

Why is it that the papers generally have had so little to say about the outrageous conduct of the President in permitting railroads to pay the expenses of his long trip? They have not even mentioned Congressman Baker's attempts to have the government pay the bill. Not so the Springfield Republican. After commending Mr. Baker's attempts, this paper, in a leading editorial, speaks out in healthy reproof of the President's conduct, as follows: "There can be no defense of such conduct. It would be bad enough for the President to accept free transportation in the course of ordinary travel. It is much worse—scandalous, in fact—for him to accept a special train with food, etc., for himself and party in a long turn about the country for the obvious purpose of strengthening himself before the people for nomination and election this year."

Mr. J. B. Lewright, a Texas lawyer, has made a commendable attack upon the evils of the railway pass. He makes the attack as a railway stockholder and in the courts, asking for an injunction against the San Antonio & Aransas Pass railway, restraining it from issuing free passes to members of the legislature, judges and other public officials. He bases his suit upon the claim that if free passes were not granted, the company would either pay dividends or give the public better service. Not only does he ask an injunction, but he demands that all outstanding passes be canceled. Mr. Lewright has taken a course in this matter which might be advantageously adopted elsewhere and with other railroads. Passes are prejudicial to the honest interests of stockholders, they are bribes of a peculiarly corrupting kind, and they operate to discriminate between travelers having equal rights on the public highways.

Apropos of ex-President Cleveland's lecture (p.55) on the Debs strike in Chicago in 1894, Mr. Debs

himself has made a public statement which is at least worthy of consideration even by the most devoted worshiper at the Cleveland shrine. In this statement Mr. Debs says:

I have never counseled violence in strikes. When I was president of the American Railway Union I never urged a single striker to unlawful deeds. They are the worst enemy of the trades union cause. I am for peace. I love to fight for the cause of labor, but not with bludgeons. Mr. Cleveland justifies himself in sending Federal troops to Chicago during the Pullman strike on the basis that there was rioting and lawlessness incident to the strike. I say that there was no rioting or lawlessness until after the Federal soldiers came on the scene. Mr. Cleveland maintains that he had a right to interfere because the United States mails were stopped. It is true enough that the mail trains were not running. But why? Not because mobs were engaged in rioting or strikers were engaged in lawlessness, but because the railroad companies could not get men to handle the trains which carried the mails.

It is only fair to note that Mr. Debs's statement accords more closely with the well-known facts than Mr. Cleveland's does.

Connecticut's Democratic convention has instructed for Judge Parker, but this is of no more importance than the Massachusetts instruction for Olney. The name concealed behind both these sets of instructions is Cleveland's. Parker is practically out of the race. When so warm a journalistic supporter as Wellman, the Washington correspondent, is obliged to concede that Parker "is not as strong as he was three weeks ago," his chances are hopeless. The Judge Parker type of candidate must be nominated unexpectedly as a dark horse or else grow steadily. Otherwise he fails. With such a candidate, fluctuation spells disaster.

The reason given by Mr. Wellman for the dwindling of Judge Parker's Presidential boom is the "weak, rapid and platitudinous platform" upon which the New York convention placed him. That was indeed enough to ruin the chances of any candidate. But

the circumstances showed that the platform was not only platitudinous but that its platitudes were intended to hide Parker's friendly relations with the Wall street brigands. Belmont, Morgan and Woodward would be the ruin of any candidate holding confidential relations with them, no matter what his platform.

Woodward is not as well known as the other two, but he belongs with them. Even the New York World, Cleveland and Parker partisan though it is, turns sick at the naming of Woodward at the head of the Democratic electoral ticket of New York. It says of this James S. Woodward, in its issue of the 4th, that—

Mr. Woodward never uttered one word, in writing or in speech, directly or indirectly involving any political idea. He never was a statesman, a politician, a speaker or a writer. He never was interested in government, national, State or municipal. He has taken no part in reforms or in any public affairs. He is not and cannot be in sincere sympathy with the Democratic platform. He is not opposed to trusts, monopolies or the rule of a plutocracy. On the contrary, the only thing publicly known of him is that he is a sharp money-maker. This is his only business, his entire record. His particular record, by which he is known to the public, is that of a money-maker out of the government. He is identified with the money-making schemes, pools, tricks and syndicates of Wall street. In the Morgan-Belmont syndicate he was a brilliant member. . . . Yet this man, unable to defend by voice or pen a single idea or principle of the Democratic platform, is put forward as the party's foremost candidate, the head of the Presidential ticket, with the necessary consequence that every man in favor of Judge Parker and wishing to vote for him must vote for Woodward.

Doubtless Mr. Woodward was put at the head of the Democratic electoral ticket of New York by the convention which instructed for Judge Parker after making a bunco platform to please him, because birds of a feather naturally flock together.

"All dat some men gits out of an education," said Uncle Eben, "is de ability to talk foolishness grammatically."—Washington Star.