

And now the Washington Post joins with other newspapers that have long shown a lively interest in the fortunes of Mr. Hill, but have now turned against him. The Post says: "The Hon. Dave Hill way do a little wriggling, like a snake's tail, but for all practical political purposes he is as dead as a mackerel."

Major Jenkins, who was recently appointed collector of revenue for Charleston, S. C., removed one of his deputies, a negro by the name of George W. Murray, in order to make a place for a white man. It is now in order for Mr. Roosevelt's literary bureau to make public a letter of rebuke to his new collector of revenue in South Carolina.

V. H. Lovejoy, editor of the Jefferson (Ia.) Souvenir, a republican paper, responding to an inquiry by the Chicago Tribune, wired that paper as follows: "I am heartily in favor of a ship subsidy and the placing of American commerce on an equal footing with other great world powers. Give Hanna what he wants." Of course, why not give Hanna what he wants?

In his message to congress Mr. Roosevelt said that "our past experience shows that great prosperity in this country has always come under a protective tariff, and that the country cannot prosper under fitful tariff changes at short intervals." And yet it is true that we had a protective tariff in 1873 and 1893 and the people have not yet been permitted to forget the panics of those years.

The Fremont (Neb.) Tribune, a republican paper, referring to Mr. Roosevelt's selection of a minister to Brazil, says: "Mr. Thompson's departure for Brazil will be of future benefit to the party." Can it be possible that appointments under a republican administration are made not with the view of the special fitness of the appointee for the office, but in order that the party may be benefited by the departure of its recognized leaders?

The Chicago News condemns the ship subsidy bill. It asserts that "the whole thing is monstrous, unreasonable, dishonest. The republican party has confessed that it realizes the wickedness that lurks in the measure by nursing it until after the election and now attempting to ram it through congress in a hurry as the act of an expiring legislative body. It is a deed of dishonor. The party will be made to regret it." And yet the president could find no room in his message for a denunciation of this "deed of dishonor."

The Kansas City Star, referring to the republican tariff, says: "It provides for a partnership between the government and 'infant industries' that enables the 'infant industries' to absorb all of the profits, which are paid by the consumer. It is a ranker and a more disgraceful style of mendicancy than is practiced by any beggar in the streets." And yet the Star was conspicuous in the campaigns of 1896 and 1900 among those newspapers that pleaded for victory for a political party that believes in this "rank and disgraceful style of mendicancy."

In reply to a criticism made of his Detroit speech in which he referred to the ship subsidy, Secretary Shaw says that he did not commit himself in favor of any particular ship subsidy bill. He explains: "I simply spoke in favor of non-partisan action if possible, for the building up of a merchant marine." In other words, Secretary Shaw not deeming it advisable just at this time to boldly indorse the ship subsidy bill that passed the senate went on record as favoring "non-partisan" action for the purpose of building up a merchant marine. When the time comes that the republican leaders deem it safe to push the ship subsidy bill through, it may not be doubted that Mr. Shaw will be so thoroughly "non-partisan"

that he will be able to embrace even the measure to which, in his Detroit speech, he did not explicitly commit himself.

The Wall street Journal in its issue of Wednesday, December 3, says: "Some time ago we ventured to express the view that Wall street in taking up a position of antagonism to President Roosevelt was acting neither fairly nor wisely, and we gave some reasons for that view. Perusal of his annual message to congress leaves us strengthened in our previous opinion." There are many other people who, since perusing Mr. Roosevelt's message, are inclined to the view that Wall street has no good reason for assuming a position of antagonism toward Mr. Roosevelt.

In his message to congress President Roosevelt said something about "monopolies, unjust discriminations, which prevent or cripple competition, fraudulent overcapitalization and other evils in trust organizations and practices which injuriously affect interstate trade." One of the greatest evils of the trust lies in its power to impose unfair prices upon the consumer and yet Mr. Roosevelt was so "overtender" in dealing with the trust question that he could not find room in his message for a reference to this, one of the greatest of all the evils of the trust system.

The Chicago Chronicle says that "silver dollars are indirectly made convertible into gold by making them receivable for all United States taxes and dues at their par value or as an equivalent of gold." Perhaps, also, the fact that silver dollars are legal tender for all debts, public and private, except where otherwise expressly stipulated, may also be pointed to as showing that these dollars are "convertible into gold;" and yet from the tone of Secretary Shaw's annual report one would hardly be led to believe that a silver dollar had anything other than its noble self for a redeemer.

