

tion they absolutely lost. The number of Democrats in the California delegation was increased from 1 in 1894 to 2 in 1896, though both were lost in 1900; that of the Illinois delegation from none in 1894 to 5 in 1896, and 11 in 1900; that of the Indiana delegation from none in 1894 to 4 in 1896 and the gain held in 1900; that of Kansas from none in 1894 to 1 in 1900; that of Massachusetts from 1 in 1894 to 2 in 1896 and 3 in 1900; that of Michigan from none in 1894 to 1 in 1896, which, however, was lost in 1900; that of New York from 5 in 1894 to 6 in 1896 and 12 in 1900; that of Ohio from 2 in 1894 to 6 in 1896, but reduced to 4 in 1900; that of Nebraska from none in 1894 to 2 in 1900; and that of New Jersey from none in 1894 and 1896 to 2 in 1900; while the Democratic delegation from the Southern state of Tennessee rose from 6 in 1894 to 8 in 1896, remaining at 8 in 1900, and that from Missouri from 4 in 1894 to 12 in 1896 and 13 in 1900. Under these circumstances Mr. Cleveland crowds the line of delicacy very close when he implies that the Democratic defeats since Tilden's day are chargeable to Bryan's leadership.

The speech of David B. Hill on the occasion of this Tilden club "harmony" banquet, is not open to the criticism that it all ran to "fat." Hill did say things. And the things he said were Democratic in substance as well as verbiage. One of them is especially worth quoting, because it puts into compact form a sentiment which needs just now to get emphatic expression. Referring to the Republican trick of confusing the government with the party in power as if they were the same, and taking President Roosevelt's Decoration Day speech as his text, Mr. Hill mentioned that speech as—

the partisan address of President Roosevelt, delivered on Decoration day, in violation of the proprieties of the occasion, wherein he purposely or inadvertently confused the well recognized distinctions which exist between the administration and the government, between the army and the gov-

ernment and between all the other officials of the government and the government itself, and assumed to question the loyalty of those who have ventured to criticize the cruel acts of a few officers of the army, who, if semi-official reports are correct, have undoubtedly disgraced the uniform they wear. This confusion of the state itself with the ruler thereof, is not new in history. It was Louis XIV. who once made the same mistake when he assumed to be France and uttered the famous declaration: "I am the state"—a remark which might have lost him his head in later times of less despotism; and President Roosevelt, in another sense, seems to have already lost his head when he forgets that this country differs from both ancient and modern France in that it is not a crime to criticize the army, or the President, or any other servant or servants of the people; and he needs to be reminded that this is a government of law—a government under a written constitution, wherein the right of every citizen freely to express his sentiments upon administrative questions is expressly guaranteed—and that loyalty to the government does not consist in loyalty to individuals or to the policies of those who happen to hold official positions. Loyalty to this government consists in attachment to our free institutions—in faithful observance of constitutional provisions, in respect for its flag as the emblem of civil liberty, in support of the authorities of the United States against the attacks of our foreign or domestic foes; but it does not consist in ostentatious professions of "intense Americanism," nor in indifference to the preservation or spread of republican forms of government everywhere, nor in suppressing free speech, nor in conquering the free people of other and distant lands who desire to govern themselves. . . .

That is the best democracy that David B. Hill has ever uttered, and he should have credit for it.

On another matter also Mr. Hill was more than usually radical and definite. While condemning trusts he demanded "free trade in all articles controlled by trusts," and said:

Everybody of discernment and intelligence must recognize the folly of the maintenance of a system of tariff taxation which enables manufacturers enjoying a monopoly of governmental favoritism here to undersell foreign manufacturers in the latter's own country and at the same time compel the people of this country to pay a larger price for the manufactured articles which they purchase in their

home markets than American manufacturers themselves are willing to accept from foreign purchasers in foreign lands. . . . The whole system of governmental favoritism, whereby the constitutional power to tax for the purpose of providing revenue for the needs of the federal treasury is improperly used for the purpose of building up one man's business at the expense of another's, by discriminating in favor of one industry as against another, is a vicious system which has long afflicted the country and which has grown more and more intolerable with years and against which Democracy has ever protested. It is utterly indefensible upon any just and proper principle of government. There is no justification for the exercise of the power of legislation to make millionaires out of one class of people and paupers of another. . . . If the policy of protection is to continue in whole or in part to be tolerated by the country it might be well to consider whether it were not better that its evils should not be attempted to be mitigated by piecemeal or popgun legislation, but that our efforts should be reserved until the country has become so surfeited with its monstrous injustice that it is prepared to destroy the whole citadel of protection and to return to a constitutional and just system of taxation for the purposes of revenue only.

If David B. Hill were a man to be trusted, that utterance could be accepted as the strongest and most satisfactory in the direction of free trade which can yet be hoped for. But to know Hill's record is to distrust his professions. He has always been a "peanut politician," with no political principles that he could not throw off or put on as seemed to him from time to time expedient. From such a leader the Democratic party may most devoutly pray deliverance. It were better for the party to suffer defeat at the election in 1904 as in 1896 and in 1900, than to suffer it after the election, as in 1892.

In responding to the challenge of the "harmony" banqueters to whom Cleveland and Hill spoke at New York, Mr. Bryan makes an indictment which is criticized for dealing in personalities. That is a weak evasion. Indictments always deal in personalities. The question is not whether Mr. Bryan's indictment is personal but whether it is true. Let no one who hopes to see the Demo-