

# The Public

Third Year.

CHICAGO, SATURDAY, OCTOBER 27, 1900.

Number 134.

LOUIS F. POST, Editor.

Entered at the Chicago, Ill., Post-office as second-class matter.

For terms and all other particulars of publication, see last column of last page.

Complaints of coercion in connection with the McKinley parade in Chicago on the 27th are many. Mercantile houses are forcing their employes to join the procession, on pain of dismissal. One house of which we hear, an exceptionally considerate one, left the question to a vote of its employes, but with the admonition that if a majority voted to parade all must join. And this enforced parade of business house employes is to be exploited through the republican press of the country as a demonstration for McKinley!

The associated banks of Chicago have voted, against vigorous protests from some of their number, to close their doors on the 27th, the day of the McKinley parade. Evidently the object of the majority was to promote McKinley's election. But they gave a different reason. They argued that the day, being Saturday, would be a short one anyhow, and that, as the streets would be congested, no banking business could be done. We shall have a test of their sincerity on the 3d. That day, too, will be Saturday, and a short day. Then, too, the streets will be congested, for it is the day of the Bryan parade. If on that day also the associated banks of Chicago close their doors, they may be credited with sincerity with reference to the McKinley parade. If not, then not.

"If Mr. Bryan were elected president, would he pay the obligations of the nation in gold or silver?" That is a question which Roosevelt asks and the McKinley papers repeat. And

there are people who think it important. Mr. Bryan's character is an all sufficient answer. No one doubts that, if elected president, Mr. Bryan would enforce the law. The question resolves itself, then, into another: What does the law require? If it requires payment in gold, Bryan would pay in gold. If it does not, he would not. And if it does not require payment in gold, who is responsible? Who else but the republican party, which, with four years' absolute control of both houses of congress and the presidency, have left us on a silver basis?

Senator Hanna's audience at South Omaha was assured by him that—the coal strike is virtually settled, and I had more to do with the settlement of it than any other man in this country.

One might fairly ask why the Ohio senator, if he has such great influence over the mining magnates, did not oblige them to settle the strike before it had run on a month. One might wonder, moreover, what kind of country this is we are living in, when one little man like Senator Hanna can thus control the livelihood of 150,000 miners.

When Mr. Hanna's party papers and leaders feel disposed again to nag Bryan for not discussing the silver question in New York, they should remember that in a speech at Norfolk, Neb., Mr. Hanna himself said: "I don't want to talk about free silver; that is a dead issue." If free silver is a dead issue in Nebraska, what makes it a live issue in New York?

Bryan is subjected to a flood of criticism from Roosevelt because he accepts the support of Croker in New York. Whose support in New York should he accept? The only alternative is Croker or Platt, and Roosevelt

has accepted Platt's support. Furthermore, in all respects in which Croker is bad, Platt is worse. Next to Hanna, Platt is probably the worst public man in the United States. Croker is only a poor third.

Chairman Jones, of the national democratic committee, charges President McKinley with misusing secret public documents. His charges are based upon the fact that Mr. McKinley, in his letter of acceptance as a presidential candidate, quoted from his instructions, as president, to the Paris peace commissioners. Since those instructions had never before been divulged, although repeatedly called for by senators, the charges are exceptionally grave. Nor are these charges to be evaded by the state department contention that "the president is at liberty to make public executive documents as he sees fit." That the president, as president, is at liberty to do that, no one for a moment questions. But it was not as president that Mr. McKinley published the quotation from his instructions to the Paris peace commissioners. He did it as a political candidate. And he did it not in a state document, but in an unofficial political document—his letter of acceptance. To make the matter worse, he has published only so much of the instructions as suit his purpose as a candidate. The remainder are still under the seal of executive secrecy. If this act be not a grave official offense, then we have come to a point in our history where our presidents, like kings, "can do no wrong."

In a carefully prepared interview published in the Chicago Tribune of the 24th, Archbishop Ireland says that a reversal of President McKinley's policy at the next election—will be interpreted by foreign nations as an indication of unsettled condi-

tions in our own country and of changeableness of political and commercial opinions and methods, and would result in lowering us immensely in the estimation in which we are now held by foreign countries.

