

cerning the death rate in various cities, together with statistics concerning the diseases responsible for the deaths. No one will be surprised at the statement that pulmonary diseases are responsible for the largest percentage of deaths, but it will be a matter of very general surprise that cancer is the disease that comes second in the list and threatens the supremacy of pulmonary diseases. In the 134 cities included in the statistical tables cancer is responsible for an average of 4 per cent of the deaths. Grand Rapids, Mich., shows 6.67 per cent of deaths from cancer, heading the list, with Portland, Ore., a close second with 6.57 per cent.

Cancer is recognized as a rapidly growing disease and the medical profession is giving it more attention every day. Much has been said and written about homes for consumptives and the efforts that have been and are being made to discover some cure for that dread disease. But cancer is a disease that has heretofore baffled the physicians and now we are beginning to hear more about investigations into the causes thereof and the efforts that are being made to discover some cure. Cancer hospitals are being established and the most eminent members of the medical profession are devoting their lives to a study of the disease.

In the matter of deaths from consumption Denver naturally leads the list. This is due to the fact that Denver is the Mecca of those afflicted by pulmonary troubles because of its high altitude and bracing atmosphere. The high death rate is caused by so many consumptives going to that city as a last resort, and in no wise due to any fault of the city.

It is a pleasant commentary on the growing charity of the world that so many men of means and talent are devoting their money and their intellect to founding sanitariums and studying the causes and cures of diseases that have heretofore baffled medical research.

The Non-Voting Voter.

The Omaha World-Herald calls attention to the boast of an Iowa citizen that he has never voted although now past fifty years of age. He refuses to take part in politics because, he says, "it is not clean." Surely there cannot be very many who have so little intelligence as not to know that the citizen has no right to enjoy the blessings of free government unless he is willing to endure the constant sacrifice for which it calls. If the Iowa citizen is more honest than his neighbors he is in duty bound to give his country the benefit of his superior integrity and intelligence. A man might possibly justify himself in refusing to vote because he is not good enough, but no one can refuse to vote on the ground that he is too good.

Sometimes men fail to vote because their party is in the majority and they think their vote is not needed; sometimes they fail to vote because they are in the minority and they think their vote will do no good, but no excuse is valid. Public sentiment is gauged by the elections and every vote has its influence. The stay-at-home vote is too easily misconstrued. One Nebraska democrat, for instance, refused to vote because he wanted to encourage the republicans to carry their policies to extremes, believing that a reaction would be thus produced, and yet the republican leaders will construe the silence of this voter as an evidence that he is satisfied with existing conditions and with the tendencies of the policies now being enforced. Between those who absolutely refuse to vote and those who feel it their duty to vote are those who are so indifferent that they will vote if carried to the polls, but will not vote otherwise.

The party that has a large campaign fund and can furnish carriages has an advantage over a party without such a fund. It may become necessary to pass a law providing for compulsory voting; in fact, such a law would not only give an administration the encouragement of an indorsement or warn it by an adverse vote, but would

lessen the fund now required to carry on a campaign. The nearer we can get to the free and uncorrupted voice of the people the better, and compulsory voting would be a step in that direction.

Political Rights Recognized.

The following item which appeared in a recent issue of the New York Times shows the liberality of Senator Dawes and the deep convictions of his coachman. Not every employer, be it said with regret, is willing to have his vote killed by the vote of his employe, and not every employe, be it also said with regret, has the courage to separate his service from his citizenship. The story told by the Times is well worth reproducing because of the lesson which it teaches. The world would be better off if we had more men who recognized the sacredness of citizenship and who both asserted their own rights and respected the rights of others. The item reads:

"From Pittsburg, Mass., where the venerable ex-United States senator and present head of the Indian commission, Henry L. Dawes, has just completed his eighty-sixth year, and seems likely to pass in a quietude far from inactive not a few more, comes a little story that illustrates a very curious possibility of American politics. In discussing his plans for the future with a reporter who had called to extend birthday congratulations—and incidentally to get a little 'copy'—the commissioner said that he would on Tuesday next be driven, just as he had been for the past twenty-seven years, to the Third ward polling place by his old coachman, Patrick O'Hearn. And then the veteran statesman added: 'Pat has voted the straight democratic ticket and I the straight republican ticket during all those years, and I hold him in high regard because what I have said has never turned him in his political belief. Together we drive to the polling place, and Pat holds the horse while I go in and vote. Then I come out and hold the horse while Pat casts his ballot. This is what we have done for twenty-seven years, and I guess it is what we will do this year.' There are not many countries where a tale like that could be told with truth, and a very pretty tale it is, too, despite the fact that one must reflect a while and take several things into consideration before figuring out exactly why the ex-senator respects his coachman for calmly going his own way so long, regardless of the desires as well as the arguments of an employer presumably so much better informed than himself and with the means which every employer who chooses to exert them has at his command to influence an employe's vote. Pleasant, moreover, is it that never in the course of the twenty-seven years has it occurred to either of these sovereign American citizens that the vote of one rendered entirely ineffectual the vote of the other, or that, so far as the results of the several elections went, they might as well have taken their election day drive in some more interesting direction than to the polling place—which they could easily have done along almost any of the roads leading out of Pittsburg. Consciously or unconsciously, each realized his duty to vote at the appointed time, and if neither ever repined, over the annulling of a senator's vote by a coachman's, then so much the more creditable to both has been their persistence in well doing."

