

12 o'clock, summer and winter, raining or snowing, through all this last seven years of "prosperity," a line has been formed, some of the men standing in it for several hours, to receive a piece of bread.

At the beginning, Mr. Fleischmann was on hand every night, giving personal supervision to the work. When organized charity dispensers have protested to him for encouraging unworthy men: he would reply, "A man that will stand in that line gives evidence that he is hungry. I care not what his pedigree may be. He is a brother man."

An instructive story is told of the impressions this "bread line" recently made upon an intelligent and educated young Chinese lady. Miss Ah Mae Wong is a medical student about entering her third year in the Toronto Medical college. She has been visiting New York for the past ten days. Coming down Broadway one night last week her attention was directed at the corner of Tenth street to the "bread line." When told that such a line of men was there regularly every night the year around to receive a dole of dry bread she innocently inquired: "Why don't these men work and earn their bread?" But her friends were unable to make her understand why it was possible for able-bodied men to be out of remunerative employment in a country so full of natural resources as this. Even in China, she told the party, it is possible for the poorest to have plenty of rice, and why men can't find employment remunerative enough to keep them comfortable puzzled her immensely. She confessed that she was too stupid to grasp the explanation.

While a native of China, having been born and reared in Shanghai, Miss Wong has been brought up in the Christian faith. Her father was converted to Christianity when a young man, and for years before his death had charge of an Episcopalian mission in Shanghai. A classmate of Dr. Florence Leigh Jones, now of Brooklyn, went from medical college to this mission in China and Miss Wong became her assistant in the hospital. Having a predilection for medicine, Miss Wong subsequently came to Toronto to attend the medical school there. Dr. Jones, whose guest Miss Wong has been during her stay here, has practiced medicine for more than ten years in Brooklyn and New York city. In the practice of her profession she became aware of social conditions that mystified and appalled her, and being a woman of wide sympathy she was much perplexed and worried over daily experiences. About two years ago a chance circumstance brought "Progress and Poverty" into her hands, and before she had finished the book the mystery had been revealed, the perplexity had passed away. She had no need any longer to ask, "What would'st thou

have me to do?" To her the line of duty was clearly marked out.

Reared in Dixie land, in the Palmetto State, she now saw clearly the solution of the race question as well as the social and labor questions. When she learned that Miss Wong contemplated visiting New York she pressingly invited her to her home as her guest, notwithstanding this Oriental girl belongs to a race so despised by our Christian nation that even she, an intelligent, refined and cultured young woman, embracing the Christian faith, speaking the English language fluently and more grammatically than a majority of our own native born men and women, is prohibited from making her home within the confines of this "land of the free" and "home of the oppressed of all nations."

Not that Miss Wong has a desire to remain here. As soon as she graduates from the medical college she intends to return to Shanghai to work among the people of her own race.

Had Miss Wong and party transferred from Broadway to the eastbound car on Twenty-third street the same night she witnessed the "bread line," she could have beheld another sight that would have puzzled her even more. One of the finest office buildings in the world covers three-fourths of the block bounded by Madison square and Fourth avenue, and Twenty-third and Twenty-fourth streets. Ultimately the building will occupy the entire block, as Dr. Parkhurst's church property, which embraces the other quarter, has been sold to the company. The exterior of the building is of granite, so white as to have the appearance of Italian marble. It is massive in structure and ornamental in design. As has become the custom in all great cities where land values are high, the space underneath the sidewalk is utilized. The ground floor of the west half of the building facing on Twenty-third street is occupied by the Madison Square station of the New York postoffice. On the third and fourth floors of this building are the offices of the Republican national committee. Between 12 and 1 o'clock on the night the "bread line" was observed by Miss Wong and party, the writer mailed a letter at Madison Square station. Before he could enter, human beings sleeping on the sidewalk, blocking the entrance, had to get up to make way for him, so closely were they huddled together. Along the entire western half of the building, wherever the sidewalk was heated from the steam in the basement below, men were packed as tightly as sardines, with no shelter but the clouded canopy of heaven, and above them the sign, "Republican National Committee."

