

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-