

tives contemplate the good of all. From past experiences with him we know that he will labor toward that end, come what may. Every consideration calls upon fair-minded men throughout the country to hold up his hands.

Of course, it was highly improper for the minister to say—especially at a memorial service, and, worse still, in the presence of President Roosevelt—that his predecessor was providentially removed to make room for one who could and would protect society from the trusts. It was a plain intimation that President McKinley was not competent to deal with the subject. No wonder the president frowned and expressed his disapproval to his wife. Equally distasteful to him must have been the eulogy pronounced upon him by the minister, not only in his presence, but on an occasion made solemn by the recollection of the sad event of a year ago.

But aside from the impropriety and inopportune-ness of the sermon it must have come to the president more as a rebuke than as a compliment. In direct, clear and forceful language Rev. Washburn pointed out the evils of the trust system, ridiculed the defense that is made of them and declared that a new crisis had come and must be met.

To follow this scathing denunciation of private monopolies with commendation of President Roosevelt as one specially qualified to crush the evil—a David going forth to meet the Goliath of wealth—well, it must have stung the recipient of the compliment. If Mr. Washburn had carefully examined the president's record and read the president's speeches he would have known that the president is not imitating the shepherd lad—he has neither sling nor pebbles and is on excellent terms with the Philistines. His speeches are replete with apologies for the trusts, he refuses to enforce a plain criminal statute and even eulogizes an inactive attorney general whose appointment was dictated by the trusts. He allowed a nearly nine-months' session of congress to go by without doing anything on the trust question and as soon as the session adjourned began to make the air vocal with his promises of future action. Instead of using the authority he has he asks for an unnecessary amendment that must secure a two-thirds majority in both houses and then receive the support of three-fourths of the states—an amendment that cannot possibly be adopted before the next election. As long as the trusts can postpone action they are content, and that they are entirely satisfied with the president is evident from the fact that conventions which are openly and notoriously controlled by the trusts are clamoring for his renomination. Without the support of trust contributions and without the aid of trust-controlled newspapers the republican party would have no chance to win, and it must have brought the blood to the president's cheeks to have the minister praise him as a divinely appointed avenger of the wrongs suffered by the people. As the trusts brought the administration into being it would be patricide for the administration to kill the trusts.

President Roosevelt promised to carry out the policy of his predecessor and while there may be departures on other subjects, there is no likelihood that the present incumbent will deal more effectively with the monopoly evil than President McKinley did.

### Mr. Littlefield's Bill.

Mr. Littlefield has made known the details of his proposed anti-trust bill, which bill, it is said, has the indorsement of President Roosevelt.

The "important feature" of the bill, in Mr. Littlefield's opinion, is that providing that no one shall be exempt from giving testimony in an inquiry into a trust on the ground that his testimony might tend to incriminate him or subject him to a penalty. It is provided, however, that no person shall be prosecuted or subjected to any penalty or forfeiture on account of any transaction, matter or thing concerning which he may testify or produce evidence. Mr. Littlefield thinks that this provision will bring men like Morgan, Hill and Vanderbilt into court and force them to turn state's evidence against their will.

The bill provides that the man who sues a trust and recovers judgment is to receive three times the actual damage suffered, is to have all his lawyer fees paid by the trust, and that the trust is to pay all other expenses of the suit, including the court costs. The bill further provides for the publicity to be through a system of registration, to be made with the secretary of the treasury. A tax of 1 per cent per annum is to be levied on all capital stock issued and outstanding of any corporation engaged in interstate commerce whose outstanding capital stock is not fully paid in cash or other property at its cash market value or whose capital is based wholly or in part,

directly or indirectly, during any period of its development, upon the capitalization of earning capacity or economics.

One thing that stands in the way of the "important feature" of Mr. Littlefield's bill, that relating to the testimony of trust magnates, is that the indisposition on the part of these magnates to reveal the secrets of their methods will not be interfered with by the guarantee that they are not to be prosecuted on the basis of any confession they may make. They will avoid the confession.

The existing federal law provides a proceeding which would be more effective than anything yet devised by Mr. Roosevelt and his associates. It is the criminal indictment. And it will occur to the ordinary man that it is decidedly strange that these republican leaders go to so much trouble to frame ponderous bills under the pretense that the trusts are to be crushed or controlled while the most effective of weapons lies idle on the statute books.

It is true that the people are confronted with a great problem in the question as to how to deal with the trust evil, but we have a right to doubt the sincerity of men who, while pretending to make a campaign against trusts, have not undertaken to enforce the chief feature of the existing law, which is the criminal proceeding, and have not undertaken to give to the people an explanation of their failure to adopt that simple and practical plan.

### A Father's Influence.

On another page will be found one of Davenport's cartoons, made for the New York Journal and Chicago American, and reproduced by courtesy of Mr. Hearst. It was drawn to illustrate an editorial which appeared in Mr. Hearst's papers commenting upon a statement attributed to one of the millionaires, to the effect that he gambled with his son whenever his son desired to try his hand at a game of chance. The editorial condemned the folly of the father who taught his son to gamble, and contrasted his conduct with the conduct of the father who, after setting a good example to his son, endeavored to draw his attention to helpful books and to sources of valuable information. Pictures often present truth more clearly than it can be done by words, and no artist has been more successful than Davenport in conveying lessons through the medium of the pencil. A child requires all of the counsel that a parent can bestow, and The Commoner is glad to reinforce the thought presented in the cartoon.

