

The Public

Fourth Year.

CHICAGO, SATURDAY, MARCH 1, 1902.

Number 204.

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.

A banquet came off at New York on Washington's birthday, at which, according to the press reports, a thousand Democratic leaders from many states assembled for the purpose of "linking" all Democrats together in "harmony."

This banquet was given by the Manhattan club, which claims a non-resident membership in 38 states. It was designed ostensibly as a reception to the non-resident members, but in reality as a boom for the presidential aspirations of David B. Hill, a purpose which is now exploited by the plutocratic papers that cling like parasites to the Democratic party, and is welcomed alike by every Democratic "heeler" in the land and all the Republican organs.

Some of the Manhattan banqueters were genuine Democrats. But if any spoilshunting machine politician of the party, or any plutocrat who affects the Democratic label for the purpose of trading off the party's principles for valuable special privileges, was not there, he must have been overlooked accidentally or was of little importance. At the guest table sat such immaculate representatives of the spirit of Democracy as McDermott, of New Jersey; Patterson and Harrity, of Pennsylvania; Sheehan and Lamont and Crimmins and Perry Belmont, of New York, and Ingalls, of Ohio, with many more of the same self-seeking stripe—altogether a rare collection of Democratic curios, antique, modern and fantastic. Edward M. Shepard was sandwiched in among

them, a man of fine democratic instincts, who allows them, however, to be held too much in check by his plutocratic environment. His toast was a safe one—"Washington." And then there was Hill himself, who had been chosen to sound the keynote and give point, purpose and prophecy to the occasion, in response to a wide-open toast—"The Democracy of the Middle States."

Hill spoke after Patrick Collins, of Boston, a thin, tall, spectacled and typical Downeaster, who talked easily, saying nothing especially worth remembering, but making the "get together" idea the burden of his speech. The pale-faced, crafty-eyed, cold-mannered Hill read his speech from proof slips. He declared for expansion to adjacent territory, but against imperialism; for revenue reform, but not for free trade, except within American boundaries; for reciprocity as an historic Democratic policy; for strict construction of the Federal constitution; for state rights; for the election of senators by popular vote; for opposition to "dangerous corporate combinations of capital;" for the Monroe doctrine, and for hard money and against "irredeemable paper currency." As to the silver question, he suggested, if necessary to enunciate any more specific policy on that subject, that "a simple declaration in favor of the general principle of bimetallism," would furnish "a common ground upon which all can stand;" a proposition to which Mr. Bryan pointedly replies:

It all depends on what he means by bimetallism. We discovered during two campaigns that there were four kinds of bimetallism. There is the genuine bimetallism; that we advocated. Then there is 'buy' metallism; 'bye and bye' metallism, which some have called international bimetallism, and 'good-by' metallism, which we are having at present. It will need an ex-

planation to find which one of these Mr. Hill is ready to advocate.

But what Hill said in detail is of far less importance than what he was driving at, and that was that he himself is the only real presidential possibility in the Democratic party for 1904. He explained that the battleground is New York, and led his audience to infer that New York can be carried only by Hill. Other speeches of the "get together" order followed that of Hill, as did Shepard's severely academic response to the "Washington" toast. But the one vital, full-blooded and inspiring speech of the evening came at the close. Inspiring as it was, however, it spread consternation among the little chieftains who had worked up this boom for Hill. That one soul-stirring and "heeler"-crushing speech is worthy of special consideration.

At the guest table sat a stranger of singular personal appearance, who had been noticed by some of the curious. His head covered with clustering curls, and on his breast a frilled shirt bosom supported by a white waistcoat the cut of which would have defied description, he might have taken the grand prize at a nineteenth century fashion show. He was evidently a man of means, accustomed to refined society, and, as his speech proved, he had command of a cultured and effective style of oratory. But while he sat at the guest table during the dinner he looked like some rare human exotic. Had he not spoken, his striking personality might have been remembered with an impression that he was probably a French poet or an Oriental prince traveling incognito. In fact, he is well known upon the Pacific coast as C. E. S. Wood, a lawyer of large practice and extraordinary abil-

ity, whose home is Portland, and who is a democratic-Democrat and that to the core. When introduced as a speaker at the Manhattan banquet, his voice rang out clear, strong, masculine and honest; and he flew at his subject like a hawk to the prey. At first the whole audience was enthusiastic, but as he unfolded the democratic principles of the Pacific coast, for which he spoke, one part of his audience was aghast, though the rest were delighted.

