

other questions, while those who resist reform on one line are apt to resist it on other lines. While circumstances may make one issue paramount at one time or another issue paramount at another time, the democratic party must stand ready to apply democratic principles to all questions, and to protect the people's rights wherever those rights are attacked.

## How the Skies Were Cleared.

The Littlefield anti-trust bill passed the house by an unanimous vote on February 6. The democrats were not permitted to amend the measure. They voted for it, not that it exactly suited them, but because they regarded it as a step in the right direction.

Mr. DeArmond, the well-known democrat from Missouri, speaking upon the bill pointed out that the bill under consideration was quite a different measure from that originally introduced by Mr. Littlefield. Referring to Mr. Littlefield's original measure, Mr. DeArmond said: "When the gentleman from Maine started out he had blood in his eye and a tomahawk in his hand, but by the time he and his colleagues caught up with the trusts they were smoking the pipe of peace, the sky was clear and the pickings continue food for the trusts."

It will be interesting to follow the process of "sky clearing," referred to by Mr. DeArmond; and, fortunately, there is an unbroken chain of incidents, testimony in support of which is provided by republican authorities.

The St. Louis Globe-Democrat, a republican paper, in its issue of January 16, printed a dispatch under date of Washington, January 15, as follows:

"The plans of Congressman Littlefield and his associates on the judiciary committee to report his trust bill to the house tomorrow from the full committee have been abandoned. This was a direct result of a conference which was held this afternoon at the home of Mr. Knox. The publicity provision is entirely too drastic. He took the bill to Pittsburg with him tonight and will submit a substitute for the publicity provision which he believes can be passed by congress."

The newspapers receiving the Associated press dispatches printed in their issues of January 17 a dispatch under date of Pittsburg, Pa., January 16, as follows:

"An informal dinner was tendered tonight by H. C. Frick to Attorney General P. C. Knox at his palatial home 'Clayton.' None but representative business men of the city were present. No speeches were made and the function was purely a social affair. Tomorrow Mrs. Knox will be given a reception by Mrs. Frick."

The newspapers receiving the Associated press dispatches printed in their issues of January 19 a dispatch under date of Washington, D. C., January 18, as follows:

"There were several officials prominent in legislative and executive circles at the White house in conference with the president tonight. Among them was Attorney General Knox who remained with Mr. Roosevelt some time. It is supposed the trust question was considered."

Let the thoughtful citizen read and re-read these telegrams. The republican attorney general for the United States concluded that the Littlefield bill as originally introduced was "entirely too drastic."

Under date of January 15 it was announced that "he took the bill to Pittsburg with him tonight and will submit a substitute for the publicity provision which he believes can be passed by congress."

Under date of January 16 it was announced that Mr. Knox was tendered an informal dinner by H. C. Frick, the great steel trust magnate, at Mr. Frick's palatial home "Clayton."

Under date of January 18 it was announced that Mr. Knox and other officials were in conference with the president and that "it is supposed the trust question was considered."

In the light of these dispatches, it is not difficult to understand how the "sky" happened to "clear."

In a dispatch to the Chicago Record-Herald, under date of Washington, February 11, William E. Curtis said that Mr. Littlefield was surprised to learn that he could not expect any encouragement from Mr. Roosevelt in the effort to push the Littlefield anti-trust bill through the senate. Doubtless Mr. Littlefield remembered that Attor-

ney General Knox had taken the bill to Pittsburg and that as a result of that visit the provisions of the bill which Mr. Knox regarded as "entirely too drastic" were trimmed down to suit the wishes of the trust magnates; and it is not surprising that he should be a bit disturbed on learning that in spite of these radical changes in his bill he could not depend upon the administration's support for his measure.

Is it possible that in the light of such exposures as this, republicans who are really opposed to the trust system and who hope that the people may find practical relief from impositions will continue to affiliate with a party that depends upon the trusts for its campaign funds and that trims its measures to suit the wishes of the trust magnates?

## A Republican's Views.

The New York Independent of December 4 prints the "Biography of a Bootblack" as told to its representative by Roco Corresca. The following extract will be of interest to readers of The Commoner:

"These people are without a king such as ours in Italy. It is what they call a republic as Garibaldi wanted, and every year in the fall the people vote. They wanted us to vote last fall, but we did not. A man came and said that he would get us made Americans for 50 cents and then we could get two dollars for our votes. I talked to some of our people and they told me that we should have to put a paper in a box telling who we wanted to govern us.

"I went with five men to the court, and when they asked me how long I had been in the country I told them two years. Afterward my countrymen said I was a fool and never would learn politics. 'You should have said you were five years here and then we would swear to it,' was what they told me.

"There are two kinds of people that vote here, republicans and democrats. I went to a republican meeting and the man said that the republicans want a republic and the democrats are against it. He said that democrats are for a king whose name is Bryan and who is an Irishman. There are some good Irishmen, but many of them insult Italians. They call us Dagoes. So I will be a republican.

"I like this country now and I don't see why we should have a king. Garibaldi didn't want a king, and he was the greatest man that ever lived."