Whence did Archbishop Ireland learn that the people of this republican country wish so to formulate American policies and so to cast their votes in presidential elections as to win the esteem of the monarchical countries of Europe? If the distinguished archbishop's impression is correct, the sooner President McKinley is voted out of office the better for American institutions. It is as our institutions differ from the established institutions of Europe, and are condemned by European powers, not as they conform to European standards and are praised by the supporters of European thrones, that they are worthy the devotion of American democrats and republicans. If the European powers want McKinley reelected, that is in itself no bad reason for defeating him.

In that same Tribune interview, Archbishop Ireland made another ominous remark. It cannot but shock every sincere Catholic whose vote for McKinley his interview was intended to solicit. Referring to Cuba and the Philippines and to Catholic interests in those places, he said:

In Rome, where Catholic interests in those countries are well understood, there is entire satisfaction as to the attitude of the American government towards those interests. If the authorities in Rome are satisfied, why should not Catholics in America be satisfied?

Why not? For the same reason that Irish patriots were never satisfied with the meddling of Rome in Irish politics in behalf of British aggression. One of the greatest of Irishmen, a faithful Catholic withal, was Daniel O'Connell, who publicly resented the attempts of Rome to fasten British power upon the Irish people. O'Connell's memorable words were: "All the religion you please from Rome, but no politics!" So say all American patriots, Catholic

and Protestant alike. "All the religion you please from Rome," Archbishop Ireland; "but no politics." When you attempt to influence American elections by an appeal to the opinions of Rome, you overstep the bounds which American Catholics, no less than American Protestants, have unalterably fixed in this country between church and state,

A Filipino of the name of Reyes, resident in Omaha, claims the right to vote at the election. He had applied for naturalization, but was told by the clerk of the court that he was a "subject" of the United States. That made it impossible, of course, for him to renounce allegiance. He could not forswear allegiance to the United States as a subject in order to swear allegiance to the United States as a citizen. Consequently he attempts to vote without naturalization. But there is no provision yet in our voting laws for subjects. Three years ago, this Filipino, had he lived here long enough, might have been naturalized and have become thereby a citizen. But now, this right is cut off. He is in worse plight with reference to American liberties in America than when he was a subject of Spain.

It amuses some republicans who have forgotten the democratic origin of their party to sneer at the new democracy as a party of "antis." But the republican party, before its moral fall, was founded exclusively upon two "antis." It was then anti-polygamy and anti-slavery. Under the Sulu treaty it is now pro-polygamy and pro-slavery. It has dropped both "antis."

A shrewd old colored woman of Evanston summed up the political situation acutely as well as picturesquely when she said, one day last week—

I yeah dis yeh man Hanna he gwine out talkin'. He talkin' coz he skaired. Fiah behine McKinley! An' mighty well he know it, too.

To be assured of the accuracy of that woman's observation one need only

read the speeches of Hanna and Roosevelt. —Those two men are McKinley's leading speakers. They take his place personally before the country. And neither of them does him or his cause any credit. Hanna, for example, when speaking at Wymore, Neb., asked what Bryan had done for the workingman and answering his own question said:

Confidentially, not a damned thing. Meanwhile, Roosevelt is indulging at his meetings in the east in vituperation that would have made him the envy of an old-time London fish wife. At West Nyack, New York, he shouted to an interrupter:

Now go back to your fellow hoboes. You stand against the flag; you haven't got a particle of patriotism in you. I am glad you are going away. I think you have learned enough hereafter not to monkey with the buzz saw.

This kind of talk these worthies are flinging not only at their audiences, but also, at longer range, at Bryan. Wholly apart from the bad taste which Hanna and Roosevelt are thereby displaying, their conduct is evidence of their demoralization. They have lost their heads. There is, as the colored woman said, a fire behind McKinley, and right well they know it, too.

The contrast between these representative McKinley men and Bryan is great. Bryan has throughout been respectful toward his adversaries and gentlemanly in dealing even with the worst hoodlums who have tried to disturb his meetings. Yet his temptations to speak with bitterness have been far more numerous and irritating than any which Hanna and Roosevelt have experienced. People who have heard both these men and Bryan, and even those who have only read their speeches, cannot but be impressed with the superiority of Bryan not only as an orator, in which respect the difference is enormous, but also as a man, a statesman and a gentleman.

Because the registration of women as voters in Chicago falls off from 6,264 in 1896 to 1,500 this year, it is