

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

not by any means bring protectionists and free traders together. What separates them is not the principle, but their radically different ways of applying the principle. Free traders contend that the only thing that can be trusted to determine as to any trade whether or not it benefits both parties, is the mutual agreement of the parties themselves. But protectionists go upon the theory that traders cannot be trusted to decide whether their trades are mutually beneficial, and that therefore government must interfere. In a word, protection is paternalistic while free trade is individualistic.

The Pall Mall Gazette has queer notions about economic phenomena. It is quoted as having said, apropos of the recent action of Parliament in the land value taxation bill (vol. vi, p. 793), that all taxation, according to the free trade fiscal theory, falls eventually upon the consumer, and then to have made the following sapient comment:

The consumer of land values is, of course, the tenant.

Tenants will be pleased to know this, for they have been under the impression that it is the landlords who do the consuming of the food, clothing, etc., that go to make up the item of land value in the distribution of products.

Judge Grosscup's efforts to manage some of the most important legislative affairs of the city of Chicago through the Federal courts have encountered a merited rebuke from the Federal Court of Appeals to which an extraordinary decision of his in this matter was carried for review. We had occasion last Summer (vol. vi, p. 242) to criticise Judge Grosscup's apparent policy in connection with the Chicago traction question. At that time we referred to the indications that some of the traction litigation in his court appeared to have been brought there by collusion, nominally to conserve traction property for the benefit of New York

creditors, but really for the purpose of securing the aid of a national court in forcing the city to extend the terms of local traction franchises. Judge Grosscup's action in connection with this subject has certainly been interesting. He has talked more like a traction manager than a judicial conservator of assets; and judicially he has gone to the extent of issuing injunctions forbidding legal proceedings in the State courts in a collateral controversy. It was from this decision that the appeal in question was taken, and we are glad to be able to say that the higher court has not only reversed Judge Grosscup, but in respect to the contention in his behalf that he is endeavoring to make a complete street cars system for Chicago, has administered this rebuke:

Without question the combination of all the railways under one management and control is an imperial scheme, possibly conducive to the public welfare, possibly beneficial to the three companies interested, and possibly lifting the Union Traction out of its insolvent condition; but the property was not taken by the court to carry out grand schemes founded on supposed future benefits. It has the property simply to conserve it in the interests of creditors, caring for it, indeed, with due regard to public interests, because it is impressed with a public service. But a scheme like that proposed should be entered upon and carried out by those interested and whose money is at stake, and should not be imposed upon them unwillingly through the action of the court.

Judge Grosscup announces in a newspaper interview that he will instruct his receivers to appeal. That is doubtless not an improper thing to do. But were he to take the hint of the court above him, no just private interest would suffer and the traction question in Chicago would be greatly simplified.

In saying last week (p. 19) that Frank Stephens and Samuel Milliken were "attendants" at the Emma Goldman meeting which the police of Philadelphia arbitrarily suppressed, we did not mean that they were attendants in the more common sense of serving the meeting in any capacity, but that they were in attendance

with the design of becoming auditors. They were not promoters of the meeting. They were simply private citizens, who, attracted by the advertisements of the meeting, were attempting peaceably to enter the hall. Following is Mr. Milliken's account of the exasperating affair:

Desiring to hear Miss Goldman, we tried to enter the hall, but found policemen barring the way. We did not attempt to force a passage, but courteously inquired for the lieutenant in charge. We were pushed back to the middle of the pavement, where we again made inquiry for the lieutenant. We were then pushed into the street, and upon repeating our inquiry were seized and taken to the police station. We had no connection with the meeting, nor with anarchism, we being single taxers of long standing. The people of Philadelphia have been described as "Corrupt and Contented." If they can calmly stand such outrageous violations of the rights of free speech and peaceable assemblage, their Liberty Bell should be sold for junk.

A complaisant police magistrate imposed \$5 fines upon Stephens, Milliken, and three others similarly related to the affair, and from his decision an appeal has been taken.

Americans who are jealous of the good old American doctrine of free speech and free assembly will be glad to know that this outrage at Philadelphia is not to be passed over in silence. Besides the pending legal proceedings, free speech societies are organizing, and on the 17th a large meeting was held at Odd Fellows' Temple, Philadelphia, to protest against the tyrannical action of the police authorities. This meeting was presided over by George Brown, and the principal speakers were Hugh O. Pentecost and George Gluyas Mercer. Resolutions were adopted which we reproduce:

Whereas, On April 10, 1904, a public meeting was called to listen to an address by Miss Emma Goldman in Odd Fellows' Hall, Philadelphia, her subject being "The Tragedy of Woman's Emancipation;" and, whereas, the police, acting under orders from the Director of Public Safety, forcibly prevented an exercise of the rights of peaceable assemblage and free speech, arresting five men who attempted peaceably to enter the hall. Resolved, That this meeting