The President on Trial.

There is no doubt that many republicans and some democrats have confidence that the president intends to destroy the trusts and events will show whether their faith is well grounded. The Commoner has pointed out, first, that he has not enforced existing laws, and, second, that he always speaks of regulating bad trusts, not of destroying all trusts. It has denied and still denies that the president is planning to attack the principle of private monopoly, but the republican party has been sustained at the polls and the president must fight the trusts (and be fought by them) or disappoint the hopes which most of his supporters entertain. It must be remembered that some of the republican leaders have been defending the trusts

as a necessary step in economic development and these will gravely inform the president that the voters have indorsed his inaction and that he must not risk the effect of a vigorous attack on the great monopolies.

The president has the responsibility which comes with power, and is on trial before the people. Having called attention to the trust question himself he cannot ignore it when congress meets. Many will judge him by the manner in which he meets the issue.

Roosevelt's Attacks on Presidents.

The Columbia (Mo.) Herald, which enjoys the distinction of being one of the "handsomest country newspapers in America," and which is also one of the ablest democratic newspapers in the country, has been reading the books written by Theodore Roosevelt. Naturally Roosevelt's "Life of Thomas H. Benton" interests a Missourian. Editor Williams of the Herald says that while abroad the two most talked-of Americans that came to his notice were Missourians—Benton and the mule. Editor Williams has been reading Roosevelt's "Life of Benton" and has made some copious extracts therefrom.

It will be remembered that about a year ago republican organs were filled with violent criticisms of men who dared to speak slightly of a president, and criticisms of a president were likened to anarchy. Indeed, the assassination of William McKinley was attributed to the newspapers and speakers who criticised Mr. McKinley and his policies, and these same republican organs demanded a federal law limiting free speech and free press. These facts are recalled for the purpose of emphasizing some of the extracts the Columbia Herald has made from Roosevelt's "Life of Thomas H. Benton."

Speaking of Thomas Jefferson, Author Roosevelt said: "The scholarly, timid and shifty doctrinaire. . . Was the father of nullification and therefore of secession. . . Cheap pseudo-classicism that he borrowed from the French revolutionists. . . Constitutionally unable to put a proper value on truthfulness."

Of Martin Van Buren, Author Roosevelt said: "Faithfully served the mammon of unrighteousness. . . Succeeded because of and not in spite of his moral shortcomings."

This is what Author Roosevelt wrote concerning Franklin Pierce: "A small politician, of low capacity and mean surrounding, proud to act as the servile tool of men worse than himself."

When Author Roosevelt wrote of James K. Polk this is what he said: "Excepting Tyler, the very smallest of the small presidents between Jackson and Lincoln."

Of President Monroe, Author Roosevelt wrote as follows: "Colorless, high-bred gentleman of no especial ability, but well fitted to act as presidential figurehead."

But Author Roosevelt's opinion of John Tyler is especially interesting. He said: "He has been called a mediocre man; but this is unwarranted flattery. He was a politician of monumental littleness. . . His chief mental and moral attributes were peevishness, fretful obstinacy, inconsistency, incapacity to make up his mind, together with inordinate vanity."

If we remember aright similar estimates of presidents made by other gentlemen were denounced as "anarchy" and "abuse of the freedom of speech" by the writer of the above estimates of presidents. And if memory is not playing us false we recall a number of remarks to the effect that such "attacks" on a president were responsible for "anarchy" and that those who made them should be held responsible along with the assassin for any crime committed because of their "influence upon weak and irresponsible minds." Is it patriotism to defame a president after death and anarchy to criticise him while living?

A comparison of Author Roosevelt's words with President Roosevelt's words will bring to light many interesting things.