Mr. Wood said in substance that he came from the West, where men's minds were influenced by their environments—by the vast prairies, the deep mines, the extensive ranches and the mountains that reach the sky. These surroundings caused men, he said, to look things in the face and have an independent democratic spirit that allowed the theaters and the saloons as well as the churches to be wide open on Sunday, and that gave every man the privilege of going to Tophet if he wanted to. It was this feeling of independence, he proceeded, that impelled him to look about and ask himself with whom he was to "get together" for 1904, and he confessed that the prospect was not good. It indicated that he might have to "get together" with himself, for, said he: "I voted for McKinley in 1896; for Bryan in 1900; and now, I do not see that there is any kind of a real Democratic party for me to act with."

The audience hesitated. It had laughed loudly at the allusion to the saloons, and it had learned that Wood was a fine speaker with strong views, but it wondered what he could say, after that declaration, under the head of Democratic "harmony." The speaker went on:

We talk of uniting the elements of the party. What is a party? What is the Democratic party? If it is anything it must be a gathering around a principle, around a great idea. But what are we talking of? Gathering the elements; getting together the parts of the party. What are the parts and what are the elements? The party cannot have more than one element, nor more

than one part, if it is democratic. The plain truth we should face; and we should honestly tell ourselves that what we are trying to do is to get into or hold inside the Democratic party a lot of people who are not democrats and who should not be in the party. The best way for us to start in to "get together" is to put out these men who don't belong here. Then, when those who remain are of one mind, they can preach their democratic faith and make recruits.

At that, the plutocrats in the audience gasped, and the faces of some were like untinted wax. This harmony movement for Hill was fast losing its way. But Wood was merciless. With unmistakable allusions to Hill's keynote speech he went on:

It has been said that tariff reform is a good issue for the party. But is it? Suppose some of the Democrats in the North and West want free trade in sugar, what will the Louisiana senators and congressmen do about it? Will they submit? I don't think so. And so you may go through the list of the tariff schedules. Then we are told that regulations of the trusts is a good Democratic issue. Is it? Regulate them how? By law. But have we ever regulated the railroads by law, or the Standard Oil company by law? Let me say that we never, never can regulate anything by law that has its roots deep down in existing social conditions. Those things are too strong to be regulated by law. The truth is that these are not the real Democratic issues and cannot be. They are but changing phases of the ever present issue for Democracy. That issue is "privilege." Look at the great fortunes of to-day. Are they made by ability? The great mass of men have difficulty to keep body and soul together, and some other men have unthinkable fortunes. Can we say that the mental powers of the few are as superior to those of the many as the riches of those few are in contrast with the poverty of the many? I don't believe it. It is not natural. I don't want to say anything against riches. What I want to say is that the masses of the people are not getting their rights. And it is the Democratic party's business to get them their rights—to make war upon privilege, which is depriving them of their rights.

An assault upon privilege, so unrestrained and manifestly so sincere, touched several individuals in the audience, and they applauded; but the same manifest sincerity which ap-

pealed to them, froze to the marrow the plutocrats who were accustomed to refer as tenderly to privilege as did Hill, when in his speech he guardedly mentioned the "dangerous corporate combinations of capital." But Wood was not through. Heeding neither cheers nor scowls he drove on to his mark:

Perhaps this is not the view of Democracy here. But I want to say that I have been called to speak for the West coast; and my say is that the pressing, palpitating thought among the great mass of men there is that somewhere, somehow, there is a great wrong that causes some men to have a superabundance and other men not enough to live good lives, though they work with all their might. And I want to say that this thought is going down to the foundations. It is going down to the roots. Men are asking themselves why it is that some few human beings are accorded the right to keep all others from the use of the land; why it is that persons who call themselves owners are permitted to lay claim and keep idle great stretches of country while other men are forced to compete with each other for a living? It is not right. Anybody who thinks about it can see that it is not right, and I want to say to this meeting of Democrats that the real principle of Democracy has sooner or later got to take up that question and settle it on the principle of equal rights, notwithstanding titles and parchments.

No wonder that reports of this speech were suppressed. Had it gone into the papers it would have been as crushing a climax to the absurd Hill boom throughout the country as it was in the banquet hall, where it turned the boom into a boomerang, simply by sharply contrasting democratic Democracy with plutocratic Democracy. This was a true contrast and no mere sentiment. Wood represented the anti-monopoly spirit of the Western farms and ranches, which will rule the Democratic convention of 1904 as certainly as it did the conventions of 1896 and 1900, and which would no sooner tolerate Hill as its presidential candidate now than then, or than it would tolerate J. Pierpont Morgan or Perry Belmont. New York state may be necessary, as Hill says, to the election

of a Democratic president, and Hill himself may stand, as he intimates, for success in that state; but the West also is necessary, and the Democrats of the West, apart from the ward "heelers" who run with the machine, and a few plutocrats with monopoly interests to conserve, have no stomach for Mr. Hill. They would rather be beaten at the election by a Republican than after the election by a Democrat. If Hill spoke for the Democracy of the middle states at the plutocratic love feast of the Manhattan club, so much the worse for the Democracy of that region. It was Wood's voice that spoke for the democratic masses of the West, and we believe that his sentiments find a welcome echo in the hearts of the truly democratic masses of the East.

