining two combinations. The rest of the trust: enjoy immunity from all attack and the two referred to are not disturbed by criminal prosecution. While the injunction suits languish the trusts go on making money and use the railroads, the mails and the telegraph lines to control interstate commerce.

A republican must be dull indeed if he cannot discover from the president's recent speeches that he has come to an agreement with the trust magnates. From now on republican speakers and republican editors will devote their energies to praising the benevolence of trust-made millionaires, to asserting the necessity for great combinations of capital and to threatening dire calamity if radical action against the trusts is attempted.

The republican leaders went through the same maneuvers on the money question and on imperialism. They first denounced the gold standard, then apologized for it, and then denied it; they at first denied that anybody wanted imperialism, then defended it as a necessity, and now they are preparing to praise it as a good thing.

To be a republican today one must sleep in his fatigue uniform and be ready to march in any direction at the command of the officers temporarily in charge.

It was not always so, and it is only a question of time when farmers, laboring men and small business men will demand of the republican party fidelity to the people's interests and, failing to compel fidelity, will desert the party.

It seems that Secretary Shaw believes in tariff revision that does not revise anything.

It is said that Mr. Morgan refuses to tip waiters, but Mr. Morgan is so rich he can afford to do it.

When the editors of Manila Freedom get out of jail their first act will be to change the name of their paper.

A large number of Iowa republican organs are frightened lest the Iowa republican tariff plank be taken in earnest.

If American naval vessels, officered and manned by Americans, failed to effect a landing on American shores it is useless for any other nation's vessels to try it.

It is not sufficient to say that labor organizations make mistakes—all people and all organizations makes mistakes. "To err is human," but those who insist upon living wages and reasonable hours are not as likely to err as those who are endeavoring to collect dividends upon watered stock.

The labor organization has been of service to those outside of its ranks as well as to those within, for the former get the benefit of the rate of wages fixed and the hours prescribed by the organization.