The Philadelphia Record says: "If the president must recognize the colored voters it would be a great piece of party strategy for him to appoint them in republican states. It might moderate the demands of Massachusetts for colored men in federal offices and it would make it possible to create a formidable republican party in the south." Has the Record forgotten that in his letter to the Charleston citizen Mr. Roosevelt said that he had appointed one negro to office "from" Pennsylvania? Or perhaps this particular appointee has, in the discharge of his duties, been required to go so far "from" Pennsylvania that the people of that state were wholly ignorant of his appointment.

Henry Clews, the New York banker, in his letter issued under date of December 6, says: "The president's message was well received. His utterances on trusts, tariff, currency and other questions were about what we expected and had no effect upon the stock market. The prospects of any of his recommendations being acted upon during this session of congress are very remote. The trust question seems likely to bring on a prolonged struggle, the issues being too numerous and complex to admit of hasty or radical legislation." In the light of such statements as these it will be difficult for the friends of Mr. Roosevelt to long continue the pretense that the trust magnates are at all disturbed because of Mr. Roosevelt's much boasted "campaign against trusts."

The Chicago Tribune objects to the passage of the ship subsidy bill. The Tribune prints telegrams from a number of republican editors in Iowa all of whom oppose the subsidy; and yet what does all this amount to, after all? The Tribune and many of these same republican papers objected to colonialism as represented in the Porto Rican bill. The Porto Rican bill was passed and colonialism was established, republican leaders feeling confident that they could depend upon these republican papers rushing to the support of republican measures. This confidence was not

misplaced and these newspapers turned some very sharp corners. If the ship subsidy bill should pass it is safe to say that many of these same papers would be found ardently defending that measure in the next political campaign.

The Washington correspondent of the Chicago News says that Congressman Grosvenor, who is chairman of the house committee that will have under consideration the ship subsidy bill, explained to one of the members of the committee that "the republican congressional campaign committee was under obligations to ship owners who had come to the committee's assistance during the last campaign when the committee's bank account was almost depleted." According to this correspondent, Mr. Grosvenor said: "This obligation must be paid this session." Some republican papers pretend indignation because of Mr. Grosvenor's frank statement and yet is it not true that for several years the republican party has been providing recompense at the public treasury for those who generously contribute to republican campaign funds?

It is related that Thomas B. Reed was once offered the sum of \$1,000 for an article on the republican party's policy of expansion, the same to be printed in a prominent magazine. Mr. Reed replied: "I feel too deeply on the subject to take money for expressing any opinion about it." Mr. Reed wrote many magazine articles on subjects on which he was in harmony with his party and received pay for them. It is fair to assume that on this particular subject this distinguished republican realized that in the preparation of such an article he would be required to condemn in his most vigorous fashion an important policy of his party; so he preferred the policy of silence. Some idea of Mr. Reed's opinion of the administration's Philippine policy may be obtained by reference to a statement he made at the time he was speaker of the house. Mr. Reed said: "We are buying 10,000,000 Malays at \$2 a head, unpicked, and nobody knows what it will cost to pick them."

It will be remembered that on one occasion Mr. Roosevelt, addressing a gathering of college students, said: "Don't flinch, don't foul, and hit the line hard." The Springfield (Mass.) Republican, recalling this statement, expresses the doubt that Mr. Roosevelt is exactly the person to offer sound precepts to the youth of the country when in the very midst of his enjoinings, he can assert with a straight face that the ease and rapidity and humanity of the conquest of the Philippine islands have surpassed the most sanguine expectations. The Republican asks and answers its own question in this way. "Is it a fact that President McKinley or any one else concerned in the business anticipated a contest at the outset which would cost the United States \$500,000,000 or more and no end of bloodshed and resort to the most savage measures of repression? It is not a fact, and no one knows it so well as Mr. Roosevelt. Yes, certainly, 'don't flinch, don't foul and hit the line hard,' and particularly 'don't foul.'"

The St. Louis Globe-Democrat provides an interesting suggestion when it says: "Newspapers in other states that point the finger of scorn at St. Louis on account of hoodling developments should note the fact that in eight trials for public bribery and for perjury connected with it there have been seven convictions, with sentence to the penitentiary in each case of from two to five years. The convictions include a millionaire briber and a rich promoter, as well as city officials who sell their votes to corruptionists. Let the critical cities secure even one conviction of this class within their own limits. The whole country will hear of the unusual circumstances with interest and St. Louis will offer its congratulations." If we remember correctly one Philadelphia paper was very bitter in its criticism concerning the conditions that were exposed in St. Louis; and yet if all reports are true, Philadelphia's municipal affairs are certainly in need of renovation. The task of acting on the Globe-Democrat's advice might be commenced in the metropolis of the Keystone state. The field there must certainly be a wide one.