

The Public

Seventh Year.

CHICAGO, SATURDAY, APRIL 23, 1904.

Number 316.

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 page.

Whether were it best to have a candidate like Parker, getting his campaign fund through August Belmont from financiers who never give something for nothing; or one like Hearst, who furnishes his own campaign fund; or again to take chances of success with one who goes to the people without a campaign fund?

If Judge Parker ever had the least chance of being nominated by the Democrats for President, his chance has been frittered away; and a definite movement for the nomination of Miles, Garvin, Shepard, Folk or John Sharp Williams would almost certainly meet with instant success.

Williams would probably be most available, because the supposed weakness of his being a Southerner would really augment his strength. His name would doubtless concentrate the support of both the Parker and the Hearst following in the South. Neither of these men is popular enough in that section to hold their own against a movement for the distinguished Mississippian; and as to the objection that Williams comes from a State that rebelled against the general government before he was born, that is mere pandering to a Northern prejudice which no longer exists. The Civil War ended nearly forty years ago, and the "bloody shirt" was buried in the '70's by President Hayes.

In saying that Judge Parker has now lost every chance he might possibly have had, we allude to the movement in his behalf

which has culminated in his forced endorsement by one faction of the New York convention. A situation has been thus produced which makes his election impossible; and a candidate who cannot be elected is not the candidate that politicians who merely want to "get in" will be in any hurry to nominate.

Judge Parker has never had anything to recommend his nomination except the concealment of his political principles, if he has any, and the fact that in 1897 he carried the State of New York for chief justice of the court of appeals by 61,000 plurality after Bryan had lost it for President in 1896 by an adverse plurality of 286,000. From this showing it has been hastily assumed that Judge Parker is so tremendously popular that he could carry his State for President at the coming election. Such figures appeal with great force to hungry politicians who have long been "out" and are insanely eager to "get in." But in fact, Parker's popular vote in New York in 1897 rose only 3,500 above Bryan's in 1896, notwithstanding the enormous disparity in pluralities. It fell 123,000 below Bryan's vote in 1900. And this in spite of the fact that Parker's vote was abnormal. It is fully accounted for, with thousands of votes to spare, by the peculiar local conditions in 1897 in the politics of the city of Greater New York. Mr. Low was running that year for mayor of Greater New York on a bi-partisan ticket, the sponsors for which flattered his Democratic support by endorsing the Democratic candidate for chief justice of the State, who happened to be Parker. Consequently a large proportion of the Republicans who supported Low for mayor voted with their Democratic associates, and with Tammany hall, for Parker for

chief justice. This peculiar as well as local and temporary condition gave Parker the phenomenal vote in Greater New York of 278,031—a plurality in that city of 65 per cent. of the total vote there. To that result in New York city, and to that alone, Parker owed his State plurality. Outside of New York city he polled 276,649—an adverse plurality of 77,000, and only 42 per cent., of the total in that part of the State. To the hungry politician there is nothing especially inviting about vote-getting ability of that accidental sort, and as the facts get out Parker's availability wanes among them.

But that alone is not what has absolutely killed Parker off as a candidate. David B. Hill, August Belmont and Grover Cleveland have produced that result between them. When Cleveland endorsed Parker, he shocked every voter who distrusts Cleveland as a tool of the Wall street conspirators. When August Belmont came upon the scene the fears Cleveland had awakened that another Wall street tool had been found as a substitute for Cleveland were confirmed. Finally, when Hill "jammed" through one of his "snap" endorsements, riding rough-shod over a large minority of delegates to do it, he not only completed the confirmation but he also threw a wet blanket upon the enthusiasm of honest but misguided Cleveland men, who, while they trust Cleveland, distrust and despise Hill. John McCutcheon fairly describes the present situation when he pictures Parker with one hand in Cleveland's, the other in Hill's and all three dancing, and describes the cartoon as "the latest razzle-dazzle trio in the Democratic party." The rank and file of the Democratic party want no more Wall street "razzle-dazzles."

