

grand jury which was appointed for the county of San Francisco in 1906 by Judge Graham, and which from its foreman has been known as the Oliver grand jury. It carried out in spirit and letter the duties which grand jurymen too often forget they take a solemn oath to perform: "To present no person through malice, hatred or ill will; nor leave any unpresented through fear, favor or affection." Nearly forty persons guilty of the offenses which had made the San Francisco city government a byword and reproach, were indicted. These crimes were openly condoned and participated in by leaders in the business, social and political life of San Francisco; and all the resources of money and prestige were used by the beneficiaries of these crimes—"the men higher up"—to prevent the indictments and balk and frustrate the prosecutions. After paying deserved tribute to the services of Heney, Spreckles, Older, Phelan and others in rescuing the city government from the band of thieves into whose hands it had fallen, the report well says: "But each of these men has had, with the trials and stress of the struggle, that honor and recognition,—in this case nationwide,—always bestowed upon strong men who become the people's recognized leaders in time of public danger. The members of the Oliver grand jury knew that no such distinction awaited the performance of their duty. They were business and professional men of good standing, none of exceptional fortune, most of them not even of the class known in American parlance as men of independent means. They, however, had growing businesses to endanger, credit at their bankers to be lost, powerful commercial antagonists to meet in the fierce competition of American economic life. . . . Harder to face, for some at least, was the severance of long-standing friendships, business and social, with the men against whom they ultimately found their indictments, and the social ostracism from certain circles, not only for themselves, but also for their wives and children." We heartily agree with the statement of the report that, "when the Pacific Coast compiles its records of civic patriotism, the names of these men should not be forgotten."

* *

Bryan's Congressional Platform.

If it were possible to spread broadcast the tariff speeches made last fall (vol. xii, pp. 924, 973, 1108) in Texas by William J. Bryan and Senator Joseph W. Bailey, a great national enlightenment might result. Although of much usefulness in many respects, this would be a good thing to do if only for the object lesson it affords in the difference between a statesman and a demagogue. To

call Bryan a demagogue is one of the commonest recreations of persons who are prejudiced against him and his opinions, and know of no other way of accounting for his tremendous personal influence. But in fact Bryan is no demagogue. Compare those Texas speeches, Bryan's and Bailey's, and instantly you recognize statesmanship without demagogy in Bryan's and demagogy without statesmanship in Bailey's. Bailey played the demagogue all the way through his Houston speech in reply to Bryan, from his coarse and brutal appeal to local race antipathies to his attempts at fulsome flattery of women; whereas Bryan's speech at Dallas, to which Bailey's was a reply, was characteristically dignified and manifestly sincere.

*

And Bryan's argument was sound, whereas Senator Bailey's, in so far as he may be credited with having made an argument, was without foundation. Bailey defended his own course in voting in the Senate against putting raw materials into the free list. He did so by asking his constituents of Texas to believe the false doctrine that the freeing of raw materials would increase the profits of manufacturers, and by putting forward the absurd proposition that there should be no abolition of protection on raw materials except as it is abolished on finished products. The truth is that the freeing of raw materials would not increase the profits of manufacturers; it would tend to reduce them by making competition in manufacturing freer and easier. Mr. Bailey's economic premises were all awry on this point, notwithstanding his boast of having mastered Adam Smith's "Wealth of Nations." Even if he had been right instead of wrong the tactics he proposed for ridding this country of protection were puerile if they were not treacherous. Protection cannot be killed at a blow, because all its beneficiaries would rally to its support. It cannot be killed by horizontal revisions, because this would make a perpetual seesaw between horizontal revisions downward and horizontal revisions upward. It can be killed only by putting one item after another as fast as possible into the free list. This policy must begin somewhere, and as raw materials of the kind that Bryan classifies offer the most vulnerable point of attack, it should begin there. When Senator Bailey demands protection all along the line until it is modified all along the line, he is like a military commander who should refuse to attack a fatally weak point in the enemy's defenses at a critical moment because he wanted to attack all the defenses at once some time or other in the future.

He is worse than such a commander, for not only does he refuse to attack the enemy's weak spot but he calls for volunteers to help repair it.

