

the soulless corporation, be held amenable to the law? Or the one who, in the Paul Morton case, laid down the doctrine that the corporation, rather than the individual, should be held?

By the one who insists upon the vigorous prosecution of all charged with violating the anti-rebate law? Or the one who throws the protect-arm of his administration around a member of his cabinet when the trail leads indisputably in that direction?

By the one who says that he means to send to prison those who violate the anti-rebate law, regardless of their position in life? Or the one whose prosecutions on this line have resulted in only fines to the corporation officers giving rebates, and to the packers accepting them, while the only jail sentence imposed was upon the broker and his clerk who acted as the go-between in the deal among these conspirators against the law?

By the one who, in public speech and message, arraigns a court for holding the corporation rather than the man? Or the one whose course was so identical with that of the judge of the court he criticises that Messrs. Judson and Harmon, special attorneys, employed to map out a course of procedure for the government, resigned in disgust?

By the one who insists upon purity in the public service? Or the one who permitted the mean spirited Loomis to continue in the diplomatic service after his irregularities had been exposed, and then permitted him to retire with honors?

By the one who says that fidelity on the part of public officials must be recognized? Or the one who dismissed in disgrace the faithful Bowen, whose only offense was that he displayed his temper upon the discovery of the dishonest practices that had been carried on by Loomis, the administration pet?

By the one who refused to give aid and encouragement to the republican machine in Philadelphia because it represented bossism, and all that is degrading in municipal politics? Or the one who permits it to become known that his sympathies are with the republican machine in Pennsylvania in spite of the fact that that machine, under the guidance of Penrose, is so representative of degraded politics that the rank and file of Pennsylvania republicans have revolted and nominated an opposition ticket?

By the one who professes hatred for bossism and machine politics? Or the one who sent his secretary of war to Ohio to speak in behalf of the Boss Cox ticket in the campaign of 1905?

By the one who stands unrelentingly for great reforms and uncompromisingly against corporate domination? Or the one who, in the distribution of patronage in Wisconsin, turns his back upon LaFollette the republican reformer; the one who permits his secretary of the treasury to enter the Iowa campaign to protest against the renomination of Governor Cummins, who is being fought by the corporations of the Hawkeye state; the one concerning whose own attitude, in that clear cut fight between the corporations and the people, the Cummins men are doubtful, but the Perkins men are confident?

By the one who insists that railroads should be operated for the public interests? Or the one who argues that the railroads should be given the privilege of pooling?

By the one who vigorously condemns the misappropriation of policyholders' money by insurance magnates? Or the one who retains in his cabinet the chairman of the national committee to whose treasury several hundred thousand dollars of these misappropriated funds were traced?

By the one who advocates the colonial system in connection with the American government? Or the one who wrote: "At best the inhabitants of a colony are in a cramped and unnatural state * * * The only hope for a colony that wishes to obtain full moral and mental growth is to become an independent state or part of an independent state?"

By the one who said: "Political economists have pretty generally agreed that protection is vicious in theory and harmful in practice?" Or the one who insists upon "standing pat" although a considerable part of the rank and file of his own party demand that the tariff be revised in order that the shelter the trusts find therein may be destroyed?

By the one who, referring to the people of "our new possessions" in the Louisiana purchase and during Jefferson's time, said: "The essential point was that they had to be given the right to self government. They could not be kept in pupillage?" Or the one who insists that the people of "our new possessions" in the pres-

ent day be kept in pupillage?

By the one who pretends to be engaged in a death grapple with special interests? Or the one who permitted the advocates of the ship subsidy bill to say at the recent session that he was very anxious that the measure be adopted by the house as it had passed the senate?

By the one who poses as the great champion of publicity? Or the one who yet withholds from the public, the report made by William J. Calhoun who went to Venezuela to investigate the past and present relations of the United States with Venezuela, and particularly the record made by Loomis?

By the one who proposes an inheritance tax in order to protect the public from fortunes "swollen beyond all healthy limits?" Or the one who favors a tariff system which, at the expense of the people, contributes to these swollen fortunes?

By the one who measured swords with Senator Aldrich on the railroad rate legislation? Or the one who tamely submitted to a railroad rate bill which had Aldrich's approval?

By the one who is so interested in the mothers of the country that he loses no opportunity to pay them tribute? Or the one who promoted to the postmastership at Washington City, the person—Barnes—who directed a negro and other attendants to lay violent hands upon a woman and remove her from the White House—Barnes, who made statements concerning that episode entirely at variance with the statements of the representatives of the New York World and the Washington Star, newspaper men whose integrity is unquestioned and who were eye witnesses to the attack?

