

cially worthy of note. We quote from the Record-Herald's report:

"We had an administration nominally Democratic, but really a J. P. Morgan administration," Mr. Bryan exclaimed, "and God forbid that we should have another that would be an August Belmont administration." After finishing his prepared speech, Mr. Bryan raised his voice above the thunder then bellowing overhead to give a parting shot to the Eastern reorganizers. "I have said I was anxious for success," he said. "Let me outline a plan. Let me show how the Democratic ticket may be made invincible. The trouble is the people doubt that the Democrats would do any better than the Republicans if placed in power. Why? Because of such a platform as that adopted in New York. Because such men as David B. Hill, August Belmont and Grover Cleveland are believed to be behind the Democratic candidate. Why do they doubt our party? Because when there is an investigating committee in city or State or nation it catches Democrats as well as Republicans. Let the party rise up and whip out those not true to the interests of the public. Let us drive them into the Republican party. Let's have a platform that is honest and a ticket that is in conformity with that platform."

Some effort was made at the Bryan meeting to give an appearance of its being a Hearst meeting. But this resulted in utter failure. A few cheers for Hearst two or three times were so feeble as to dispirit the Hearst clique that started them. Those were enough, however, to afford excuse for an elaborately false description of the meeting in the Hearst papers as a Hearst meeting, and to account for a page headline in Hearst's Examiner, which was insulting to Bryan as well as misrepresentative of the audience: "Bryan's gathering causes ovation for Hearst; listens to Ex—but cheers next candidate." It is a pity that Hearst's papers cannot get far enough away from the proprietor's personality to make their news reports veracious and to elevate their political policy to the level of political principle. All the cheering at Bryan's meeting, and there was much of it and very enthusiastic, was for Bryan's declarations of principle. It was no man's meeting; but it was a democratic meeting. And the speech throughout was for no man, but was a straightforward appeal to conscience.

We predict with confidence that

this speech marks the beginning of a new and more progressive campaign in the irrepressible conflict between equality and privilege, liberty and power, right and wrong. For the Democratic party to win in the sense of getting at the offices concerns no one but office seekers; for it to win in the sense of advancing the march of democracy, whether in office or out of office, concerns us all. That was the spirit of Mr. Bryan's speech, and that is the spirit which the St. Louis convention will find itself forced to take most seriously into account. The convention may defy that spirit with both platform and candidate, but if it does it will thereby write the epitaph of its party. Like the "doughfaces" of our politics of half a century ago, the "doughfaces" of this generation are also coming to judgment.

#### EDITORIAL CORRESPONDENCE.

##### WASHINGTON.

Washington, D. C., April 23.—How completely Congress is governed and run by a few men was again plainly shown this week when they passed a Chinese exclusion act as a rider to an appropriation bill. It is doubtful whether Republicans had any idea that the leaders proposed to touch the question at this session. It was sprung upon the House without any notice, and the House kept in session for three hours beyond the usual hour of adjournment, so as to force it through that evening. Having received no intimation that the matter was even being considered, nearly half of the entire membership knew nothing of it until they read of its passage in the Washington papers the next morning.

The closing days of this Congress, as of all others, witness many attempts to rush through without notice, without warning, and without consideration, innumerable "log rolling" schemes. One would need to be argus-eyed, to be as sharp as a score of Philadelphia lawyers, and to be a regular magazine of information on multifarious subjects to be able to do one's duty under such circumstances. Under the rules any member who can obtain the previous consent of the Speaker can call up his particular pet project, asking unanimous consent for its immediate consideration. These bills are picked from a calendar containing several hundred projects, and they embrace every conceivable subject, running from a bill of ten lines to one of ten or more pages, as widely different as the construction of a bridge over

some unheard of stream to the building of a courthouse in some obscure town, or the granting of some special rights of entry on some public land, Indian or otherwise; or they may relate to a subject of such international importance as a government, or lack of it, for the new Panama canal zone. Probably the worst feature and the greatest danger to good government in this connection is the fact that so many members have one or more bills either already upon the calendar or which they are desirous of having considered at a later date, and fearing objection may be made to unanimous consent to consider these projects—no matter how innocent or meritorious—they sit by and offer no opposition to legislation which they know or believe to cover a steal or a raid upon the public treasury, fearing that their opposition to evil legislation may result in their failing to obtain unanimous consent for their meritorious measures. They are thus made assenting parties to vicious legislation. I admit that it is not an easy matter under present conditions and with the economic policies now obtaining to lay down a rule governing such a projected legislation which may not frequently work great hardship. But it would seem that it is not too much to require that the local authorities, preferably even the local community, must express an affirmative desire for local legislation before it can even be considered by the House. This would unquestionably cut off many log-rolling schemes which now are rushed through, not only because of the reasons just stated, but because of the total ignorance of their merits by practically the entire membership of the House. If such a rule were adopted, communities could compel railroad companies to pay for the privilege of bridging navigable streams, while bills to secure possession, without pay, of valuable water falls and large tracts of land would fail of passage unless they contained provisions protecting the public interests.

The attempt of the chairman and other Republican members of the House judiciary committee to make an exhibition of Mr. Hearst signally failed. Weeks ago Mr. Hearst introduced a resolution directing the attorney general to report what steps, if any, he had taken in the action he (Hearst) had instituted against the anthracite coal trust. This resolution has slumbered in the judiciary committee and probably never would have been discussed at all but for the belief privately expressed by some of the leading members of that committee that they could "make a monkey" of Hearst by inviting him to explain the purpose of the resolution. For nearly an hour he was subjected to a rapid cross-fire of questions, some of the most tantalizing nature, and all evidently designed for the purpose of embarrassing him to the fullest extent.

