

dency we are confronted not only with the white peonage case in Alabama, but with several similar cases in Michigan. These have been discovered at Kalamazoo, where the proprietor of a shoe-blackening stand has been detected in buying a Greek boy. It appears that this is only one instance. Boys are said to be picked up every year in Greek cities and sold into slavery in the United States.

By degrees the more intelligent anti-Bryan newspapers are coming to understand Bryan's position on the money question. One of these newly enlightened papers is the Chicago Record-Herald, which, in commenting upon the Democratic platform of Ohio (wherein nothing is said in terms about bimetallism, but "financial monopoly" is opposed) observes:

From this we are to infer that free and unlimited coinage at the prescribed ratio is not an indispensable specific, but merely one method of striking at financial monopoly.

Although this is not exactly as Mr. Bryan would state his position, it goes far to show that at least one hostile paper has come to some sort of an understanding of his insistence that the question of money monopoly is a live question whether the silver question be dead or not. The strange part of the matter is that any American newspaper, with its columns loaded with reports and discussions and conferences and schemes and Congressional bills with reference to the currency, should imagine that the money monopoly question is dead. Whether bimetallism be the remedy for money monopoly or not, and whether it is a dead issue in politics or not, the persistence of money monopoly is nevertheless a present fact too obtrusive to be innocently ignored.

The country has heard, with many expressions of much joy, of the recent conviction at New York of a labor leader of the name of Samuel J. Parks, for extortion. But few have heard that

the prosecuting officers profess to know that Parks was in criminal partnership with a business house of enormous wealth, and that while Parks is sent to prison this house is unmolested. Yet that seems to be the fact. In the course of his cross-examination of Parks on the 20th of August, the assistant district attorney asked a question the object of which the court called upon him to explain. This was his explanation, as reported by the New York papers of the 21st:

I am going to prove that before Sam Parks came to this city he was a maker of strikes in Chicago, and that he was brought here by Sam McConnell, the head of the Fuller Construction Company, for the purpose of calling strikes on all work in which the Fuller company was not engaged.

The court ruled out the question and struck the lawyer's statement from the record. That was proper. But why is Parks the only one of the conspirators to be indicted? If the district attorney knows that the Fuller Construction company conspired with him, why does the Fuller Construction company go scot free? This company is a \$20,000,000 corporation, but that is no reason for ignoring the crimes of its officials, if they have committed any. So far, however, as has yet appeared, there has been no prosecution of the Fuller people.

The special election at Cleveland on the question of establishing a municipal lighting plant (p. 346) did not come off on the 8th. Senator Hanna's attorney general, upon the application of a Cleveland lawyer who belongs politically to Senator Hanna's Democratic contingent, secured a restraining order from some of the Supreme Court judges. The order was obtained without notice to the city, and the hearing was set at a date two weeks after that set for the election. The purpose of this "snap" order is therefore manifest upon the face of the proceedings. It was to prevent an expression of public opinion. A month had elapsed during which such proceedings might

have been instituted and a full hearing had. But the back-door restraining order was granted only a week before the election. The election would not have determined the matter. Even after an affirmative vote of two-thirds of the people, a two-thirds vote of the city council would have been necessary to confirm. Consequently the restraining order might have been granted against the council after the popular election, and thus have saved all property rights. But it was an expression of popular opinion that the combination of corporations and Republican officials wished to prevent. Hence the restraining order at the particular moment at which it was granted.

The straits to which the Cleveland "grafters" are driven by Mayor Johnson is well illustrated by that injunction against a popular election. The law under which the election was to have been held was a Republican act, and the corporation-Republican combine now seek its nullification by Republican judges through a Republican attorney general. In doing so they advertise the very facts about themselves that Johnson lays stress upon in his appeals to the people. Surely Johnson is one of the luckiest of public men in the political enmities he incurs and the assinine maneuvers he frightens his adversaries into making.

They could hardly make any move more foolish than the moves they have already made, which have lost them the county of Cuyahoga and bid fair to lose them the State, unless it might be the one that Senator Hanna's attorney general threatens through the newspapers—the arrest of Johnson for contempt of court in criticising the injunction judges. Johnson's friends over the country might wisely pray for something of that kind. It would advertise the iniquity of the plutocratic programme in Ohio as nothing else could. Johnson has in fact not criticised the judges, un-

less the following extract from his Cleveland speeches in support of the public ownership plan, may be so construed:

To-night I shall, as I believe I always have, speak with the utmost deference of the Supreme Court. We ought to respect the court, for the court is the representative of the law of the land, and I in common with other people, respect our laws. Without such respect we should have anarchy. If we think the court has made a mistake the remedy is in our own hands. We have the remedy of the ballot, and by this remedy we can depose judges who, we believe, have erred. But while they remain judges it is our duty to honor and respect them. In this case, as often before, I think the judges have made an error. It is the privilege of every citizen to criticize a court, so long as his criticism is respectful.

