

tion, as a man who has run away from his own fight for the people and against the railroad ring, his co-partisans trailing behind him and his allies left in the lurch. He has compromised with the railroad ring when his own non-partisan alliance with the Democrats made compromise unnecessary. And in his compromise he has surrendered his cause and given himself away. He appears from this episode to be the boaster and "quitter" that his critics who knew him best have all along accused him of being.

\* \* \*

### A High Example of Civic Conscience.

An event of extraordinary significance in municipal affairs occurred in Springfield, Illinois, at the meeting of the City Council on the 14th. Alderman Bode, the single tax Democrat who had carried a Republican ward (p. 7), was about to be confronted with the necessity of voting on a question of high license for saloons, a question not at issue at the election. Personally he was opposed to high license, his position being that if the saloon business is illegitimate it should not be licensed at all, and if legitimate it should not be discriminated against in taxation. But, regarding himself as a representative of the people of his ward, he addressed them on the subject and solicited a postal card referendum. Out of 1,639 voters he received replies from 652, and of these 437 voted for the thousand dollar license. Mr. Bode thereupon declared that as alderman he would vote for this measure.

\*

Accordingly, at the meeting of the Council at which his vote was called for, he cast it as his constituents had voted, but with an explanation which throws a great light upon the influences that business men exert upon public officials to tempt them to betray the people they represent. After narrating the circumstances outlined above, Alderman Bode, who is the senior member of a wholesale grocery house in Springfield, proceeded:

Those of you who have read my letter to the citizens of the Fifth ward will probably remember that I claimed that the crowning evil of this license system is the demoralization of our politics—that such demoralization is the natural result of this socialistic policy of governmental interference with private business, and that we should not be surprised when men affected by such interference do everything in their power to control the political machinery of this country. Just the day before yesterday I was given the most striking and direct proof of the painful correctness of this argument. It is because I am convinced that this proof is a matter of direct interest and deep concern to every citizen of this community

that I consider it my solemn duty to publicly expose every word that I can safely substantiate with witnesses. I deeply regret the personal nature of the remarks I am about to make and wish to say in advance that it is not from malice but entirely from a conviction of civic duty that I am impelled. Last Friday I received a telephone message from Mr. George Reisch, Sr., of the Reisch Brewing Company, asking me to call at his office that afternoon. I replied that as city salesman for our firm my regular route would bring me in his neighborhood Saturday morning. Accordingly I called about noon: As he is the owner of the building which our firm occupies I assumed that he wished to see me on ordinary business. What he did wish to see me about was this question of high license. He accused me of being a party to what he called a conspiracy to pass a high license measure which he claimed Mr. Devereaux and others had planned last summer. I denied being a party to such conspiracy if it existed. . . . He then notified me that unless I voted against high license he would order our firm to vacate his building in twenty days, viz.: by the first day of June, that if we did not move our rent would be raised \$125 for that month, and if we had not moved by July 1 it would be raised again until we could not bear it and would be forced to get out. This in spite of his verbal agreement to allow us to remain five years from July 1, 1904, without raising the rent. He went so far as to threaten to do all he could to ruin our business not only in Springfield, but in the surrounding towns as well, taking pains to remind me of the great influence he possessed. He ended by accusing me of having "sneaked" into office—that if he had known that I intended to be influenced by the wishes of the majority on the license question he would have accomplished my defeat; to which I replied that if he had the power to boss this city he had more power than he ought to have. He replied that he did not want to boss the city, but that he must protect his business, and insisted that whatever he did to gain control he did honestly. Is it not evident that, as a community, we have tempted this man to constantly endeavor to control every candidate for public office until, from constant practice, he has actually become deadened to any realization of the enormity of endeavoring, by oppressive methods akin to bribery, to coerce a public official into betraying his constituents? Thus, in a sense, we can hardly blame him, although now that he is so wealthy even he should be unwilling to resort to such methods as I have described. . . . But I do not wish to give the impression that I consider myself persecuted. It was no temptation to me. I do not believe he can injure us financially to any great extent, and even if he can, I value some things more than money. As I said before, it is entirely without malice and with a charitable recognition of the fact that we, as a community, must share the blame, that I have felt it my duty to publicly expose these facts with the hope of awakening the citizens of Springfield to a realization of the danger to popular government here at home, which we simply augment by agitation for further encroachment on the liquor traffic or any other private business.

