

dential campaign of 1896 were conspicuous in their efforts to see that the people remained free from "hysteria and rancor;" they saw to it that the republican party, with the aid of campaign funds stolen from democratic policy holders, as well as from republican policy holders, achieved a victory that, as was then claimed, was to be a victory for truth and righteousness, but, as is now known, was a victory for falsehood and dishonor.

The people are so far removed from "hysteria and rancor" that, although it has been shown before the insurance committee that even the present republican administration, as well as its predecessors, was placed in power through the aid of campaign funds stolen from the policyholders, no serious demand has been made that the republican party restore to the policyholders those ill-gotten gains.

Even in the face of the disclosures that the republican party has profited by these thefts, republican statesmen pretend to be anxious to devise a plan whereby such contributions shall, for the future, be made impossible, expecting the people to forget the part their party played in the absorption of those funds. And the American people are so far removed from "hysteria and rancor" that newspapers seriously discuss the pretended efforts of these republican statesmen to give reforms along this line, while there is hardly a mention of the disreputable part played by republican party leaders, and even by a member of the president's cabinet in the misappropriation of these trusts funds.

Men are not necessarily "hysterical" when they grow earnest in demanding reform. Men do not necessarily display "rancor" simply because they insist that when the roguery of a United States senator or an insurance magnate has been exposed the guilty man be treated even as the common rogue is treated.

The last person in the world to intimate that there is a disposition on the part of the American people toward "hysteria and rancor" should be of a party that has shown utter disregard for the public welfare, servile devotion to special interests and complete indifference to the simple rules of common honesty.

Rather than warnings against "hysteria and rancor" on the part of those who have real concern for the public welfare, men who assume to teach and to lead, owe it to themselves and to their country to plead that the people show greater zeal in the protection of their interests and that they arouse themselves to greater earnestness in the effort to see to it that the welfare of eighty million people is not jeopardized. The people owe it to themselves to defeat the machinations of a coterie of men whose wicked purposes differ from the wicked purposes of the highwayman only insofar that where one steals pennies the other steals thousands; only insofar that where one retains his freedom by evading the courts and dodging the officers of the law, the other retains his freedom because the authorities are so far removed from "hysteria and rancor" that they dare not act resolutely in a simple effort to assert the majesty of the law.

"FOLLOWING ROOSEVELT"

It is absurd for men to say that the democratic party has abdicated, simply because representatives of that party give their support to democratic principles and democratic policies, even when those principles and policies are advocated by distinguished republicans. The time has long since gone by when statesmen or political parties can gain advantage by attacking their own principles because men who formerly opposed those principles are persuaded to adopt them.

Senator Foraker was eminently correct when he said that the railroad rate plan indorsed by President Roosevelt is "a democratic measure." During three successive presidential campaigns the democratic platform spoke unequivocally in favor of the very plan now advocated by the president, and during all these years the republican platform was silent on that question. At least since 1896 democratic statesmen and democratic editors have preached the doctrine of railroad rate legislation as it is now preached by President Roosevelt, and that method has been as resolutely antagonized by republican statesmen and by republican editors.

The democratic party stands for certain well defined principles, and it would be absurd if it did not support those principles even when distinguished representatives of the opposition are converted to the democratic doctrine. If any considerable number of democrats admire Mr. Roose-

velt's public policies today, it is only insofar as he has embraced democratic doctrine.

Men who approve of his clear statements with respect to railroad legislation have nothing but pity for his evasions with respect to the tariff question.

Men who approve of the earnestness with which he insists upon the prosecution of the beef trust conspirators have no respect for the readiness with which he throws the protecting arm of his administration around the powerful Paul Mortons who violate the law.

Men who approve of his high-sounding essays with respect to the evils of corporation contributions to campaign funds remember the advantages obtained by his own administration through corporation contributions and recognize the fact that he has not suggested adequate remedies for the evil, nor has he called upon his own party to "put it back."

Men who approve of his declamations against special privileges and in favor of popular government generally, have no sympathy with his hint that the already too highly favored banking system shall be favored beyond all reason with the privilege of an asset currency.

Men who applaud his assertions that he is in favor of policies that will result in the greatest good to the greatest number have no sympathy with his indorsement of the ship subsidy scheme.

It is safe to say that whenever and wherever Mr. Roosevelt shall adopt democratic policies, embrace democratic principles and move in behalf of the public welfare along democratic lines, he will have the cordial support of democrats generally. But it is an insult to the intelligence of the American people to say that when representatives of a great political party act on these lines they act to the detriment of the prestige of their political organization.

Democrats follow Mr. Roosevelt only so far as he hews to the line of public interests; and if any one shall say that we are not justified in declaring that Mr. Roosevelt hews to the line of public interests only so far as he adopts democratic policies, then we invite attention to the fact that Mr. Roosevelt has increased his popularity among the people only as he has advanced along the pathway which has been blazed by the democratic party. In other words, democrats "follow" Mr. Roosevelt only as Mr. Roosevelt follows democracy.