Every impartial observer must agree that Mr. Hearst acquitted himself admirably. Never attempting flights of oratory, he was most composed, had himself thoroughly in hand and showed an entire familiarity with the subject he was discussing. He gave what should have been conclusive reasons why the resolution ought to be adopted. But conforming to the almost uniform rule which the Republican party in this Congress has followed all through the session, of suppressing every investigation, shunting every disagreeable subject, the committee merely referred the matter to a sub-committee of three, who, of course, will do nothing—probably will not even report, as Congress is expected to adjourn on April 28.

In the guise of a "commission" bill the ship subsidy hunters made considerable progress to-day towards the United States treasury. It is true the bill merely provides for a commission to investigate the merchant marine, but that is but one of the steps necessary in the opinion of Republican leaders before the treasury can be reached. It is not merely an indirect method of attack, but it possesses, from the standpoint of the holders of the Republican campaign collection basket, the great advantage of putting a Presidential election in between the treasury and the final realization of the ship subsidy beggars' goal. The proposition that now confronts these patriotic gentlemen is: "Are you willing to put up a little 'insurance,' or will you run the risk of losing all the money already invested?" For this to be appreciated by the uninitiated it is necessary to say that it was generally understood by those believed to be well informed that in the Congressional campaign of 1898 the Republicans found themselves "shy" on campaign contributions. At one stage of the campaign the managers seriously believed that the Democrats would carry the Fifty-sixth Congress. Facing the possibility of such a dire calamity, the great corrupter of national politics was appealed to. As the "business" interests had been touched quite heavily two years before, they did not quickly nor generously respond. Recourse was then had to certain big shipping interests, who had already received considerable largesse, but who hungered for more. As the story goes, these gentlemen came down to the tune of \$400,000, in return for which they were assured of a ship subsidy bill, were even told that they might write their own bill. Although Hanna made strenuous efforts to carry out the contract, some stupid Republicans, unmindful of the "honor" of the party, refused to be cajoled or bullied into voting for the Hanna-Payne subsidy bill. The proposition therefore now before the contributors to the 1898 corruption fund is: "Shall we put up a little more now and help the Republicans to carry the presidential election, or shall we con-

sider the \$400,000 as a dead loss?" There is no doubt of what their answer will be. Being very largely the same men who have been the beneficiaries of other "protection" legislation, they will come to time, and, if their money can save it, the "honor" of the country will again be saved and the raid upon the treasury to the tune of some \$9,000,000 a year will surely follow. For even should the Republicans lose both the Presidency and the House of Representatives, there will be, under our foolish system of government, a short session of Congress within which to enact a ship subsidy steal.

The use that is made on occasion of the name of reputable organizations when special interests so require, is shown in the telegram sent to the New York delegation in Congress yesterday immediately preceding the vote on the ship subsidy bill. The telegram, which was in duplicate, was as follows:

New York, April 23, 1904.—Trust you will support Gardner commission bill investigate merchant marine.—New York Board of Trade and Transportation.

In order that they might not be in doubt as to the reasons which controlled at least one member, I at once sent this reply:

I shall oppose ship subsidy bill as I shall oppose all special privilege legislation.  
ROBERT BAKER.

## NEWS

Week ending Thursday, April 28.

What appears to be regarded by the press of the country generally (judging by their comments and extended reports) as the most important political event of the week, was Wm. J. Bryan's speech of the 23d at Chicago, on "The New York Platform." This estimate is doubtless correct, for it is well-nigh impossible to regard that event as anything less important than the opening battle of the contest within the Democratic party which will probably be fought out to the death in the convention at St. Louis. Mr. Bryan's audience filled a large auditorium. Another crowd as large as the audience clamored for admission, but were excluded by the police under the safety ordinances of the city. The authorized abstract of the speech Mr. Bryan delivered on this occasion is printed in full on another page of this issue.

The Democrats have met in State convention since our last report (p. 39) in only two States,

Massachusetts and New Hampshire. The Massachusetts convention assembled on the 21st. George Fred Williams contested for an endorsement of William R. Hearst, but was defeated by P. A. Collins, who leads a delegation instructed for Richard F. Olney, of Massachusetts. The instructions assume to control the district delegates as well as those at large; but the Hearst leaders denied the authority of the State conventions to do this and appealed to the district conventions. These met on the 26th, and 22 of the 28 delegates then elected are claimed for Olney. Mr. Williams was himself defeated in the 12th district. Charges of corruption are made by the Hearst followers and Mr. Williams announces that the fight has just begun. The New Hampshire convention met on the 27th. It adopted no instructions, but left the question of candidate to "the wisdom of the delegates."

Republican conventions were held for Rhode Island and Indiana on the 26th. The Rhode Island convention instructed for Roosevelt on the 26th, as did the Indiana convention at an adjourned session on the 27th. The Louisiana convention met on the 27th and endorsed Roosevelt.

A sensation has been created in Congress by attacks upon Congressman Cockran, New York Democrat, by Congressman Dalzell, Pennsylvania Republican, and Mr. Cockran's replies. Dalzell charged Cockran on the 23d with having been influenced with money to make speeches in 1896, and Cockran retorted that he had for twenty years been a contributor to and not a recipient of campaign funds, and that he had not only received no pay for speaking for McKinley in 1896, but had paid his own expenses. This contradiction was explained by Walter Wellman in his Record-Herald [Chicago Republican paper] letter from Washington of the 24th, in which he writes:

Bourke Cockran's indignant denial that he was paid for the speeches which he made against free silver in 1896 is understood to refer to any payment alleged to have been made by the Republican national committee. Mr. Cockran is wholly in the right. The Republican national committee did not