### Who is the Party?

The Cleveland Leader says: "The republican party is competent to settle any question that may arise. It is the party of prosperity and construction. It meets issues with intelligence and wisdom, and all the timid men who vote its ticket have to do is to keep busy at their daily affairs and to trust the party to do its duty as it always has done in the past."

But who are the party?

Here we are told that the timid voter has nothing to do but vote while "the party" will look after everything. The republican organization, composed of a few leaders and controlled by corporate wealth, will attend to the government and relieve the voters of all responsibility. The rank and file of the party are told to trust "the party;" they are told that "the party" can do no wrong; that it always has done right and always will.

If a lay number of the party assumes to criticize imperialistic methods he is denounced as a timid republican and told to trust the party. If he objects to having the financiers dictate the financial policy of the government he is denounced as a timid republican and told to trust the party. If he complains of the trusts or of a high tariff, he is denounced as a timid republican and told to trust the party. The Leader's advice recalls a story told some years ago by a farmers' alliance speaker. He said the farmers would elect a man to office and that it was the duty of the official to act as a watchman on the tower. "But," the speaker added, "when the farmer inquires, 'Watchman, what of the night?' the answer is plow on, plow on." The Leader would simply add "and trust the republican party."

### Real Riches.

As I was passing through southeast Kansas a few days ago my attention was called to a farm by the side of the railroad. "There," said a gentleman who sat beside me, "is the farm of a man who homesteaded here thirty years ago. By industry and economy that man, with his wife as a

helper, has raised and educated four children and by gradual accumulation has doubled the size of his farm. The children are worthy citizens, a credit to their parents and to their country, and the old people are now able to live comfortably on a modest income and their declining years are blessed by the affection of their children and by the memory of a well spent life."

The records of the "four hundred" do not chronicle the doings of this man and wife; Bradstreet and Dun do not report on their financial standing, but they are rich—richer in all that goes to make up a happy and successful life than those who amass millions by questionable means, waste their strength in the dissipations of society and die childless or leave offspring enervated by luxury.

There are still some things that are priceless, and the Kansas couple would hardly exchange the fortune which they have in their own consciences and in the character developed by the members of their family for all the glittering promises that great wealth can offer.

### Returning to the Mire.

The Kearney New Era has the following to say in regard to a populist who left the republican party some years ago and has recently announced his return to the republican party. The only excuse a populist can give for returning to the republican party is that he has undergone a complete change himself, and that he is now in a worse position politically than the republican party was when he left it, for the evil tendencies of the republican party have become more apparent and its transgressions have been multiplied since the populist party was organized. The New Era's summary of the situation is so much to the point that it is given in full. It says that when Mr. ——— left the republican party "it had many principles that were good enough for populists. It has none now. Then it advocated bimetalism, now it is wedded to the single gold standard; then it boasted of having been the author of the greenbacks, now it is their destroyer; then it claimed to be the true friend of the silver dollar, now it is pledged to its extermination; then it was labor's helper, now the trust promoter; then it guaranteed civil rights to all, white or black, now it denies these to the Filipinos; then its policies were measured by patriotism, now dollars and cents; then it had a voice for struggling liberty, now shot and shell; then it aided Christian missionaries, now it kills Christians and bribes pagans; then it was a power for peace, now an armed force for plunder; then its platforms extolled the teachings of its Lincolns, Garfields and Blaines, now it boasts of unsoldier-like Funstons and its ill-gotten gains; then it passed a national anti-trust law, now it refuses to enforce it; then it condemned G. Cleveland's financial policy, now praises and adopts it; then it was anti-slavery, now opposes its abolition in the Philippines; then it favored the masses, now it fosters the classes."

### A Legacy of Disgrace.

On another page will be found an editorial, entitled "A Sermon and a Suicide," reproduced from the Cincinnati Post. The young man mentioned left a legacy of disgrace, and yet how many men are imitating him, apparently heedless of consequences to themselves and loved ones. Often parents with marriageable daughters place so high an estimate upon wealth and social position that they will frown upon a poor young man with character, purpose and good habits and court an alliance with some pampered son who has acquired questionable morals by his own efforts and expects to inherit a fortune by the efforts of his father. "A good name" is not only better for the living than "great riches," but it is a better inheritance to leave to a child.

In a well ordered society and under a just government material prosperity ought to accompany virtue and uprightness, but when a choice must be made between the two every sensible person must prefer to cherish the memory of an ancestor's pure and noble life rather than to handle the millions of one who lived a life of shame and died in a wild debauch.

Within a few days a wealthy New York financier, Nicholas Fish, a man of social prominence and son of a former cabinet officer, was killed in a saloon in a drunken quarrel. His presence there, his companions and his own conduct all tended to show that he was leading a double life and no estate however large can wash out the stain.

Money is corrupting the nation's morals and buying indulgences for those who habitually violate the laws of society, of government, and of God.

There is a crying need for a purification of pub-