I believe that there is no court high or low that should hear one side of a case and then pass judgment without allowing the other side a chance to state its case. In this case, so the newspapers say, the court, or a part of it, sitting behind closed doors, has granted an injunction to prevent this election, and has set the hearing at a date two weeks later than that fixed for the special election. So we are left helpless. We are not allowed to state our case before judgment was passed, and now we are prevented from even making our arguments until two weeks after it could have been of avail. My friends, I believe this custom is wrong.

The election was to have been merely an expression of the opinion of the people. It could not authorize the bonds. After the special election the council, by a two-thirds vote, had still to authorize the bond issue. The mayor, the auditor, the clerk of the sinking fund commission, all had to certify to the ordinance before it could become effective. That would have been the time to bring the suit and to raise whatever objections there might have been to the selling of the bonds.

I believe that the Supreme Court has been imposed upon. I believe that the court has been imposed upon by persons interested in defeating the municipal lighting plan, when they refused to allow to the people merely an expression of opinion. They might have had some excuse if the election were really to authorize the bonds. But they know that the election could have done no such thing; that it was merely an expression of the people's wishes, and knowing this they went down to Columbus and secured that injunction.

But the literature which we have prepared is going to be circulated just the same. We are going to go on with our meetings and our discussions just

as if there had been no injunction. We ought to consider this question in the light of the corrupt and unholy alliance which has been consummated between the owners of special privileges in this State and the leaders of the Republican party. This injunction suit could not have been brought if it had not had the sanction of Attorney General Sheets, a man thoroughly dominated by our United States Senator Hanna, a man who has proved his devotion in the past to Mr. Hanna and Mr. Hanna's interests and those of Mr. Hanna's friends. It was Mr. Sheets who brought the injunction suits to block three-cent fare in Cleveland; it was Mr. Sheets who instituted the ouster which threw down our city government, that Mr. Hanna's street railroad interests might not suffer. Mr. Sheets has always been on that side, working might and main. For years these Republican leaders have been using their party to help out their business interests, so-called, which means their special privileges. We have had proof after proof, and this last injunction is but one more.

If Mr. Hanna's attorney general regards such utterances as contempt of court, he could probably do Mayor Johnson no greater favor than by inducing the judges to arrest him for contempt. That would make an artistic climax which would probably produce startling effects.

Grover Cleveland has been nominated as the Democratic candidate for the presidency by a Western paper, the Chicago Chronicle. Originally this paper called itself Democratic, and it did scatter a good deal of democracy through its columns, for its editors were democrats. But it had a publisher—John R. Walsh by name,—also a Democrat, but only by name. He is a banker who, like all the more successful men of his vocation couldn't recognize a political principle if he saw it coming up the street, unless it were coming to his own bank for deposit or discount or as collateral. Owing to the influence of Mr. Walsh, the Chronicle turned in to help Hanna beat Bryan in 1896. In 1900 Hanna didn't need the Chronicle, and it skipped from one side of the political fence to the other, after posting the city with handbills protesting its loyalty to the Dem-

ocratic party—protesting altogether too much. Since then it has proclaimed its independence of party. But meanwhile Mr. Walsh has become editor as well as publisher, and the policy of the paper is dictated by him from the back office of his bank. The nomination of Cleveland by the Chronicle is therefore nothing but a nomination by Mr. Walsh, made for business reasons and not from political or journalistic motives. When it is known that Mr. Walsh, besides being a banker, is one of the greatest monopolists of Chicago, and that he cherishes his monopolies as old-time misers cherished their potted gold, his nomination of Cleveland, in his capacity as directing and supervising editor of the Chicago Chronicle, will probably not serve the cause of the Great Uncommoner to the full extent that was intended.

One of the difficulties of editing a "Democratic" paper from the back office of a plutocratic bank, was illustrated in the issue of the Chicago Chronicle of September 2. The editorial columns of that issue displayed the following bit of "Democratic" opinion:

People who have maintained that Colonel Bryan will not bolt next year will do well to note what has happened in Ohio. Despite his friendship for Tom Johnson the colonel deftly sidesteps that gentleman's invitation to orate from the same platform with the "goldbug" Clarke.

But in another column of the same paper in the same issue was the following item of news relating to the same subject:

Versailles, O., Sept. 1. — The Ohio Democratic State campaign was formally opened here to-night, with a large meeting. Excursion trains were run from the surrounding country and brought thousands to the meeting. The chief speakers were: W. J. Bryan, Tom L. Johnson, Democratic candidate for governor, and John H. Clarke, candidate for United States senator to succeed Senator Hanna. Bryan in his speech spoke enthusiastically of the ticket nominated by the Democratic State convention, and predicted victory for the ticket. He also indorsed Clarke for United States senator.

The banker-editor of the Chronicle ought to edit its news as well