

### MAYOR JOHNSON'S WAY. MORE BOUQUETS FOR CLEVELAND.

Lincoln Steffens' declaration that Cleveland had the "best mayor of the best governed city in the United States" has led to the throwing of many bouquets at various city officials. Gus Hanna superintendent of the street cleaning department, and Prof. Bemis, manager of the water department, are the latest recipients of flowery things.

Bemis yesterday received a letter from Joseph M. Patterson, water commissioner of Chicago, requesting copies of the annual reports of the local department for a number of years back.

"We all feel that the Cleveland water-works system is a standard, and we want to take the benefit of your experience as far as possible," concludes Patterson.

Hanna's bouquet comes from Section Superintendent McGrath, of New York's street cleaning department. McGrath was recently here on a vacation, and yesterday Hanna received a letter from him in which he declared he had never visited a city in which streets were so uniformly clean as those of Cleveland.—Cleveland Plain Dealer of July 13.

### AN ESTIMATE OF WILLIAM J. BRYAN.

From a private letter from John T. McClure, of Beaver City, Neb.

Yes, I am for Bryan and Free Silver, and in favor of a Republic and against an Empire; eternally against a standing army, and likewise against trusts; and am proud of the fact that I live in a State which has the least illiteracy in the Union, and produces such a statesman as William J. Bryan—

- a man who has the heart and conscience of an Abraham Lincoln;
- the philosophy of a Benjamin Franklin;
- the simplicity of a Thomas Jefferson;
- the oratorical ability of a Daniel Webster;
- the personal magnetism of a James G. Blaine;
- the courage of an Andrew Jackson;
- the patriotism of a Patrick Henry;
- the fortitude of a Bismarck;
- the wisdom of a Gladstone, and
- the piety of a Paul Kruger;
- and who stands to-day the best specimen of statesmanship produced in the world during the nineteenth century.

For nobler 'tis to stand alone  
On God Almighty's highway,  
Than gnaw with millions at the bone  
That lies in Satan's by-way.  
—Speed Mosby.

### THE GRACE OF HOSPITALITY.

For The Public.

If thou *hast* something, bring thy goods,  
A fair return be thine;  
If thou *art* something, bring thy soul,  
And interchange with mine.  
—Schiller.

We are naturally social beings. The universal desire for friendly fellowship underlies our hospitality. Unfortunately, the form of social intercourse now much in vogue does not commend itself to the judgment of wise and thoughtful people. It is prodigal in efforts to gratify the luxurious propensities of our nature—suggests that we "eat, drink and be merry," savors of ostentation and emulation, and is not devoid of a spirit of commercialism.

Who shall say that the malevolent influence of extravagant entertainments has not much to do with the dishonesty, defalcation, and general disaster of which we see and hear much?

Society at our national capital, if current report be true, recently received a merited rebuke in the retirement of one of its prominent members, who declined longer to keep pace with its unreasonable requirements.

The spirit of reform is abroad, and men and women courageous enough to lead in the release of intelligent and otherwise independent people from the slavery of conventionalism, will receive grateful appreciation. Then we shall be blessed with sunshine and fresh air at midday entertainments, instead of being irritated, blinded and suffocated by gaslight and heat, and we can dine and lunch without sitting through the serving of numberless courses which nobody wants.

True hospitality is simple and unpretentious. It does not depend on riches, but is entirely compatible with economy and frugality. It does depend on wealth of character—the result of intellectual and ethical culture. The quintessence of true hospitality gives hearty welcome and perfect freedom in the every-day life of the home, with the manifest assurance that the presence of the guest implies no burden and imposes no restraint.

I shall not soon forget, and shall never cease to admire and honor the dignified hospitality of a mother and her daughters who, though dependent on their own efforts for livelihood, invited a series of semi-monthly gatherings during a winter. Little expense was incurred, but the best people in the large city in which they live were their guests.

Nor shall I forget the reply of Rev. Jenkin Lloyd Jones to a young friend who asked if living in the city was

really so very much more expensive than in the country. "No," he said, "if you want only the very best things!"

The world is moving, conditions are changing, men and women are so much occupied in educational, economic, philanthropic and kindred subjects, that less need is felt than formerly for purely social entertainments. A prominent woman, much given to hospitality, said recently that she seldom now invited company without an ulterior purpose—the discussion of some interesting or important subject.

Only slight variation is needed in Lowell's inspiring lines to adapt them to the present time:

New occasions teach new duties,  
Time makes ancient good uncouth;  
He must upward still and onward  
Who would keep abreast of truth.  
SUSAN LOOK AVERY.

### CALLING LEGISLATORS TO AC- COUNT.

For The Public.

A people is but the attempt of many  
To rise to the complete life of one.

So Browning the poet defines a people. "The people," as the term is used in the political field, is a corporation politic with legal methods of expression and action.

Such methods of expression and action may be inadequate or unsatisfactory. It is the belief of many that popular government is unsatisfactory in proportion to the legal limitations upon direct methods of expression by the people.

If the people do not nominate their representatives, but allow them to be chosen by party leaders; if the representatives when legally chosen do not represent those who elect them; if the people have no means to correct such unrepresentative action; if the courts are unable to declare illegal such acts of the representatives as violate their trust to the people—the system of popular government, and not the people themselves, is directly to blame.

The preamble of the Constitution of the United States says:

We the people of the United States, in order to form a more perfect Union, . . . promote the general welfare, and secure the Blessings of Liberty to ourselves and our Posterity, do ordain and establish this Constitution for the United States of America.

Knowing that eternal vigilance is the price of liberty, it will be admitted that a free and intelligent electorate will exercise its right and duty to use its political powers.

