

publican organ that denounced the Chicago platform because of its plank relating to this very point.

In that platform it was said, "We especially object to government by injunction as a new and highly dangerous form of oppression by which federal judges in contempt of the laws of the states and rights of citizens, become at once legislators, judges, and executioners." And yet it has not been forgotten that the supporters of the Chicago platform were denounced as "anarchists" because of their position on the injunction question.

What difference is there between the arraignment of the injunction by this republican newspaper and the arraignment of the injunction by the Chicago platform? Time and experience are vindicating another plank of the much-abused Chicago platform.

The Figure on the Bridge.

Mr. Roosevelt's decision in the Schley case will not operate to the disadvantage of the admiral in the estimation of the American people. The people have become quite accustomed to the systematic effort to deprive Schley of the honors to which he is entitled, and when, to the injustice of depriving him of his just credit is added the wrong of seeking to smirch his good name, the only effect will be that the cockles of the popular heart will grow considerably warmer for the hero of Santiago Bay.

The verdict of Admiral Dewey, rendered after hearing the evidence and consulting his own good judgment, has considerable more weight with the people than Mr. Roosevelt's decision made after consulting republican leaders as to the political effect.

Admiral Schley could have afforded to rest upon Admiral Dewey's verdict, though, to be sure, it is not surprising that, smarting under the injustice that had been done him by two members of the court of inquiry, Schley should have appealed to the president in the hope of obtaining fair treatment. And now in spite of Mr. Roosevelt's decision, Admiral Schley may rest content in the knowledge that he needs no vindication before the people and that even the edict of a president cannot remove from the popular vision the "figure on the bridge of the Brooklyn."

The Gage Advancement.

The friends of ex-Secretary Gage will be delighted to know that he is to be president of the United States Trust company (Rockefeller) with a salary of \$40,000 per year, but the people generally will wonder if this handsome reward bestowed by Mr. Rockefeller is due to Mr. Gage's generous treatment of the Rockefeller interests while Mr. Gage was secretary of the treasury.

In another column The Commoner prints an extract from the New York World Almanac. The facts set forth in the World Almanac have been printed at various times in the daily press, but The Commoner reproduces these things in order to show that the facts are so well established that they have come to be accepted as a matter of history.

It will not be difficult for an intelligent man to understand that while Mr. Gage was secretary of the treasury, he gave to the Rockefeller interests advantages which, as a public officer, he had no right to bestow; and The Commoner regards it as its duty to direct public attention to this fact at this time, and to the further fact that upon Mr. Gage's retirement from public office he was rewarded by an important position in connection with the Rockefeller interests.

Is it not about time that the American people began to put "this and that together" in order to do justice to themselves? Read the extracts from the World Almanac printed in this issue; pass them along to your neighbor; ask yourself and ask your neighbor if these facts do not justify

the American citizen in the suspicion that republican leaders are not nearly so zealous for public interests as they are for individual advantage or corporation advancement.

The Political Effect.

The Chicago Tribune, in its issue of Sunday, February 16, printed a dispatch from Washington to the effect that President Roosevelt called in Senators Allison, Aldrich and Spooner, Speaker Henderson and Congressmen Grosvenor and Cannon for the purpose of asking the opinion of these gentlemen as to the political effect of the decision in the Schley case. The Chicago Record-Herald, in its issue of Monday, February 17, commenting on this conference, said:

What is there about the Schley case that it has never been considered on its merits irrespective of some ulterior effect of its hearing and decision? . . .

Does the president not know that the more care he takes to make his opinion fit political exigencies as seen through the partisan spectacles of three republican senators and three republican congressmen the more certain will it prove a partisan and unconvincing document to the people who look for a judicial decision based on the evidence and not a campaign document based on political necessities?

If President Roosevelt had sat up nights to devise a scheme to prevent popular acceptance of his decision as settling the Schley case he could not have hit upon anything more certain to accomplish that end than the conference of last Saturday. What faith can the people have in the judgment of a judge who has not enough faith in it himself to formulate it without securing the approval of interested parties as to its effect on their joint fortunes?

It will be observed that these gentlemen were not asked to assist Mr. Roosevelt in arriving at a just conclusion. The president wanted to know what effect his decision in the Schley case would have upon his political fortunes. The senators and representatives expressed the opinion that the political effect would not be serious.

