

a steaming copper for twelve hours a day, scalding yourself if you aren't careful," and "then about 2 or 3 in the morning you polish up the brass kettles before they cool, and then split kindling wood for the next day, and carry up coal from the cellar." But even this work at \$1 a day is hard to get.

+

What to do with the increasing army of the disemployed in New York and everywhere else (unless it be in Cincinnati) is an awful problem. But the defunct "prosperity association" of Cincinnati (Geo. A. Shives, chairman, and F. B. Wiborg, treasurer) professes to have solved it with half a million "sunbeams," and at the extremely moderate cost, according to the card with which it announces its triumphant retirement, of only \$1,061.33—less than 3 cents per dozen beams. Messrs. Shives and Wiborg should resurrect their miraculous "prosperity association" at once, and let its "sunbeams" shine again, and shine broadcast.

+ +

Senator Tillman's Case.

We doubt if it is possible for any fair-minded man to read the President's accusations of Senator Tillman, and Senator Tillman's answer, without sympathy with the Senator and pity for the President.

+

The very chronology of the case makes for Senator Tillman's vindication. While lecturing in the State of Washington in October, 1907, he learned that a real estate firm was filing claims for clients upon Oregon lands which had been forfeited by a land-grant company that ostensibly owned it; and he wrote to that firm of his desire to make claims, and authorized a resident of the region to act as his agent for placing claims, for eight quarter-sections for members of his family, to cost them, if finally secured, about \$5,000, which the government would get. His lawful right to do this was beyond question. The fact that he was a Senator did not affect the transaction. He and his family were citizens with the same rights as other citizens under our land laws.

+

But those circumstances brought to Senator Tillman's attention the fact that millions of acres of public land are held by land-grant corporations, which, like that of Oregon, have forfeited their titles. Consequently he did what it was his duty to do. He brought the whole matter to the attention of the Attorney General and caused the

enactment by Congress of a joint resolution in January, 1908, ordering the Attorney General to institute proceedings for the recovery of these forfeited lands. Success in this litigation would have enabled Senator Tillman or any other citizen to establish claims to the Oregon land or any other public land so recovered. The fact of his having already made a claim or contracted for an interest would, therefore, have added nothing to any private rights which might be supposed to have inspired his public activity in this direction. But he had made no contracts. He had come to no understanding in regard to any of the lands involved. On the contrary, he had dropped his negotiations soon after they were begun.

+

The negotiations were revived by efforts on the part of the firm with whom Senator Tillman had begun them in the fall, but not until after he had introduced his resolution directing the Attorney General to proceed against all land-grant corporations for the recovery of forfeited lands. Learning then that the Oregon firm looked to him for public service in promotion of their private interests, he wrote them on the 15th of February the only letter that can, by any stretch of interpretation, imply a connection between his personal desire to obtain \$5,000 worth of the forfeited land, and his official efforts to secure the recovery by the government of all the millions upon millions of dollars' worth of public lands that had been forfeited by the faithless land-grant corporations which still clung to them. But the circumstances as well as the letter show that neither official malfeasance nor personal turpitude was contemplated by him or involved. Two days after that letter, and again three days after it, he received the information upon which, on the following day, he cast the whole matter aside in its private relations, and officially and publicly denounced the conspirators who were misusing his name as a Senator to promote their interests as real estate speculators.

+

Senator Tillman may well defy this attack upon his good faith in trying to compel President Roosevelt's administration to recover for the public domain from land-grant corporations, an empire of forfeited land. President Roosevelt's administration should have needed no prodding from Senator Tillman to enter upon the performance of this manifest but strangely neglected duty. President Roosevelt's position would be pitiable even if Senator Tillman were guilty of the President's accu-

sations. So inconsequential would be Senator Tillman's wickedness in laying lawful plans to get in a lawful way eight quarter-sections of land—1,280 acres—for \$4,000 or \$5,000 to be paid to the government, out of millions of acres recovered for the whole people, even if he had laid those plans; so puny would have been Senator Tillman's lie in saying he had not done so, even if he had lied,—so petty would these offenses have been in comparison with the enormous land steal he was attacking in the general interest, even if the offenses had been committed, that the President's accusations could not have risen above the dignity of an attempt to "draw a red herring across the trail," as the Irish proverb puts it. But when it appears, as it surely does appear, that there were no wicked plans on Tillman's part, nor any lie at all from his lips, what can be said? Isn't the inference strong, that Mr. Roosevelt must be in great need of material for diverting public attention from the land-grabbing corporations to which his political indebtedness is heavy? We repeat, therefore, that fair minded men who read President Roosevelt's accusations and Senator Tillman's answer, will sympathize with the Senator and pity the President.

+ +

Care of the Body.

A distinguished clergyman is reported as severely condemning the Emanuel movement by preaching that "the church of Jesus Christ" is mistaking its function "when it becomes a hospital for physical repairs." But didn't its Founder engage pretty exclusively in that kind of repairing? While it is quite true that care of the body for the sake of the body is overdone, and for its own sake may not be worth the doing at all, the conclusion is hardly avoidable that the care of the body as an instrument for its spiritual occupant is of the very first concern.

+ + +

THE PRESIDENT'S SALARY.

Senator Jonathan Bourne, of Oregon, justifies his bill to double the President's salary, making it \$100,000 a year, by comparing the present salary with the much greater salaries paid to some corporation presidents. He thinks that the President of the United States, "the biggest corporation in the world, is certainly as big in the business of government as a railroad president." He lays aside all mere "sentiment," and views the matter as a "business" proposition.

+

The senator is ludicrously unconscious of the

fact that a consideration of the problem from a purely business standpoint would lead to the very opposite of what he proposes.

There is no *business* need of increasing the President's salary.

One year's salary of the President is enough to support him in comfort for the remainder of his life, leaving the rest of the salary for his four-year term—namely, \$150,000—for defraying his private expenses while in office. But there is no reason why he should spend even one-half of his four years' salary of \$200,000 while in office.

Furthermore (still viewing the matter from the *business* standpoint), no candidate for the Presidency has ever even so much as hinted a wish for an advance in salary. In fact, the honor of the office would induce the best and most capable of men gladly to undertake the administration even at a great reduction of the present salary. Nobody will deny that. Then what *business* reason is there for an increase?

+

Senator Bourne further says that the stress of the official life is so great as to shorten the life of the victim.

But, having disclaimed all regard for "sentiment" in the discussion, why mention this? The "business" argument would be: The shorter his life, the less money will serve his future needs.

The fact is that Senator Bourne's argument is purely sentimental, from beginning to end.

+

Comparing the salary of the President of the United States with that of a great private corporation president is even worse than sentimental—it is an affront to the intelligence of the country.

Social equity is outraged by the salaries paid to corporation officials. The power of the corporations to pay such fabulous salaries comes from a practice of public exploitation, stupendous in magnitude, intolerably oppressive; a practice of public exploitation that has been for years past the theme of righteous denunciation by all honest and right-thinking statesmen; a denunciation in which the present incumbent of the Presidential office has taken a leading part.

And the country expects Mr. Taft, the President-elect, to continue the struggle to direct the power of government as a curb to the menacing power of the great corporations. Indeed, the very same newspaper that gives Mr. Bourne's speech contains the statement of a corporation