

other man or body or generation of men. No franchise was ever granted by the unanimous consent of all concerned. All new-comers to a town after a franchise has been granted, are thereby governed without their consent during the lifetime of that franchise. The self-evident truth of "government by consent of the governed" invalidates every irrevocable franchise, —every one at least which is of unreasonable duration.

The Hon. Robert Baker's courageous and useful record in Congress is about to be rewarded, so it is reported, by the Democratic Boss of Brooklyn, inspired thereto by Wall street men, with an interdict forbidding his renomination. Political bosses and Wall street men have no use for a Congressman who declines railroad passes. Not that they care so much about the passes per se; but a Congressman who refuses passes, especially if he tells about it, thereby exposes a weakness for being honest and courageous in the public service, and this identifies him unmistakably with the "dangerous classes." It is probable, however, that the premature discovery of the Brooklyn Boss's purpose may frustrate it. At a dinner given to Baker on the 27th in Brooklyn (p. 106), where the subject was mentioned, the demonstration was menacing to Bosses. This dinner is reported by the New York and Brooklyn papers as having been extraordinarily successful and significant. Over 200 were present and the speaking was vigorous and excellent. Among the speakers were Gov. Garvin, of Rhode Island, and Bird S. Coler, the last Democratic candidate for governor of New York, besides Congressman Baker himself. Since Baker's district is a Republican stronghold, any attempt by the plutocrats to prevent his getting the Democratic nomination cannot but testify to his popular strength and indicate the wholesome fear in which he is held by spoilsmen of both parties.

Mr. Baker has issued a challenge

to the Republican party which might well be imitated by radical Democratic candidates elsewhere. It is contained in the following letter:

544 Carlton avenue, Brooklyn, N. Y., May 26, 1904. Hon. Jesse Overstreet, Secretary Republican Congressional campaign Committee, Washington, D. C.:

Dear Sir—A news item which appeared in the Washington Evening Star of April 25 has been brought to my attention. It relates to the speech of Hon. William Bourke Cockran of New York, delivered in the House of Representatives on Saturday, April 23, and announces the intention of the Republican campaign committee to print large quantities of the speech for circulation in certain Congressional districts. I have no means of knowing whether this article was inspired or not. Assuming, however, that such announcement was authentic, I respectfully submit this proposition:

Should your committee print this speech, it will, of course, be because convinced that the free trade utterances of Mr. Cockran will lead voters to desert the Democratic and support the Republican candidates. Believing in the circulation of literature rather than "boodle"—especially literature which calls a spade a spade—I shall be glad to assist in the wide distribution of this speech and therefore hereby promise and agree, if your committee will supply the same, to address and mail a copy to every voter in this, the Sixth Congressional District. Being thus circulated under my frank, the voters will understand that I heartily indorse the free trade sentiments therein expressed.

I shall be glad to be favored with an early reply. Yours respectfully,
Robert Baker..

The Republicans were supposed to have suffered great loss in the way of campaign management when Senator Hanna died, but Secretary Cortelyou is well-conditioned to make a good substitute. It must have been somewhat like an inspiration, the idea of turning the job of raising campaign funds and "jollyng" labor union leaders over into the hands of the cabinet officer who is at the head of the Department of Commerce and Labor.

A socialist orator, J. L. Fitts, as reported in Appeal to Reason, had an interesting time in Salisbury, N. C. When he undertook to speak on the street a policeman took him down, and when he appealed to the mayor he met the following decision:

I don't want my people stirred up. I know what is good for them, and have their welfare at heart. You don't look

like you do. I allow candidates and their friends to speak, but you can't. I have that entirely in my charge, and you need not talk any more about it.

The fine, large way in which the mayor talks of "my people" and "their welfare" is worthy of His Majesty Edward VII. or Kaiser Wilhelm, and shows that the "protective spirit" still reigns supreme in Salisbury, as well as in some other places.

It is with profound regret that we note the suspension of City and State of Philadelphia. Under the devoted editorial management of Herbert Welsh, that paper has exerted the most wholesome influence, both in its own commonwealth on local questions, and in the nation on imperialism. It has stood bravely and intelligently for clean politics, equal rights, just laws, and genuine democratic government. Deeply as its suspension is to be deplored its influence while it lived can not be forgotten. After all, with newspapers as with men, the vital consideration always is, not whether they are dead, but whether their work and influence lives and is worthy to live.

That distinguished anti-labor leader, David M. Parry, is reported to have drawn a queer distinction between restriction of competition by labor unions and restriction of competition by protective tariff laws. The matter is put in the form of this question to Mr. Parry and his reply:

Question: As you believe in unrestricted competition in the employment of labor, do you also believe in conducting industrial enterprises in harmony with natural competitive conditions? Do you believe in free trade or protection? If you are a protectionist, how do you harmonize the application of a natural law in employing laborers and the ignoring of this law in conducting a manufacturing enterprise?

Mr. Parry's reply: As an interference with natural law the tariff is to be tolerated because its aim is the advancement of the interests of the whole people; but the interference of organized labor with natural law is not to be tolerated because its aim is the advancement of the interests of only part of the people.

Mr. Parry's reply fixes his stand