## Why Some College Presidents Defend Trusts

Or. James R. Day, chancellor of Syracuse (New York) University, took it upon himself to issue a statement in which he bitterly assailed President Roosevelt because of his recent message relating to Standard Oil. Mr. Day said: "There are two forms of anarchism. The late practices of our president are of the more dangerous of these two forms." He also said that "Anarchism clothed with official authority is covert, deceptive and perilous in the extreme."

Below are extracts from Dr. Day's statement: "Anarchism which, among anarchists, is comparatively harmless is not so when we adopt it into the administration of our government. The president of the United States has positively no right, constitutionally or morally, to attack corporate business or private business by name, or court judges who decide cases in opposition to his views.

"There are regularly constituted methods and processes of our country, national and state, for the correction of evils in corporations and courts and also for the arrest and punishment of criminals. It is an amazing blunder for our president to depreciate the properties of the country, like those of the New York Central Railroad, Standard Oil, the Sugar and other corporations, by an ex-parte condemnation and by sensational

charges. It is an 'amazing blunder' for our chief executive to ride into the senate with a 'round-up' of the commercial interests in which hundreds of thousands of people have their investments, thus threatening the permanency of great corporation interests, before hearing a word which the representatives of these vast interests may have to say for themselves."

Dr. Day also said: "Anarchism in the White House is the most perilous anarchism that ever has threatened our country."

On the day following this statement Dr. M. M. Parkhurst, a Chicago clergymen belonging to the same denomination to which Dr. Day claims allegiance, speaking to a representative of the Chicago Record-Herald made this statement:

"Within the past sixty days I have been at Syracuse University and was shown about the place by Dr. Day, who confided to me certain plans for the extension of the college. He designated various buildings, as I recollect, and said Standard Oil money had built this one and cash from railroad and sugar interests had built that.

"If memory serves me, he said that something like \$500,000 had been given the university recently by the corporations which he is defending in his attack on President Roosevelt. He told me he hoped, or expected, to get about a

million more, and mentioned various structural additions to the institution which he was desireous of making."

Dr. Parkhurst was asked if he had obtained other evidence of the educator's alleged affection for the "money kings," and in reply he said:

"Yes, I heard a number of interesting things that I did not expect to relate. I was told that the board of trustees of the university expected to retain Chancellor Day because of his influence among wealthy New Yorkers. I was informed that the chancellor would remain at the head of the school at an annual salary of \$7,000 a year and at the end of a stipulated period would be pensioned for life on half salary, providing his program of extension were fully carried out. In other words, the chancellor was to complete the work of rebuilding the university with the money, of his millionaire friends, and when he had finished was to be given a life pension."

Comment is unnecessary, but it may be observed that if these great corporations were required to obey the law there would be no subsidies for educational institutions and no generous pensions for sycophantic educators. No wonder Dr. Day of the Syracuse University regarded as "anarchism in the White House" the president's patriotic demand that the Standard Oil trust be

required to comply with the law.

### What Will be the Result of This Condition?

In a recent issue the New York World printed an interesting article showing that "the problem of existence grows more and more serious." Following are some extracts from this article:

"Necessities of life cost more today in New York than ever before. With national prosperity at its highest mark, with riches being amassed on every hand, with business being consolidated into a few vast corporations, and even with universal demand for labor, the simple problem of daily existence—of food, of shelter and of clothing—is growing beyond solution to one-half the people of this metropolis.

Twenty-five articles of every-day food for rich and poor alike have been selected to show the remarkable rise in prices within ten years. The quotations are the wholesale figures, thus avoiding the various fancy prices charged by retail dealers according to their location and class of customers. They represent the basic prices of commodities. The individual purchaser pays considerably more, depending whether he lives in Fifth avenue or in First avenue.

"The figures show the market price on April 20 of the years 1896, 1901 and 1906. They were

taken from the published lists of commercial newspapers of the day. In each case the same grade and quality of the particular article priced was carried through, so that the comparisons are fair. The tabulated figures show an average increase of from 33 to 50 per cent. The retail increases may average even more, because small dealers are compelled to raise their margin of profit to meet higher rentals and miscellaneous expenses."

The World quotes from one experienced investigator as follows:

"I have not found any increase in wages to make up for this increase in cost of necessities of life. To meet the burden the men must work all the time and the children must become wage earners younger. And they all must struggle with less nourishment."

"What is to be the result of this condition?" was asked of Dr. Tolman. To which he replied:

"A senator said the other day: 'We are heading toward a political, social and economic revolution.'"

