

or completely by rebuking the somewhat unparliamentary but honest member who exposed the parliamentary but dishonest one. Oh, that Congress might have in its membership fewer parliamentary Babcocks and more unparliamentary Bakers.

What with his Babcock exposure and his railroad pass exposure, Congressman Baker has become persona non grata to passing members of both parties. So restive are they that they accord him none of the favors of the floor, and none of the rights of a member when they can avoid it, and some of the worst hit are in their manner insulting besides. An instance may be found in the Congressional Record of March 23 at pages 3760, 3762 and 3765. Mr. Baker had secured the floor in committee of the whole as matter of right, upon the familiar evasive motion to "strike out the last word" of a line in the pending bill, and had spoken on the subject of wages for postal employes. The point he had made, and ably made, was that the majority, though lavish in the extreme with public money for privileged corporations, for a big navy, for a large army, for royal decorations at the White House, are extremely economical when it comes to recompensing government employes for hard labor. Instancing the income of rural carriers, which had been shown upon the floor to net only \$300 to \$325 a year, he reminded the majority that this is only half what they have claimed that every man can get in these days of "prosperity." Mr. Baker was forceful, yet entirely parliamentary. But when he asked unanimous consent for an extension of his time for a further five minutes, a courtesy that is almost invariably granted to other members, and was granted to one a few minutes later, the Republican leader objected. And when, to get the time he needed, Baker moved to strike out the two last words of the line in the bill then being considered, he was ruled out of order. Whereupon he

remarked: "It has been done before, Mr. Chairman, and I shall notice the fact in future." The animus of the Republican leader's objection (Overstreet had charge of the pending bill and he objected), is manifest from the report in the Record taken together with Baker's active hostility to the corruptionists. Baker has made himself obnoxious to the friends in Congress of the corrupting railroad interests, because he has made himself dangerous to the corrupt railroads. It is satisfactory, therefore, to see from the Record of the 23d, at page 3774, that he intends to fight these corrupting influences in Congress even if he fights alone. He has taken up the only weapon that is available under such circumstances—his right under the rules to deny to others the courtesies which are thus denied to him.

This policy appears to have been adopted by Mr. Baker in two instances on the 23d. Unanimous consent to consider private bills out of their order was asked and Mr. Baker's objection headed them off. To keep this up will be hard work. Mr. Baker will have to be in his seat every minute of the day from the opening to the close of the session. Otherwise unanimous-consent legislation may slip through. How easily that may happen is evident from the fact that Mr. Baker was recently the only member who voted against an Indian land bill which was so corrupt that the President has given warning that unless it is modified before it comes to him he will veto it.

In an interview a political friend of Mr. Baker's now in Washington makes this explanation of Mr. Baker's position:

It is quite obvious that the leaders have a wholesome dread of Baker and have practically decided to curtail his opportunities to speak. They realize he is without fear, or, rather, that he does not weigh the consequences to himself when he feels impelled to expose official rottenness, and with this the post office department reeks. They make no concealment of their purpose to give strict interpretation to the rules whenever

Baker seeks recognition. He is, however, unruffled and undaunted by the rather summary manner in which his Babcock exposure was expunged from the Record by the majority. He proposes to force a change of attitude on their part so that he may receive such courtesies as are due to a member of Congress; and for this purpose he will, if need be, sit daily in the House from opening prayer to adjournment and seize upon every opportunity to block the wishes of the majority and force a change in their line of campaign. From letters received by him from constituents of Representative Babcock, and also from other letters and newspaper clippings that come to him, it is very evident that Mr. Baker's action in getting the Babcock matter into the Record meets with wide and pronounced approval. If properly utilized by the Democracy next fall the Babcock episode should not only result in the defeat of Mr. Babcock, but add upwards of 100,000 votes to the Democratic party column. As I have said, Baker will be on guard from the convening to the closing of each day's session, and it will be interesting to watch which side first cries "quits."

This is the way in which the Washington staff correspondent of the Brooklyn Eagle, a paper that fought Baker's election because he is a democratic-Democrat, and is far from friendly to him now, sums up Baker's contest with the Republicans for the week ending last Saturday:

Representative Robert Baker, of Brooklyn, is engaged in a warfare with the rest of the House, or, at least, with the 206 members who compose the Republican majority. He has just closed a week of strenuous battle, coming out of the fray somewhat the worse for wear. Here is the list of casualties sustained by him in successive skirmishes with the oppressive majority:

Monday—The House, by a party vote, expunged from the Record a speech inserted by Mr. Baker under leave to print.

Tuesday—Persistent refusal of the chairman to recognize Baker, who is still under displeasure by the majority.

Wednesday—Ditto, in addition to taunts from Sibley and other leaders for his so-called paternalistic bill. [This bill was introduced by Mr. Baker at the request of a constituent, and the fact that he introduced it by request appears upon its face. Mr. Baker is not a paternalist. He is an individualist, believing that that government is best which governs least.—Editor Public.]

Thursday—Double reprimand from the chairman for transgressing the rules of the House.

Friday—The chairman chokes off Baker's anti-Roosevelt amendment to the post office bill, after it is only half read.