Here, at the base of one of the most magnificent structures in the world, representing luxuriant wealth, underneath the headquarters of the political party that is proclaiming from the ros-

trum, the pulpit and the press that we are enjoying transcendent prosperity, is the most remarkable juxtaposition of wealth and poverty possible to behold. A picture of it, could it be so portrayed as to be brought to the view of all the voters of the land, would forever relegate from power a party so brazenly audacious as to shout "prosperity" when such conditions are so apparent in all great centers of population.

D. S. LUTHER.

NEWS

Week ending Thursday, Sept. 29.

Judge Parker's letter of acceptance as the Democratic candidate for the Presidency appeared just two weeks after Mr. Roosevelt's (p. 376), having been released for publication on the 26th. It contains about 7,000 words and is in substance as follows:

Beginning with the statement of a desire that so much of his notification speech (p. 295) as refers to matters not mentioned in his letter shall be regarded as part of it, he again declares his "unqualified belief" in the gold standard, and proceeds to a specific discussion of "tariff reform, imperialism, economical administration and honesty in the public service," issues which "stand forth preeminent in the public mind." He describes tariff reform as "one of the cardinal principles of the Democratic faith," insisting that "the necessity for it was never greater than at the present time," and that "it should be undertaken at once in the interest of all our people." Proceeding then to a discussion of the Dingley tariff and its operation he concludes: "The two leading parties have always differed as to the principle of customs taxation. Our party has always advanced the theory that the object is the raising of revenue for support of the government whatever other results may incidentally flow therefrom. The Republican party, on the other hand, contends that customs duties should be levied primarily for protection, so called, with revenue as the subordinate purpose, thus using the power of taxation to build up the business and property of the few at the expense of the many. The difference of principle still obtains, but our party appreciates that the long continued policy of the country, as manifested in its statutes, makes it necessary that tariff reform should be prudently and sagaciously undertaken on scientific principles, to the end that there should not be an immediate revolution in existing conditions. In the words of our platform we demand 'a revision and a gradual reduction of the tariff by the friends of the masses, and for the common weal,

and not by the friends of its abuses, its extortions and discriminations.

It is true that the Republicans, who do not admit in their platform that the Dingley tariff needs the slightest alteration, are likely to retain a majority of the Federal Senate throughout the next Presidential term, and could, therefore, if they chose, block every attempt at legislative relief. But it should be remembered that the Republican party includes many revisionists, and I believe it will shrink from defying the popular will expressed unmistakably and peremptorily at the ballot box." Turning next to the question of Imperialism the letter explains Judge Parker's use in his speech of the term "self government" with reference to the Philippines, saying that it "was not intended that it should be understood to mean, nor do I think as used it does mean, less than independence. However, to eliminate all possibility for conjecture, I now state that I am in hearty accord with that plank in our platform that favors doing for the Filipinos what we have already done for the Cubans; and I favor making the promise to them now that we shall take such action as soon as they are reasonably prepared for it. If independence, such as the Cubans enjoy, cannot be prudently granted to the Filipinos at this time, the promise that it shall come the moment they are capable of receiving it will tend to stimulate rather than hinder their development. And this should be done not only in justice to the Filipinos, but to preserve our own rights, for a free people cannot withhold freedom from another people and themselves remain free. The toleration of tyranny over others will soon breed contempt for freedom and self government and weaken our power of resistance to insidious usurpation of our constitutional rights." Following this declaration as to Philippine independence the letter declares with reference to equality of citizenship that "the pledge of the platform to secure to our citizens, without distinction of race or creed, whether native born or naturalized, at home and abroad, the equal protection of the laws and the enjoyment of all the rights and privileges open to them under the covenants of our treaties, as their just due, should be made good to them." The remainder of the letter is devoted to questions of administration. It commits Judge Parker to civil service reform; to faithful administration of the act for the irrigation of the arid lands; to diligence in the construction of the Panama canal, while criticizing the Executive methods whereby that particular route was acquired; to oppose ship subsidies; to purify the Executive departments; and to abolish favoritism in army and navy appointments. Much space is given to the subject of pensions. Declaring that the Democratic party favors liberal pensions, the letter "denies the right of the Executive to usurp the power of Congress to legis-