+

In opposition to Bailey's fatally Fabian policy, Bryan's speech at Dallas, reinforced by his speech at El Paso, offered a sound and vigorous policy to the Democratic party. To those among us who object to Bryan because he does not go deep enough or far enough into the tariff question, these speeches should be a complete answer. True, he does not demand absolute free trade and direct taxation. But if he did, he would be unfit for leadership in active politics at a time when the Constitution stands in the way and there is no general sentiment in favor of a Constitutional amendment in that particular. But he does go the full length of tariff for revenue only—which is the extreme possibility of free trade in the United States at the present stage of public sentiment,—and he does advance elemental arguments in support of this demand. Such sentiments as these appear again and again in one form or another in Bryan's Dallas speech.

The security of the masses is to be found not in trying to get a tariff that will benefit them, but in reducing the tariff to the lowest possible point.

The masses of the people must not expect to get their hands into other people's pockets; their efforts must be to keep other people's hands out of their pockets.

I began the study of public questions with the tariff question, and years ago reached the conclusion that the protective principle is indefensible from every standpoint.

The man who contends for incidental protection soon becomes as unreasonable as the man who asks for direct protection. Incidental protection is protection that was not intended—a protection that came without planning; the moment you begin to plan for protection it ceases to be incidental and becomes direct and intended protection, and to defend it one must resort to the same arguments that are used to defend the protective system in general. It was in that spirit that Mr. Bryan at Dallas addressed the Democrats of Texas, who in their desire to protect local wool raising, had demanded the maintenance of protection on raw materials so long as finished products are protected.

+

In the same spirit, Mr. Bryan proposed a Democratic policy of national scope for the coming Congressional elections, and here is what he proposed:

1. A platform is a contract between the candidate elected upon it and the people who elected him, the violation of which is an "embezzlement of power."

2. Congressional rules to "insure the rule of the majority on every question."

3. Free wool and abolition of the compensatory duties on woollens, together with a substantial reduction in the ad valorem rate on woollens.

4. Free lumber, free wood pulp, and free paper.

5. Free hides, leather, harness, boots and shoes.

6. Free oil and products of oil.

7. Free iron ore, free coal, and low duties on all manufactures of iron and steel.

8. Free binding twine, cotton ties and cotton bagging.

9. Material reduction in the cotton schedules and in the tariff on all other necessaries of life, especially upon articles sold abroad more cheaply than at home.

10. Articles competing with trust-made goods to go into the free list.

11. No tariff to be above 50 per cent ad valorem, except liquor and tobacco, and all rates above 25 per cent, excepting those upon liquor and tobacco, to be reduced one-twentieth each year until a 25 per cent rate is reached, the purpose being to reduce the tariff gradually to a revenue basis and thereafter to collect tariff for revenue only.

That platform is no broader than it ought to be, and no narrower than is absolutely necessary for effective purposes under existing political circumstances. The radical free trader who complains that it does not go far enough, is probably taking counsel of his impatience instead of his judgment; for, short of an improbable revolution, this country must get to a revenue tariff basis before it can establish free trade. The conservative Democrat who on the other hand objects to specifications so minute, may not be a protectionist, but he is justly open to suspicion. The only way to bind political leaders is to substitute specific for general instructions.

+

The candidate for Congress next fall, who makes that platform his pledge to and contract with his constituents, ought to be supported by democratic Democrats whether he wears the Republican label or the Democratic. Senator Bailey has exposed himself by attacking it. Mr. Bryan has again served his party and his country well by proposing it.

+ *

A Great Citizen of Minnesota.

In speaking last March of the Citizens' League of Minnesota (vol. xii, p. 244), The Public said: "The name of S. M. Owen as a member of the executive committee is alone a guarantee throughout Minnesota of efficiency and good faith." Sidney M. Owen, editor of Farm, Stock and Home, and a regent of the University of Minnesota, died at his home in Minneapolis on the 2nd. He was born on a farm in Ohio in 1838, was educated at Oberlin, and served in the 55th Ohio during the Civil War. In 1885 he became the editor of Farm,