

dodger," and talked the platform full of holes, and the political weather looks a little gusty. About a thousand of us couldn't get in to hear Bryan's speech, and stood out in the rain and wanted to know a few things—why Bryan didn't hire a big hall, and why he didn't come outside where the fun was, etc. One shover at the door was mad clear through. "Why," he says, "I'm a Texas man, and I can't get in! Let me get near enough to the door to hear what they are yellin' about inside! You won't, hey? Well, I was up to Lafayette, Ind., on a little business, and I says to myself: 'I'll just run up on the cars and hear Billy Bryan.' I could have been here six hours ahead, but they told me that Bryan, up here, was a back number. Read it comin' up. The paper said there'd be plenty of seats. Listen to 'em yell! That's what a man gets for believin' the newspapers. Oh, yes, he's a back number; but I've come all the way up from Lafayette, Ind., and I can't get a good sight of the door!"

U. S.

WHAT THOMAS JEFFERSON STOOD FOR.

Letter of Hon. John Sharp Williams, Congressman from Mississippi, to the Iroquois Club of Chicago, read at the Club's banquet in commemoration of the birthday of Thomas Jefferson, at the Auditorium, Apr. 13, 1904.

To the Iroquois Club,
Chicago, Ill.

Gentlemen:—I regret very much not to be able to be with you on the occasion of the celebration of Mr. Jefferson's birthday. I am in spirit and politically with you, notwithstanding my bodily absence. There is in the history of all the world no birthday, except one, so well worth being celebrated by the masses of mankind. Mr. Jefferson was very nearly the only man of equal or of approximate celebrity in his time who sincerely believed in the capacity of the people for self-government. It is to him more than to any other man that we owe the first ten amendments to the Federal Constitution. Without them there would have been no fundamental guarantees of freedom of speech, freedom of assemblage, freedom of religion, freedom from unreasonable search, in short, no Bill of Rights for the American people. Moreover, there would have been no distinct declaration of the great Democratic principle that the powers not delegated to the Federal Government are reserved to the States, or the people therein.

In this day it is especially well to

remember what Mr. Jefferson stood for. I would suggest that you have some one read to the Iroquois Club Mr. Jefferson's first inaugural address. It is the political "Sermon on the Mount" of all Democrats, and would not make a bad platform for the Democrats, even in this year of our Lord's grace, 1904. Are Democrats anti-consolidationists? Mr. Jefferson taught them the doctrine. Do Democrats believe that a national debt is not a national blessing, but a national curse? Mr. Jefferson taught them that. Do Democrats believe that there should be left to the individual every liberty possible, consistent with the welfare of other individuals, that there should be left to the town or the county the largest possible measure of home-rule, that there should be lodged in the State, every judicial and legislative power that is not strictly national and necessary to the public defense and to national independence? They got that lesson from Mr. Jefferson. Mr. Jefferson taught and taught wisely, that, as a rule, "the people least governed are best governed" and that the less Federal interference with local self-government in the family, in the town, in the county and in the State the better for all concerned.

Do Democrats believe that, within the scope of the exercise of Federal power, there should be, as nearly as possible, equal opportunities and equal burdens? Mr. Jefferson taught them that. Do Democrats believe that the taxing power ought to be used for the purpose of raising a revenue to carry on a government constitutionally, economically and effectively administered? That was one of Mr. Jefferson's lessons, too. Do Democrats believe that, "the object of all government is the happiness and prosperity" of the masses, "the greatest good of the greatest number"? He is the author of the phrase.

Do they believe that our foreign policy ought to be based upon the idea of friendship for all and entangling alliances with none? He was the Secretary of State under whose guidance Washington practiced the policy. Do Democrats believe in a proper and right expansion over unpeopled areas, or homogeneous and assimilable people—an expansion carrying with it equal laws and our common constitutional guarantees? Mr. Jefferson set the example and blazed the way. Are Democrats anti-colonialists? Stronger denunciations of colonialism and of the arbitrary, unlimited government lodged within the discretion of the governors, that necessarily goes with it—

were never penned than the utterances of Mr. Jefferson upon that subject. Do Democrats believe that no community has the right to govern another community across the seas, in accordance with the uninformed dictates of its own sweet will? Mr. Jefferson was the pen of the Revolution who wrote that doctrine large. Do Democrats believe in amicable and reciprocal trade relations with the other nations of the world? Mr. Jefferson negotiated the first reciprocity treaties. Do Democrats believe in the Monroe Doctrine, its proper assertion and its proper limitations? Mr. Jefferson expressed the idea before Monroe, after a consultation with him, had included it in a state paper. Do Democrats believe militarism to be a curse, and that the farmer or mechanic ought not to be compelled to bear upon his stooped shoulders a helmeted soldier; that the military power ought always to be subordinate, not in words nor in law alone, but in spirit as well, to the civil authority? Mr. Jefferson was their forerunner there, too. Do Democrats think that, in our relations with foreign countries, we ought to be a true world power by setting a glorious example of liberty, home development, industry, prosperity and sweet-winged peace? It was Mr. Jefferson who said: "I frankly admit that my passion is peace." Do Democrats believe, however, in proper resentment of international wrong and in brave confrontation of positions of peril? It was Mr. Jefferson who put down the Algerine pirates when England, "the mistress of the sea," was paying them a tribute. It was Mr. Jefferson who gave notice to the great Corsican himself, when the world was trembling at his nod, that "the one power in all the world which could not be our friend and necessarily must be an enemy" was a strong European government in control of the Mississippi Valley and its outlets!