If it has the means it will use them. If it has not the means it will seek them. Having the means it will obtain a gov-

ernment which is conducted for the general welfare, and which will secure the blessings of liberty to ourselves and our posterity. We know no means, consonant with the fundamental principles of our government, whereby the people may secure such a government and such blessings, which are better than direct action at the polls. The people should when a sufficient number petition to do so, pass directly on the acts of the men they elect to public office. If these means are provided, the evils of our political system will soon disappear, and if follies are committed, it will be the fault of the people and not of their political system.

If an experiment of this kind is wise in operation it will benefit the whole nation. If the event proves that it is unwise in operation, the law permitting it can be repealed. But the business principle of review of acts of agents by the principal when the latter so elects, is sound. Even if the agent is more competent and is chosen because he is more competent than the principal to do certain acts, the latter should have the decision on matters affecting his interests, when he so desires.

Otherwise he abdicates in favor of the agent—and must take the consequences. The vesting of special privileges in corporations for private gain may be an act of deliberate injustice to the people, and may lead to unsatisfactory exercise of the privileges granted and to grave discontent. If this is so, are the people to be left without legal remedies?

Good citizens want to know the sources of political corruption. They want to apply the remedy to the end that they may have good government. They will not rest satisfied when they are told by those who are in power and who are responsible for the existing conditions, that "politics" as it exists, forbids the trial of an adequate remedy. How can the people know without a trial? Are they to admit impotence as sovereign citizens? Are they to acquiesce in the failure of popular government alleged by those who really rule under the forms of popular government?

Wherever true democracy exists—whether in New Zealand or in Switzerland—the people are not found to be incompetent or corrupt politically. The same cannot be said of autocracies—whether in Russia or in the United States.

LEWIS STOCKTON.  
Buffalo, N. Y., July 7, 1905.

In the progress of civilization woman's suffrage is sure to come.—Charles Sumner.

#### THE DEADLIEST INFIDELITY.

Extract from a sermon delivered by the Rev. Quincy Ewing, in the Church of the Advent, Birmingham, Alabama, July 9, 1905.

A man's life consisteth not in the abundance of the things which he possesseth.—Jesus.

The kind of infidelity that Christianity has to combat to-day, or itself perish, is not at all the infidelity of the Paines, the Bradlaughs, the Ingersolls—an infidelity which spends itself in denials of, or attacks upon, a "supernatural" basis for doctrine and dogma; but rather is it an infidelity which vaunts itself in every-day practical denial of and attacks upon the universal moral basis and justification of human life, without which religion as truth, religion as right, religion as deed and character, were empty, purposeless, and meaningless.

Jesus said, speaking for the ideal of fundamental religion, "a man's life consisteth not in the abundance of the things he possesseth." So far as I know, Tom Paine, Charles Bradlaugh and Robert Ingersoll agreed with Him. But the powerful many-handed and million-tongued infidelity of the present day flatly disagrees with Him. It says—and what it says it embodies in deeds—that a man's life *does* consist in the abundance of the things he possesseth, and in nothing else—except incidentally.

The only way to avoid the conclusion that the men responsible for the corruption that is rampant in our social and political life—the men who boodle; the men who crush rivals out of business by the secret rebate and other immoral methods; the men who conspire together to pay less for what they buy, and compel their fellowmen to pay more for what they buy and must have; the men whose supreme effort in life is to get something for nothing, or very much for very little;—the only way to avoid the conclusion that they are all essential infidels, is to suppose that the moral message of Jesus Christ is no fundamental part of His religion; that He won His great fame, not as humanity's Exemplar in the paths of righteousness, but as its most remarkable instructor in the realm of abstract metaphysics.

Thought of in this light, as it must be, how much infidelity there is in our social and national life! How many of our troubles, our problems, our sins and sufferings, it is responsible for! And how they would vanish, if for unfaith we could substitute faith in

the moral leadership of Jesus; if we could drive the awful infidelity out of business, out of "best society," out of politics and government, and put in its place the reverent spirit to ask, "Quo vadis, Domine?" Whither goest Thou, Master? and the spirit of faith to pronounce, "Whither Thou goest, I will go, and what Thou commandest, I will do!"

How long has it been since any great national question, or any small national question, was settled in these United States on the basis of right, in obedience simply to an ideal of rightness? Does any of us remember when such a question was so settled? Are not practically all our national questions settled rather on the basis of what will pay—the politicians in votes, or the privileged classes in dollars? Who ever expects, these days, a measure to go through Congress merely because it is a righteous measure, a measure in accord with the moral teaching of Jesus Christ, a measure framed in the spirit of the injunction, Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself? And the Supreme Court with its five to four decisions, in which the four are usually right, morally, and the five wrong, is rapidly acquiring the infidelity of Congress!

Consider the Chinese Exclusion Act as an illustration of Christian unfaith on the part of our national government. Years ago we shut Chinese laborers out of this country, but stood ready with the big guns of our battle-ships to see that our missionaries got entrance into China, to convert the subjects of the Chinese emperor away from their ancestral religion. Recently the excluding act has been repealed. No Chinaman is allowed to land on our shores to help us turn our raw material into usable wealth. Just a few weeks ago a Chinese citizen of the United States, a man born here, and naturally supposing he had the right of any other citizen—Irish, German, Pole, Swede, Sicilian, Hungarian, Bohemian—to travel abroad, if he so desired, was barred out of his native land by an immigration official, because he had been on a visit to China. And the Supreme Court of these United States upheld the official's act!

Now, in retaliation for our heathenish treatment of them, the Chinese in their own land are boycotting our goods, but still receiving our missionaries and according them every courtesy. Our producers and manufacturers are not selling so much in Hong-Kong and Shanghai. They are aware of a smaller inflow of Chinese gold. And,