Wholesale prices of staple articles of food in New York market on April 20, 1896, 1901 and 1906:

#### NO MATERIAL CHANGE

The St. Louis Globe-Democrat (republican) says: "Mr. Bryan has modified his demand for complete Filipino independence. Some day he may discover that republican administrations have been giving the islands all the home rule the inhabitants can carry successfully."

Mr. Bryan's position has not materially changed. Since visiting the Philippines he is able to be more specific in the description of the policy he would pursue. In his letter on the Philippines Mr. Bryan said:

"If our nation would at once declare its intention to treat the Filipnos living north of Mindanao as it treated the Cubans, and then proceed, first, to establish a stable government, patterned after our own; second, to convert that government into a native governmen't by the substitution of Filipino officials as rapidly as possible; third, to grant independence to the Filipinos, reserving such harbors and naval stations as may be thought necessary; and, fourth, to announce its purpose to protect the Filipinos from outside interferences while they work out their destiny -if our nation would do this, it would save a large annual expense, protect its trade interests, gratify the just ambition of the Filipinos for national existence and repeat the moral victory won in Cuba.

"In return for protection from without the Filipinos would agree, as the Cubans did, that in their dealings with other nations they would not embarrass us."

Now, compare this with Mr. Bryan's statement in his speech of acceptance delivered at Indianapolis in 1900. On that occasion he said: "If elected, I will convene congress in extraordinary session as soon as inaugurated and recommend an immediate declaration of the nation's purpose, first, to establish a stable form of government in the Philippine islands, just as we are now establishing a stable form of government in Cuba; second, to give independence to the Filipinos; third, to protect Filipinos from outside interference while they work out their destiny, just as we have protected the republics of Central and South America, and are, by the Monroe doctrine, pledged to protect Cuba."

# TABLE SHOWING THE REMARKABLE RISE IN THE WHOLESALE PRICE OF STAPLE PRO-

	1896.	1901.	1906.	INCREASE.
Butter, state dairy fancy	.14	\$ .19	\$ .20	6 cents per lb.
Cheese, full cream, colored	.0934	.12		
Macaroni, Italian			.141/2	4% cts per lb.
Tapicoa, fine pearl	.05%	.07	.07	1¼ cts per lb.
Lemons, choice Sicily	.021/4	.023/4	.041/2	21/4c per lb.
Oranges, California fancy navel	2.00	2.25	2.75	75 cts. box
Bananas, Limon firsts	3.50	3.50	4.50	\$1.00 per box
Apples, Ben Davis	1.00	1.15	1.65	65c per bunch
Eggs, new laid state	2.75	4.00	5.00	\$2.25 a barrel
Tea, Ceylon Orange Pekoe	.121/2	.151/2	.21	81/2 cts. dozen
Olive Oil, Italian	.24 -	.37	45	21 cts per lb.
Pepper, Singapore	.05	.70	1.75	\$1.25 a gallon
Brazil Nuts		.13	.11	5 cts per lb.
Turkeys, live young	.031/2	.07	.08	41/2 cts. lb.
Geese, live, per pair		.09	.13	3 cts per lb.
Capons, large dressed	1.00	1.12	1.50	50 cts pair
* madeiphia proffers small	.18	.16	.20	2 cts. per lb.
Turkeys, young dressed	.30	.35	.40	10 cts. per lb.
ACRO, IA I. NO. I.	.14	.101/2	.20	6 cts. per lb.
ven, prine country dressed		.20	.20	5 cts. per lb.
Pork, light country dressed	.07	.07	.081/2	1½ cts per lb.
Pork, mess	.06	.08	.091/2	3½ cts. per lb.
Beef hams	11.50	15.50	17.75	\$6.25 per bl.
Lard, prime Western	16.00	21.00	21.00	\$5 per barrel
Codfish, genuine boneless	4.70	8.25	8.95	\$4.25 a tierce.
	.07	.08	.09	2 cts. per lb.

#### A FAIR TEST

111

Senator LaFollette's railroad valuation proposition appears to be growing in favor among the people if not at the national capital. He suggested that the interstate commerce commission be given authority to make a valuation of all the railroad property of the country, such as Wisconsin, Michigan and Texas have made of the railway property within their limits. If the measure now under consideration were framed so as to provide for Senator LaFollette's plan for obtaining a basis for the rates to be fixed by the commission, and also to include the Bailey amendment forbidding suspension of the rates—then there would be some reason to hope for a fair test of government regulation of the railroads.