Against this array of disasters, Baker places the following achievements to his credit:

A published attack on Chairman Babcock, of the Republican Congressional campaign committee; a speech attacking the extravagance of the administration and its parsimony toward the letter carriers; holding up of half a dozen private bills of Republican leaders; general fear of him on the part of the majority.

At present there is a truce between Baker and the Republicans. He has compelled them to treat him with a little more consideration than was accorded to him earlier in the week. • He can now occasionally get recognition from the chair. If things continue favorable, Baker will let the Republicans pass some of their private bills, but if the policy of suppression is resumed the warfare will be reopened, and there will be no unanimous consent for consideration of pet Republican measures.

Baker believes there is an organized movement on the part of the majority to suppress him. He has been told this by a dozen or more of his Democratic associates who have urged him to assert himself.

The Brooklyn man was particularly incensed over the action of Chairman Boutell in publicly reprimanding him on Thursday for insisting on speaking in the absence of recognition. Baker says the chairman repeatedly ignored his appeals for recognition in the most unfair manner. He believed the rebuke to be unmerited and laid himself out to get revenge. He systematically objected to every request that came up for consideration of Republican bills. He stuck faithfully to this task, even refusing to answer telephone calls for fear of a ruse to get him out of the House. Yesterday morning the Republican leaders came to him with offers of peace. They tried to make him think reprimands and the expunging of speeches are mere trifles in the life of every Representative. Baker was obdurate to all appeals to withdraw his objections, and served warning that until he received better treatment he would make it his business to see that not a single Republican private bill got through. "I can afford to sit here five hours a day for this purpose," he declared. "I haven't a single bill before the House in which I am interested, and am not concerned in any log-rolling scheme. Until I get my rights and privileges the blockade will continue." After this defiance Baker noticed a change in sentiment toward him. Late yesterday [Friday] evening the chairman recognized him to submit an amendment to the Post Office bill. It was a proposition to reimburse the railroads for the expense of the trip taken by the President last year. After

about two lines of the amendment had been read the leaders caught on to its purport, and the reading was instantly stopped, the amendment being declared out of order.

Baker says he is fairly well pleased with the situation to-day. Hostilities will be reopened at the first sign of a renewal of the effort to squelch him.

From the Record of the 26th it would appear that Baker's tactics have won. He is there reported as having made a 15 minutes' speech on the floor, and at its close to have asked unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the Record—that is, for "leave to print." The unanimous consent was given.

If William Allen White's "sermon" on the conviction of Senator Burton fairly indicates the Republican ideals that hold sway in Kansas, Senator Burton's real offense, according to those ideals, is not that he was a corrupt corporation tool, but that he acquired a bad reputation and then allowed himself to get caught red-handed.

Mr. White tells us that Burton has been notorious in Kansas for corruption for 20 years and that his election to the Senate "was due to the influence of railroads" in Kansas politics, "peremptory orders" having come out of Chicago and St. Louis in the campaign which ended with Burton's election demanding that Kansas railroad lawyers "support Burton or lose their places." Mr. White observes incidentally and suggestively that Burton has been of no assistance to the railroads that elected him, "because he could not be trusted with any important work and his connection with even a minor measure subjected it to suspicion." The moral of it all for railroads would seem to be this: When buying a legislator of the party in power, buy one of bad character but good reputation. Mr. Burton made the fatal mistake when he set about building up a bad character to build up a bad reputation also. He was therefore at a disadvantage when caught with incriminating goods in his possession. How he must have yearned at that dread moment to be able to exclaim

defiantly, as do pass-taking Congressmen, judges, etc.: "Who dare accuse me of corruption? The corporation booty has been found upon me, do you say? Granted. But who dare charge a man of my reputation with being corruptly influenced by corporation booty in my possession?"

So much has been said recently by the "remorganizing" newspapers about an alliance between Mr. Bryan and Mr. Hearst for the nomination of the latter, and so many rather well-intentioned but somewhat unsophisticated citizens are fooled by this species of journalistic skulduggery, that it is worth while to state again Mr. Bryan's absolutely defensible position. He has very definitely and frequently drawn the line as to the kind of man who, in his judgment, ought to be available for the Democratic nomination. On one side of this line he has named some names—Cleveland, Hill, Parker. On the ground that these men are not really Democrats but are agents of plutocracy, Mr. Bryan rightly regards them as ineligible. On the other side of the line, he has named many names, absolutely without regard to his personal preferences; and as to these he has consistently and persistently refused to make any choice or indicate any preference. Mr. Hearst's name is one of the many whom Mr. Bryan has placed in that group—it should be plain to anyone that he could not do otherwise,—and that is the sole basis for the assertions that he has an alliance with Mr. Hearst for the latter's nomination.

In a letter of February 29, part of which is now telegraphed from San Francisco, Mr. Bryan distinctly declared his position, evidently in answer to a question. He said:

I have called attention to certain men who are not to be considered because opposed to the party's position. I regard Mr. Hearst as one of the men who are to be considered, and at present he has the largest following of any person mentioned and is the only one who heartily supported the ticket whose