The Senate will be making a dangerous precedent if it disfranchises the state of South Carolina by way of punishing Senators Tillman and McLaurin for disorderly conduct on the floor. It has no right to prohibit their voting in that body, and in doing so it offends something more august than its own dignity. Such a precedent might work incalculable harm. Under the constitution (par. 2, sec. v., art. i.) the Senate is empowered to "punish its members for disorderly conduct," and with the concurrence of two-thirds it may "expel a member." But it cannot expel nor otherwise punish a state. It must so adjust its punishments that the derelict member may vote for his state, or else expel him so that his state may fill the vacancy. If senators could be deprived of voting powers without expulsion, the way would be open to holding-up a state indefinitely, neither allowing its senators to vote for it nor its governor or legislature to send other senators to take the place of degraded ones.

In this connection a word will not be out of place with reference to the subject which led to the disorder upon the floor of the Senate. Mr. Tillman had charged, by implication at least, that Mr. McLaurin voted to ratify

the treaty with Spain in consideration of a bargain with the President for Federal patronage in South Carolina. That he did vote for ratification is matter of record. But this does not necessarily imply a corrupt bargain. Even Mr. Bryan advised the ratification of the treaty, and had he been a senator would doubtless have voted for it. It has always seemed to us that this was wise advice. For bad as has been the administration policy under the treaty, it doubtless could not have been reasonably foreseen; and in the state of war in which non-ratification would have left us indefinitely, we might have experienced an administration policy infinitely worse. But while Mr. Bryan's judgment has been criticized, no one impugns his motives. Mr. Bryan, however, got no Federal patronage; and that marks one difference between him and Mr. McLaurin. With Mr. McLaurin's demand for an investigation we nevertheless heartily sympathize. It is possible for him to have voted for the treaty in good faith and to have got the patronage also in good faith. Mr. Tillman may have misjudged him, for "post hoc ergo propter hoc" is an alluring fallacy. But it would not be fair to confine the investigation to the McLaurin case. If any investigation is made it should cover all the secrets of the ratification; and it is gratifying to find that this is what Mr. Hanna demands. Such an investigation might give the public the truth about Senator Wellington's apparently just grievance. It might also explain the remarkable 'bout-face of Senator Kenny, of Delaware. While the treaty was under consideration in the senate Mr. Kenny stood charged with complicity in the Dover bank embezzlement, in which a number of Delaware politicians were implicated. He had been tried twice in the Federal courts. In both cases the jury disagreed, the majority, it was said, being for conviction; and preparations were being made for a third trial. Mr. Kenny was at first opposed to the treaty, but eventually changed his mind and voted for it.

Shortly afterwards it was announced that the charges against him would not be further pressed. Here again there may have been nothing consequent in the events, but only accidental sequence; yet the sequence is sufficiently significant, taken in connection with the other curious sequences, to warrant a full inquiry, a course which it is to be hoped Senator Hanna will continue to insist upon.

What Judge Shiras and the other Supreme Court judges mean by refusing to take original jurisdiction of the railroad merger case brought by the state of Minnesota is not very clear. The constitution distinctly (art. iii., sec. 2, par. 1) invests this court with jurisdiction over all "controversies between two or more states, between a state and citizens of another state," and "between a state, or the citizens thereof, and foreign states, citizens or subjects;" and (same section, par. 2) in all cases "in which a state shall be a party" it confers original jurisdiction. Upon common sense grounds, then, it would seem that if the court could have jurisdiction, either appellate or original, over a case brought by Minnesota against the New Jersey corporation called the Northern Securities company, it would not lose this jurisdiction through the bringing in of any other necessary parties whatever; but that the question would turn solely upon whether or not the state was properly a party against another state, or citizens of another state, or a foreign state or its subjects. Yet Judge Shiras is quoted as saying, and the court as holding with him, that— as the Great Northern and the Northern Pacific Railway companies are indispensable parties without whose presence the court, acting as a court of equity, cannot proceed, and as our constitutional jurisdiction would not extend to the case if those companies were made parties defendant, the motion for leave to file the proposed bill must be and is denied.

It is to be hoped that this is either a misquotation or has been supported by sound precedent and good reason. As it stands, it is one of those jumbles