From the above it will appear that Roco was a republican. The only reason he gave was that he was informed at a republican meeting that the republicans wanted a republic while the democrats were for a king. It is evident that while he had some prejudice against the Irish he was most influenced by the fact that he thought the republicans most friendly to the liberty which Garibaldi had taught his people to love. It will also be noticed that this republican did not have a very high idea of the right of suffrage, valuing it at \$2.00 a year.

It can be said to his credit, however, that he told the truth about the time he had been here and that he lost a chance to make \$2.00 that year.

The editor of The Commoner has often heard it said that many foreigners vote the republican ticket because the name sounded so much like "republic" that, without comparing the policies of the parties, they came to the conclusion that the republican party is more nearly an exponent of the ideas of a republic, but this Italian's testimony would indicate that the delusion is not a natural one arising from the similarity of the words, but one studiously cultivated by unscrupulous republican leaders. The absurdity of this republican claim is the greater at this time when the administration is carrying out the strenuous policy of imperialism while the democrats are defending those principles of human liberty which have raised up patriots in every land.

## Religious Statistics.

Religious statistics gathered from the most reliable sources by Dr. Henry K. Carroll for the Christian Advocate, are full of comfort for church workers. It is to be regretted that no method has been devised for collecting absolutely reliable statistics from the different church branches, for doubtless such would make even a better showing than those collected by Dr. Carroll. The statistics gathered by him, however, show conclusively that it is not true, as we so often hear asserted by su-

perfluous observers, that the church is losing its hold upon the people. Men and women who read and think and study see ample evidences of the fact that the hold of the church is growing stronger every day. They see it in the work of advancing every civic and moral reform. They see it in the growing liberality of church people. They see it in the growing efforts of missionary work. And they see it in the numerous church buildings that are springing up on every hand. The pessimist loves to believe that the world is growing worse, and argues that it is because he sees so much of evil every day. The Christian optimist knows that the world is growing better instead of worse, and understands that evil is not growing; that it is merely being shown up to a greater extent by the white light of Christian publicity. Evil loves the dark and hates the light, and this explains why opposition to the church springs up here and there with altogether too much frequency. The percentage of church communicants is gaining on the population, another fact shown by Dr. Carroll's statistics. This of itself should be an incentive to renewed effort.

Dr. Carroll's figures show an aggregate of 28,689,028 church communicants, a gain during the past year of 405,743, and a total of 194,116 churches, a gain of 1,261. The order of the churches in the number of their communicants, as shown by Dr. Carroll's figures, is as follows:

(1) Catholics, 9,401,798; (2) Northern Methodists, 2,801,798; (3) Southern Baptists, 1,702,324; (4) Colored Baptists, 1,615,321; (5) Southern Methodists, 1,518,854; (6) Disciples, 1,207,377; (7) Northern Presbyterians, 1,024,196; (8) Northern Baptists, 1,012,276; (9) Protestant Episcopal, 758,052; (10) African Methodist, 728,354; (11) Congregational, 659,324; (12) Synodical Lutherans, 599,951; (13) African Zion, 542,422. No other denomination claims as many as 400,000 members and scores of them have only a few thousand.

The \$20,000,000 fund just completed by the Methodists is another evidence of renewed activity in church circles, and is an example that other churches should not be slow to follow. Taken as a whole Dr. Carroll's statistics refute the claim that interest in church work is on the wane, and provide a hopeful augury for the future.

## A Question of Intolerance.

Mr. Wals's republican paper, the Chicago Chronicle, which masquerades as an exponent of democracy, is very angry because it is reported that Mr. Bryan is not willing to meet ex-President Cleveland at a political communion table. It calls it intolerance and says that democrats who will not harmonize with the Cleveland element must consent to the rule of Hanna, Quay and Elkins. Well, the Chronicle helped to inaugurate the rule of Hanna, Quay and Elkins and seems to enjoy it so well that it prefers its continuance rather than risk a return of the government to real democracy. And what is the difference, anyhow, between a Hanna administration and a Cleveland administration? They are run on the same principle and the republican administration has at least one advantage, namely, that it can be criticised by democrats while democrats have to apologize for a Cleveland administration. Until Mr. Cleveland has shown some regret for his past conduct and given some evidence of a desire to aid the democratic party he ought to be content to banquet with Hanna, Quay, Elkins and the Chronicle's owner.

## Raising Presidential Salary.

In supporting the bill raising the president's salary to \$100,000 some of the republican papers are comparing the present salary with the salaries and allowances of European kings and emperors. It is a sad commentary on the aristocratic tendencies of the times that such arguments should be seriously advanced. The present salary is sufficient if our president is to live according to American standards. Instead of trying to enable our chief executive to ape European courts we ought to be proud to have the president of a republic set an example that would cause the people of other countries to cut off the extravagances of their rulers. Our presidents have lived in sufficient elegance and they have not been impoverished by their occupancy of the White house. If the friends of the president want to make him a donation, let them do so, but they should not make the provision a permanent one. The taxpayer is very patient, but he will protest after a while when he finds that the raise of one set of salaries will lead to other readjustments, and that all will be in the direction of making the burdens of government constantly heavier.