MR. WATTERSON'S STORY

Henry Watterson, visiting at the national capital, was asked by a newspaper reporter for his opinion on the railroad rate question. According to Walter Wellman in the Chicago Record-Herald, Mr. Watterson replied by relating the following story:

"Once a Spanish premier was appealed to by a mob of workmen. The men imagined they were being ill treated, and they surrounded the house of the premier, demanding that he speak to them. Finally the premier raised a window and, thrusting out his head, asked:

"What do you folks want?" and the answer came, in chorus:

"We demand our rights."

"I grant them to you," responded the premier, whereupon the men dispersed, and that was the end of their discontent.

"It is much the same way with the people on this railroad question. On the whole I think the country is doing fairly well."

A very pretty story, indeed!

But is it possible that so able a man as Henry Watterson is known to be attaches no more importance to the evils of which the American people now complain, and places no higher estimate upon the intelligence of that people than one might imagine from his very interesting tale?

Unless we have woefully mistaken the intelligence as well as the temper of the American people, they will require in their present-day demands for bread something more nutritious than stone.

DIRECTOR AND SENATOR

In a newspaper interview Senator Depew says that the rumor that he contemplates resigning from the United States senate is "absurd." Yet Mr. Depew has resigned his position as a director in the Equitable Life Assurance society.

It is generally understood that Mr. Depew has severed his official connection with the Equitable because of recent disclosures. How does it happen that while these disclosures have been sufficient to cause Mr. Depew's retirement from an official position in the Equitable, it is "absurd" for any one to suggest that he retire from the United States senate?

Does it not occur to thoughtful men that

what the magazine known as "Public Opinion" calls the "literature of exposure" has not gone far enough when a man who, because of certain exposures, hangs his head in shame in the presence of a commercial body, yet walks proudly and defiantly in the councils of men presumed to represent a free and intelligent people?

NO RETREAT

If one were to judge by the tone of newspaper comment generally, President Roosevelt achieved wonders in the construction of that portion of his message dealing with railroad legislation.

Democratic newspapers and republican newspapers that favor railroad legislation approve that portion of the message. These publications say that the president handled the subject frankly and fearlessly, and maintained his position in favor of that plan upon which public sentiment has crystallized.

But, strange to say, those republican newspapers that have all along opposed railroad legislation, speak in glowing terms of the president's recommendations on this line. They say he is not at all radical, but rather is so conservative that it is now plain there will be no difficulty in the republican congress passing a bill that will meet with the president's approval.

Even Senator Elkins says he has been surprised at the president's conservatism. And Senator Elkins seems, also, to be in a jolly mood.

Call the president's references to the railroad question radical or conservative as you please; he plainly declared himself to be in favor of railroad legislation on the lines laid down in democratic platforms. He plainly declared for a policy against which the Elkins, the Forakers and the entire railroad contingent have repeatedly protested. Every one knows that if in the legislation to follow the president's recommendations Senator Elkins and the railroad contingent are pleased, the president will be displeased unless he shall have made a conspicuous retreat in his boasted campaign in the people's behalf.

We are told by Walter Wellman, Washington correspondent for the Chicago Record-Herald that the republican leaders "feel that they can fix up the railroad rate question without having a big row within the party, and without setting the administration at loggerheads with the men who have been its chief supporters in the halls of congress." Mr. Wellman adds: "Curiously enough, the senate leaders, almost to a man, believe that the president will accept what they have to offer him. They think he is in a conciliatory mood and prepared to 'take what he can get.'"

The president has something more important at stake than the conciliation of republican senators who are more interested in advancing the selfish interests of corporations than in promoting the public welfare. He has gone too far to retreat. The popularity he now enjoys is based largely on the public confidence in the sincerity of his professions. For the best interests of popular government it would be better that there be no railroad legislation whatever than that the president of the United States, having gone so far in an important reform as Mr. Roosevelt has gone, should prove himself a "weakling" in the presence of corporation lobbyists, even though they act in the guise of United States senators.

MANNING AND CARLISLE

Speaking of the importance of the office of the secretary of the treasury, the St. Louis Globe Democrat makes interesting reference to the part played by various ministers of finance. Among other things the Globe Democrat says:

Daniel Manning of the treasury, during his service in the first Cleveland administration, had a more important task than fell to the head of the state department, Bayard, while Mr. Carlisle, in Cleveland's second administration, when gold was being drawn out of the treasury faster by the greenbacks' endless chain than it was drawn in by the bond sales, had a job which, in the comparison, made most of the labors of Hercules look light.

But if memory is not at fault, Daniel Manning adopted a more simple method of dealing with that endless chain than Mr. Carlisle did. Mr. Carlisle yielded to the demands of the gold barons, giving them the option. Daniel Manning notified them that if they undertook a gold raid on the treasury the government would exercise its option of paying in silver or gold, according to its convenience.