There were no trusts in Mr. Jefferson's day, but we may well understand what his doctrine would have been concerning them if we will but re-read what he said about the menace to the people's liberties and happiness which the undue amassment of great wealth in the hands of a few people would occasion. He not only foresaw it, but did what he could to prevent it, giving up his place in the Continental Congress in order to go home to Virginia and pull up, by the roots, primogeniture and entail—the two sources whence the evil seemed chiefly to grow in his day. He went further—and further than we are prepared to go, even now, at this day—when he said, that

the time would come when the "statutory privilege of bequest and devise" would have to be limited in the interest of the well-being of society "in whose interest" it had been granted, and that the amount which could be left by bequest or devise to any one person or for any one purpose should be demarked.

Intelligence, subtle and far-seeing; character broad and all loving; a moral courage superb; consideration for the foibles and prejudices of others; exquisite courtesies; indifference to personal enrichment; all these marked him a gentleman, and, as such, an embodiment of the highest ideals of the English-speaking race.

I am, with every expression of regard,
Very truly yours,
(Signed) JOHN SHARP WILLIAMS.
Mar. 4, 1904.

FASHIONABLE ANARCHY.

Some ten days hence
all the assessors
in eighty-three counties
assembling by counties
will agree among themselves
to nullify the law,
to repudiate their oaths,
to ignore the constitution—
all the people consenting.

According to their custom
they will adopt their own standards,
one class of property 50 per cent,
another 25 per cent,
another 20 per cent,
another 60 per cent,
another 80 per cent,
another full 100—
all in despite of the law.

Other classes they will rate
at \$40 apiece,
others at \$1.50 a hundred,
others at \$5 apiece,
others at \$5 to \$75,
without regard to value,
others they leave entirely
to the whim of the assessor.

Then they'll go home
and ignore their agreements
even as the agreements
set aside the law,
all the people consenting.

Here is a shame
and a veritable scandal,
the most fundamental
law of our government
swept into the dust bin
by the very officers
sworn to enforce it—
all the people consenting.

It strikes at the bottom
foundations of the government,
it saps and enfeebles
the bulwarks of state,
it undermines decent
respect for the law,
it is virtual anarchy
with its red shirt concealed
by a mild gray disguise.

It is the same brand of disorder
that is seen in our great cities

where it spreads into corruption,
into purchase of special favors
by otherwise honest citizens,
where politics is tainted
by upright business interests,
where the civic life is rotten
and honeycombed with grafts
because law is despised.

This disregard of law
is the republic's only peril.
There is one place to cure it
which is right here at home.
Goodhue Co. (Minn.) News of Apr. 16.

MR. BRYAN ON THE NEW YORK PLATFORM.

Abstract of the speech delivered by William J. Bryan at the Second Regiment armory in Chicago, Saturday evening, April 23, 1904.

As it is somewhat unusual for a political speech to be made as this one is to-night, let me preface my remarks with an explanation. I have hired this hall, and I introduce myself, because I do not care to speak under the auspices of any club or organization which is committed to any particular aspirant for office. My concern is not about the name or the personality of the nominee, but about the principles for which the Democratic party is to stand. While many of the papers seem to assume that the contest for the Democratic nomination is necessarily between Judge Parker and Mr. Hearst, and that every Democrat must either be for one or the other, such a position is illogical and without foundation. Those who are classed as reorganizers—and by that I mean those who would carry the party back to the position that it occupied under Mr. Cleveland's administration—are not entirely agreed among themselves as to the proper candidate upon whom to concentrate their votes, and so those who are in sympathy with the spirit of our recent platforms may differ as to the relative availability of those who represent the progressive element of the party. My own position is one of neutrality. I regard as available all candidates who are in favor of making the Democratic party an honest, earnest and courageous exponent of the rights and interests of the masses; and I regard as unavailable all who are in sympathy with, or obligated to, the great corporations that to-day dominate the policy of the Republican party, and seek, through the reorganizers, to dominate the policy of the Democratic party. I have no favorites among those on our side, and no special antagonism to those who represent the reorganizers. I believe that the line should be drawn between principles, not between men;

and that men should only be considered as they may be able to advance or retard the progress of Democracy.

I have come to Chicago because from this point I can reach a large number of voters in the Mississippi valley; and I have expressed a desire to have the ministers attend, because they can and should exert an influence in behalf of honesty and fairness in politics. When some two years ago I became satisfied that ex-Senator David B. Hill was planning to be a candidate, I pointed out the objections to his candidacy. When the Cleveland boom was launched, I pointed out the objections to his candidacy; and now that Mr. Parker seems to be the leading candidate (though not the only candidate) among the reorganizers, I desire to present some reasons why he cannot be considered as an available candidate for a Democratic nomination; and I find these reasons not in his personality, but in his position upon public questions. For a year he has been urged to speak out and declare himself upon the important issues of the coming campaign, but he has remained silent. If this silence meant that nobody knew his views, those who have been loyal to the party in recent years would stand upon an equal footing with those who deserted; but it is evident now that while to the public generally his views are unknown, they are well known to those who are urging his nomination. Whatever doubt may have existed on this subject heretofore, has been dispelled by the platform adopted by the New York State convention; and, taking this platform as a text, I am sanguine enough to believe that I can prove to every unbiased mind that Judge Parker is not a fit man to be nominated, either by the Democratic party, or by any other party that stands for honesty or fair dealing in politics. I cannot hope to convince those who favor deception and fraud in politics, but I am satisfied that we now have evidence sufficient to convict Judge Parker of absolute unfitness for the nomination. If he did not know of the platform in advance, if he did not himself dictate it, or agree to it, he has allowed it to go out as his utterance, for the convention was dominated by his friends, and adopted a resolution presenting him as the candidate of the party of the State. This platform, then, can fairly be regarded as his declaration upon public questions, and what does the platform say? The first plank reads:

This is a government of laws, not of men; one law for presidents, cabinets and people; no usurpation; no executive en-