Some good Democratic speeches were made at the Jefferson banquet of the Iroquois Club in Chicago on the 13th, but the affair itself seems to have been a pretty thorough-going Cleveland demonstration. This is not remarkable, considering the personnel of the wealthier members of the club and the fact that the banquet was of the expensive order. Gen. Miles, however, was recognized with as much enthusiasm as the mention of Cleveland's name invoked; but the little boom attempted for Judge Parker had a comparatively frosty welcome. A mention of Bryan's name was received in dead silence. Bryan had been invited to attend and had written a letter which the managers refused to have read at the banquet, although they had given copies to the press and did have the following letter from Mr. Cleveland read to the company:

I very much regret the necessity which compels me to decline your courteous invitation to attend the celebration of Jefferson's birthday under the auspices of the Iroquois club. It is especially fitting at this time of confusion in political ideas and misapprehension as to the meaning of true Democracy that the character of the great exemplar of Democracy should be fully appreciated and that his political opinions should be better interpreted and understood. His devotion to the interests of the people, his wise conservatism and his constant adherence to the public good, always the guiding star of his career, commend his acts and his beliefs to the careful study of those who in these days patriotically seek the welfare of our country through the ascendancy of safe and sane Democracy. Trusting that the celebration of the birthday of this great leader will prove to be both a source of pleasure and profit to those who participate, I am very truly yours.

We append Mr. Bryan's letter, which was suppressed:

I am just in receipt of your invitation to attend the twenty-third annual banquet of the Iroquois club, to be held on the 13th inst. I thank you for the invitation, and regret to say that I shall not be able to attend. I trust, however, that those present will take advantage of the occasion to present to the country the importance of maintaining democratic principles as they were set forth in the platforms of 1896 and 1900. The merger decision shows how closely the Supreme Court is divided and how easy it is for those who sympathize with cor-

porate wealth to find plausible reasons for staying the hand of the law when it attempts to rebuke those who exploit the people. Under our Constitution the President appoints judges, and those who have watched the decisions in the Hayes-Tilden contest, in the income tax case, in the trust case, and in the cases involving the policy of the government in the Philippines cannot doubt that it is as important to have judges who sympathize with the people as to have judges learned in the law. In the present struggle between plutocracy and democracy the corporations are seeking to control the Supreme Court, and if they can do that the House of Representatives, the Senate and the President will be powerless to protect the public. I trust that those who are honored with an invitation to speak at your banquet will raise a note of warning against the attempt now being made by the money magnates to control the Democratic convention and to secure the nomination of a Democratic candidate who will be obligated in advance to betray the hopes of the democratic masses.

It is not easy to understand why such a letter should have been suppressed at any gathering professing democracy. Those who see it in print, however, will have no difficulty in discerning its superiority to Mr. Cleveland's as the deliverance of a democratic statesman with something vital to say and the candor to say it in unmistakable terms.

The Hill-Cleveland-Parker organ, the Brooklyn Eagle, boasts that the supporters of Parker in the Democratic party are of the better element, while those who oppose him are of the lower classes. But if it is with the "better elements" the Eagle wishes to associate politically, why be satisfied with the Democratic grade. At the best that is only fair to middling. The Republican party is par excellence the party of the "better elements." It is composed pretty much altogether of "better elements;" and the really and truly "better element" go into it as a haven of refuge from vulgarity. No Democrat can be a first rate "better element" where Republicans abound. Even the best Democrat can no more be a "better element" in comparison with a Republican than an industrious and honest day laborer can be respectable

in comparison with an undetected confidence operator.

Congressman Baker has several times succeeded in getting before Congress and into the Congressional Record a provision for securing the President from the indignity of being "deadheaded" by railroad corporations; but he has not yet been able to get the provision enacted. His Republican colleagues, with their pockets lined with railroad passes, are not disposed to pay Mr. Roosevelt's traveling expenses out of the public purse. They prefer to let him suffer as a "deadhead" the same as they do themselves. We quote the clause Mr. Baker has unsuccessfully tried to include in appropriation bills:

To reimburse the great railroads for the cost of supplying the President of the United States with special trains, food, cigars, wines, liquor, etc., during his trip about the country last year, \$50,000, provided no railroad shall share in the appropriation unless it shall, within ninety days, furnish an itemized list of what was supplied the President of the United States; and, provided further that the President shall not contract any further expense similar to this without the express consent of Congress.

A remarkable instance of abuse of a sound principle appears in the final sentence of the following resolution adopted by the Republican convention of Massachusetts last week to head off a growing free trade sentiment in that State which is manifested in demands for reciprocity with Canada:

Reciprocity with Canada is a mere phrase until the concessions offered on one side and demanded on the other are stated in detail. No administration and no party can legislate or negotiate a mere catch word into substance. Those who demand reciprocity with Canada should furnish details if they desire action, always remembering that no trade can be a good trade unless both parties are benefited thereby.

"Always remembering that no trade can be a good trade unless both parties are benefited thereby." No principle could be sounder than that, and it is gratifying to find a protection convention endorsing it. But their common acceptance of that principle does