But suppose these gentlemen had told the president that the political effect would be serious. Would he have changed his opinion? If such a statement would have had no effect on his opinion, then why were these gentlemen called in to consult on this point immediately before the president rendered his decision? If Mr. Roosevelt is a courageous man, why did he manifest any concern as to the political effect of his opinion?

He Wanted the Gall.

Frank C. Andrews, vice president of a Detroit bank, made way with \$1,600,000 of the bank's money. This record entitles Andrews to the palm among all the great bank wreckers of the country. Called to account for his offense, Andrews said: "These criminal proceedings are all right, but if the fellows think that they can get their money by putting me behind the bars for some years, so I can get a rest, I am satisfied. I have not a penny, but I don't worry about myself. All that is on my mind now is to save the others involved in this crash."

The bravado and assurance of this man is in keeping with the attitude of many of his predecessors in his peculiar line. The hope is held out that if he is not sent to prison, he will, in an impulsive and generous moment, conclude to aid the depositors by restoring their money.

The statement quoted above, which statement is taken from the Chicago Record-Herald, recalls the story of a bank cashier in a western state. He had wrecked the bank, and, like the Detroit man, he was not worrying about himself, but he felt "extremely sorry" for the unfortunate situation of his victims. A meeting of the bank directors was held for the purpose of devising means of saving something from the wreck. The bank wrecker addressed the gathering and said: "Gentlemen, I am indeed very sorry for you. You don't

know how sorry I am. If it would do you any good, I would be willing to have my body cut up into little pieces and distributed among you."

One of the directors was a very deaf man and he leaned over to a colleague who sat beside him and asked: "What did he say he would do?" His colleague replied: "He said if it would do any good, he would have his body cut up into little pieces and distributed among us." The deaf director leaned back in his chair, heaved a sigh, and said: "Well, if that is done, I speak for the gall."

Boer War Expenses.

The Sheffield, England, Daily Telegraph of February 1st has an interesting editorial in reference to Mr. Broderick's speech in introducing the supplementary army estimate in the house of commons. The Telegraph says that this statement "reveals a highly satisfactory state of affairs."

It will be interesting to learn what, in the estimation of an English newspaper, constitutes a "highly satisfactory state of affairs" with relation to the South African war. The Telegraph points out that a supplementary vote of about \$25,000,000 was asked for. The cost of the war from 1900 to 1901 which, according to the Telegraph, was the first complete year, was more than \$312,000,000. The estimate so far this year was more than \$275,000,000. To this the Telegraph adds the \$25,000,000 asked for in Mr. Broderick's statement and it finds a total for the present financial year of more than \$300,000,000, and the Telegraph congratulates itself that this is less than the total for the period from 1900 to 1901.

Perhaps the Telegraph has overlooked the fact that the present year for which it makes this estimate, like the South African war, is not yet at an end. Perhaps more money will be necessary because it requires fortunes, and immense ones, to destroy life by the wholesale.

The Telegraph's own statement does not justify its optimistic view so far as expenditures are concerned, for it says:

We have still 250,000 men, or thereabouts, in South Africa, and drafts and remounts have gone out in an ever-flowing stream to make good the inevitable wastage. At the same time that our expenses have been decreasing, our responsibilities have been increasing; for we have now 27,000 Boer prisoners of war to keep, and 150,000 people in the concentration camps. In addition, there have been the blockhouses to build and maintain. Yet, in spite of those extra calls upon the country's purse, the war is now costing us only 4½ millions a month, as compared with 5½ millions a year ago.

Now one or the other thing is true. If the war is now costing England four and a half million pounds a month where a year ago it cost five and a half million pounds per month, either England was robbed by fraud or incompetence in its war management one year ago or else no decent effort is being made to feed the 27,000 Boer prisoners of war and the 150,000 people in the concentration camps.

The Telegraph, however, is determined to be optimistic and it seems inclined to accept as accurate Mr. Broderick's statement that the Boer forces are scattered, that there are now only three important bodies of Boers in the field and that each of these bodies number about 2,000 men. Let us accept all these statements as true, and according to this British authority, Great Britain must spend more than \$300,000,000 this year; it must maintain an army of 250,000 men; it has in the guard house 27,000 Boer prisoners and in the concentration camps 150,000 Boer women and children; besides its enormous force already there, "drafts and remounts have gone out in an ever-flowing stream to make good the inevitable wastage;" and all this has been done and is being done to accomplish the overthrow of the comparatively insignificant number of 6,000 Boer soldiers!

What a showing, indeed; and in the light of such a showing, however "highly satisfactory" it