late on that subject." This condemnation refers to pension order No. 78, which provides for an age pension to surviving soldiers and sailors over 62 years old, although Congress has never authorized age pensions. Repeating the challenge of the Republicans that the Democrats may take the responsibility of revoking this order if they wish to, Judge Parker says: "This suggests the suspicion, at least, that the order was made to create an issue—that it was supposed to present a strong strategic position in the battle of the ballots. On the assumption that the order, as stated by the Administration, is revocable at the pleasure of the Executive, it having been attempted, though perhaps unwitting encroachment upon the legislative power, and therefore unwarranted by the Constitution, I accept the challenge and declare that if elected I will revoke the order. But I go further and say that that being done, I will contribute my effort toward the enactment of a law, to be passed by the Executive, that will give an age pension without reference to disability, to the surviving heroes of the civil war, and under the provisions of which a pension may be accepted with dignity because of the consciousness that it comes as a just due from the people through their chosen representatives, and not as a largess distributed by the Chief Executive." Referring to foreign relations Judge Parker urges that new conditions have made it more than ever essential "to adhere strictly to the traditional policy of the country as formulated by its first President and never, in my judgment, wisely departed from—to invite friendly relations with all nations while avoiding entangling alliances with any. Such a policy means the cultivation of peace instead of the glorification of war, and the minding of our own business in lieu of spectacular intermeddling with the affairs of other nations. It means strict observance of the principles of international law, and condemns the doctrine that a great state, by reason of its strength, may rightfully appropriate the sovereignty or territory of a small one on account of its weakness. It means for other American states that we claim no rights and will assume no functions save those of a friend and of an ally and defender as against European aggressions. It means that we repudiate the role of the American continental policeman; that we refuse to act as debt collector for foreign states or their citizens; that we respect the independent sovereignty of each American state and its right to preserve order and otherwise regulate its own internal affairs in its own way; and that any intervention in its affairs by us is limited to the single office of enabling its people to work out their own political and national destiny for themselves free from the coercion of any European state." The remainder of the letter relates to extravagant expenditures, and

promises economy. The peroration is in full as follows:

I have put aside a congenial work, to which I had expected to devote my life, in order to assume, as best I can, the responsibilities your convention put upon me.

I solicit the cordial cooperation and generous assistance of every man who believes that a change of measures and of men at this time would be wise, and urge harmony of endeavor as well as vigorous action on the part of all so minded.

The issues are joined and the people must render the verdict.

Shall economy of administration be demanded or shall extravagance be encouraged?

Shall the wrongdoer be brought to bay by the people, or must justice wait upon political oligarchy?

Shall our government stand for equal opportunity or for special privilege?

Shall it remain a government of law or become one of individual caprice?

Shall we cling to the rule of the people, or shall we embrace benevolent despotism?

With calmness and confidence we await the people's verdict.

If called to the office of President, I shall consider myself the Chief Magistrate of all the people and not of any faction, and shall ever be mindful of the fact that on many questions of national policy there are honest differences of opinion. I believe in the patriotism, good sense, and absolute sincerity of all the people. I shall strive to remember that he may serve his party best who serves his country best.

If it be the wish of the people that I undertake the duties of the Presidency, I pledge myself, with God's help, to devote all my powers and energy to the duties of this exalted office.

The only other political news of the week of special interest relates to the contest in the Republican party of Wisconsin. The "stalwarts," with Samuel A. Cole as their candidate for governor; and the "half-breeds," with Robert M. La Follette for their candidate, were hopelessly split at the State convention (p. 119), whereupon they carried their contest to the national convention, which decided against the "half-breeds" (p. 182), who refused, however, to submit, contending that this decision had been forced upon the party by corporation interests represented by Senator Spooner and Postmaster General Payne, both of whom are leaders in the "stalwart" faction of their State. The matter then came into the Supreme Court of Wisconsin (p. 293), which issued an order in August requiring the Secretary of State to show cause why he should not be restrained from placing the names of the "half breed" candidates, and be compelled to place those of the "stalwart" candidates, on the official ballot in the Republican column. The arguments in this case, lasting two days and a half, were concluded on the 16th, and a decision was expected on the 27th; but on the latter day no decision came, and