\*

The high license measure was defeated, as it

ought to have been; but Mr. Bode was right in heeding the wishes of his constituents. His act will educate them in civic intelligence, as well as strengthen his colleagues in municipal democracy and honesty. The greatest service he has rendered, however, is in exposing the manner in which officials of honest purpose are coerced by business men and business interests. For Mr. Reisch, the Springfield brewer, is only a specimen of "the business man in politics," and comparatively a small specimen at that. What he tried unsuccessfully to do with Alderman Bode, of Springfield, business men of greater financial interests and a higher grade of respectability are all the time doing successfully in every city, in every State, and in the national government. If the same courage and candor that Alderman Bode has shown were shown throughout the nation, from the White House to every city hall in the land, a tale would be told that might startle the people into retaining political power in their own hands, by referendum and recall, instead of placing it irrevocably in the hands of representatives who are constantly under temptations from cupidity or fears of coercion.

\* \*

#### Corruption Corporations and Woman Suffrage.

That organized opposition to woman suffrage originates with and is supported by the great grafting corporations, has been shrewdly suspected. It seems now almost to have been proved. The evidence comes from Oregon, where a referendum campaign for woman suffrage is now under way, and is in the shape of a circular letter ostensibly from the "Oregon State Association Opposed to the Extension of Suffrage to Women." This letter declares that—

One of the serious objections to the adoption of the woman suffrage amendment at the June election, is the injury which it would undoubtedly bring to the business interests of the State. In connection with the Initiative and Referendum, it would result in much bad legislation. Its adoption would alarm the cautious investor, and would discourage the construction of new lines of railway and other enterprises which promise much for the prosperity of the State. For these reasons the O. S. A. O. to the Extension of Suffrage to Women invites an expression from the business interests of the city of Portland in opposition to the proposed amendment. For this purpose our representatives will call upon your house within a few days, and we write you to request you to join with other business houses of the city in a public statement of the attitude of the business interests of the State on this subject. We believe such a statement will be of the greatest value in the campaign against the amendment.

No extraordinary experience with the dark and

devious ways of grafting corporations is necessary to spot the authorship of that circular letter. It is as clearly traceable as a time-table, to the Southern Pacific railroad combine. Significant as well as curious is the fact, that opposition to woman suffrage lines up with the interests of the great plundering corporations, as naturally as ducks take to water.

\* \*

#### Standard Oil Exposures.

Mr. Monett, the Republican attorney general of Ohio whom his party refused to renominate because he had set the machinery of the law in operation against the Standard Oil Company, has been investigating Standard Oil affairs before the Interstate Commerce Commission at Chicago, and with gratifying success. The exposures have been sensational, but no denial is raised. Standard Oil representatives call it "muckraking," a term which has been on the tongue of every criminal about to be exposed, ever since Mr. Roosevelt perverted Bunyan's meaning in order to defend rich grafters from exposure. One of the minor exposures before the Commission was the fact that the Standard Oil Company systematically bribes clergymen with petty gifts.

\* \*

#### Curious Extradition Laws.

It appeared at the Standard Oil hearing before the Interstate Commerce Commission at Chicago on the 12th, that it makes a difference in criminal cases in some circumstances whether the accused is a labor union leader or a Standard Oil official. Two years ago, it seems, the Tazewell County, Illinois, grand jury indicted C. T. Collings and Guy B. Taylor for suborning Charles Kercher to commit perjury. The indicted men were officers of the Standard Oil Company resident in Ohio, and had not been personally in Tazewell County. So when a writ of extradition was about to be applied for, the attorney general of Illinois advised the prosecuting attorney of Tazewell County that Gov. Deneen should not grant extradition because the law is clear that extradition proceedings lie only against persons who were physically present in the State when the alleged crime was committed, and at the time of its commission. Doubtless this is the law. It was applied also by the Governor of New York when the Governor of Texas made requisition for a New York officer of the Standard Oil Company under whose instructions a crime had been committed in Texas. But when the Governor of Idaho recently made a requisition on the Governor of Colorado for cer-