By the one who insists upon the enforcement of the new railroad rate law? Or the one who appoints as a member of the board charged with the enforcement of that law E. E. Clark of Iowa, who is charged with being instrumental in stirring up opposition to the measure at the last session of congress?

These facts are not cited in captious criticism of the man to whom they conspicuously relate. They are recalled to show the utter absurdity—in a government whose success must depend upon the intelligent and patriotic action of its voters—of the republican slogan for 1906.

Because the evils under which the people suffer are real, the remedy must be real. Real remedies are not to be obtained, if men are to be elected to congress because they bear the label of the party to which Theodore Roosevelt belongs; and elected in response to an appeal to "stand by" a gentleman who has—craving all pardons—faced in every possible way, on nearly every public question with which he has had to deal.

"Stand by Roosevelt" means nothing more than that the personal popularity of the president is to be used to elect to congress republican candidates regardless of the position these candidates hold upon public questions. In Rhode Island, Aldrich; in New York, Platt; in Pennsylvania, Knox; in Wisconsin, Spooner; and in West Virginia, Elkins—all of them special interest senators—will plead "Stand by Roosevelt." In Wisconsin the LaFollette republicans will be asked to "Stand by Roosevelt;" in Iowa the Cummins men will be urged to "Stand by Roosevelt," and that will mean that in Iowa, as in Wisconsin and many other states, republican candidates must be elected whether as members of congress they proved themselves to be the pliant tools of corporations, or the faithful servants of the people.

And the cry, "Stand by Roosevelt," will be taken up in the school districts where well meaning young orators will plead for republican victory, unconscious of their folly; and republican editors will echo the cry "Stand by Roosevelt" when urging the election to congress of republican candidates whose entire public lives may have been given to the service of corporations.

The "Stand by Roosevelt" argument is a delusion and a snare. As a description of a certain political policy it is false and fraudulent. It means nothing more than a partisan cry to lure men from serious thoughts on public affairs and distract the attention of the people from the republican party's foul record. Wherever the phrase is used—and it will be used in every district where a corporation politician is running for congress—its real character should be exposed.

With almost prohibitive prices placed on the necessities of life; with our food poisoned; with our insurance funds embezzled; with our congress throwing away the people's money and truculently submitting to the dictates of the trust magnates; with the problem of maintaining life

in a land of plenty becoming more and more difficult of solution—it is not with the American people a question of "standing by Roosevelt," or any other man whose record is not descriptive of his principles. But the question is: Shall the American people stand by themselves and for themselves, calling a halt to the mediocre and unscrupulous men who interpreted the republican victory of 1896 as license to prey upon the American people, and a quit claim deed to the American government?

RICHARD L. METCALFE.

"STAND BY ROOSEVELT"

When you ask us to "stand by" our bold president
 You will pardon, I'm sure, if I ask what is meant;
 For it's hard to "stand by" one who's jumping about—
 A fact you'll admit if you are honest, no doubt.
 Pray tell us how we could "stand by" in a case
 Where Loomis is praised, but where Bowen lost place!
 Or "stand by" when he rails so hard at rebates
 Then honors a man who has made special rates?
 When you ask of us that, common fairness demands
 That you clearly define where the president stands.
 When he talks of the shackles we've put upon force
 We know what he means while he's talking, of course;
 But talking of cunning and shackles it needs
 A chasm yawns wide twixt his words and his deeds.
 Shall we boldly "stand by" as he hurls his deft
 At Aldrich and Foraker? Then with a sigh
 "Stand by" when surrender is counselled, because
 The trusts are too strong to be hampered by laws?
 When you ask us "stand by" and to hold up his hands
 You clearly should show where the president stands.
 Shall we "stand by" the man who gave Morton a place
 While asking "square deals" for all men in life's race?
 Or shall we "stand by" when he says that campaigns
 Must never be fought with a trust's stolen gains?
 Or stand boldly by as the trusts march in view
 And yield up their "fat" to the bold Cortelyou?
 Shall we "stand by" the man who denounced corporate loot
 Then gave a high place to a trust lawyer named Root?
 Before we "stand by" common fairness demands
 You tell us exactly where Theodore stands.
 When we try to "stand by" it will fill us with doubt
 If the president fidgets and jumps all about;
 One thing for a minute, then with a grave frown
 He boldly looks upward and backs slowly down.
 One day cries "anarchy" because of reports
 That people have dared look askance at the courts
 And then on the next takes a Humphrey to task—
 How can we "stand by?" is the question we ask.
 We'll be glad to "stand by" if you will heed our demands
 And clearly define where the president stands.

—WILL M. MAUPIN.