

ing to the distinguished ex-senator, are "usually men of property," and he describes them as "strictly conscientious," "patriotic in their purposes, and sincerely desirous of good government under whatever party it may be secured," while he has nothing but words of condemnation for those who supported the Chicago platform.

If, as Jefferson says, there are but two permanent parties in every country, the democratic party and the aristocratic party, the above quotation from Mr. Hill's article would justify him in aspiring to the leadership of the aristocratic party, for no republican has gone beyond him in sycophantic praise of "men of property." He would put the party in a servile and suppliant position before the corporations and syndicates and make its action depend upon a wink or a nod from them. Since they are not attached to any party, but go wherever their pecuniary interests lead them, all platforms must be made to advance their interests and all nominations must receive the stamp of their approval. No opponent of Mr. Hill has ever brought against him a stronger indictment than he brings against himself in the language above quoted. After having thus declared himself it was not necessary for him to elaborate upon issues, for issues find their basis in fundamental principles and Mr. Hill boldly announces that no principles are to be considered and no policies advocated which "disgust, offend or frighten this class of electors." If these people want a gold standard we must have a gold standard; if they want a national bank currency we must have a national bank currency; if they own stock in trusts we must deal tenderly with the trusts; if they want high tariff we must not disturb the tariff; if they expect to find a profit in the exploitation of distant colonies we must not say anything against a colonial system—this is Mr. Hill's logic, although he does not apply it to all issues. In other words, because the republican party offers to lend itself to concentrated wealth, the democratic party must do the same, and those who object to the surrender of democratic principles must be content to be classed with the "political adventurer, ignoramus and demagogue."

According to Mr. Hill the party should have adopted the silver plank which he recommended at the convention, which was a declaration in favor of international bimetalism. But as this was the exact position taken by the republican party at St. Louis there would have been no issue on the money question. Besides, the plank that the republican party and Mr. Hill favored abdicated self-government and made our financial system depend upon the action of other countries. A man who believes the gold standard to be a good thing can be excused for advocating it, but what excuse can there be for a policy that permits other nations to decide for us a question of such great importance as our financial policy?

Mr. Hill's argument against the income tax is the same that he made in congress and is based upon the fact that he looks at the question from the standpoint of one who is more interested in protecting rich clients from the payment of their just dues to the government than in the welfare of the public generally. He is indignant at what he regards as injustice to people with large incomes, but he is not at all concerned about the injustice done to the masses of the people by a tax upon consumption. He is too intelligent a man not to know that taxes collected on consumption through internal revenue duties and import duties bear heaviest upon the poor and are, in fact, a graded income tax, the highest per cent being paid by those with the smallest incomes and the lowest per cent being paid by those with the largest incomes. Knowing the effect of a tax upon consumption his failure to make any protest against it while he is quick to object to a small income tax, shows that his sympathies are on the side of those who have large incomes rather than on the side of those who labor for small compensa-

tion. So long as he looks at the question of taxation with an eye single to the interests of the people of one state he ought not to attempt to speak for the people of other states, and as the income tax would touch but a small fraction of the people of New York, it is a question whether he really represents the interests of any considerable portion of the people of his own state. He thinks the supreme court was not treated with proper respect. He ought to read the speeches of Lincoln and republican platforms on the Dred Scott decision. The construction which he places upon the income tax plank is far fetched and betrays his desire to find fault with the platform rather than to find reasons for supporting it. There was no ground whatever for his suspicion that the democratic party intended an attack upon the court. The fact that one set of judges overthrew by a majority vote a decision rendered by the unanimous vote of a former set of judges naturally suggests the possibility of a different decision from some future court.

He seems to know so well how a court can be packed by an "unscrupulous president" that one is led to wonder whether he, if president, would pack the United States bench with corporation attorneys recommended by the "intelligent" and "patriotic" "men of property."

Mr. Hill also places himself on record in opposition to legal tender paper money. Infringing on Mr. Cleveland's copyright of "true democracy" he says "the true democratic theory is that congress has no constitutional power to issue any more paper money and should not issue any whatever." This, taken in connection with his plea for national banks, places Mr. Hill squarely against government paper and in favor of national bank paper, and explains why he has had nothing to say against the Fowler bill which proposes an asset bank currency and a branch bank system.

It is fortunate for the public that Mr. Hill wrote the Forum article, because it gives to democratic voters some idea of the purposes of the reorganizers. A reorganized democracy would continue the republican policy and make the treasury department an asset of the national banking association.

Mr. Hill also took offense at the plank which declared against the issue of interest-bearing bonds in time of peace. That plank was a condemnation of Mr. Cleveland's bond policy, and Mr. Hill's criticism of the plank makes him a defender of the Rothschild-Morgan contract which was as disgraceful a transaction as any administration was ever guilty of.

The plank against life tenure in office was directed against the growing tendency to increase the number of positions for which appointments are made for life, and was entirely consistent with the position taken by the democratic party on other questions. The fact that there are frequent changes in elective offices shows that public sentiment is against life tenure, and in a republic there is no excuse for systems which are not supported by public sentiment.

Mr. Hill was so anxious to have an excuse for sulking that he even resented the attempt to limit the plank to offices not created by the constitution.

In discussing the plank relating to federal authority in the states, Mr. Hill purposely ignored the fact, brought out during the campaign, that the democratic plank on that subject was not as emphatic as a similar plank which appeared in Lincoln's first platform, as will be seen by the following:

#### PLANK IN REPUBLICAN PLATFORM OF 1860.

That the maintenance inviolate of the rights of the states, and especially the right of each state to order and control its own domestic institutions according to its own judgment exclusively, is essential to that balance of powers on which the perfection and endurance of our political fabric depends; and we denounce the lawless invasion, by armed force,

of the soil of any state or territory, no matter under what pretext, as among the gravest of crimes.

#### PLANK IN DEMOCRATIC PLATFORM OF 1896.

We denounce arbitrary interference by federal authorities in local affairs as a violation of the constitution of the United States and a crime against free institutions, and we especially object to government by injunction as a new and highly dangerous form of oppression, by which federal judges in contempt of the laws of the states and the rights of citizens become at once legislators, judges and executioners, and we approve the bill passed at the last session of the United States senate, and now pending in the house of representatives, relative to contempts in federal courts, and providing for trials by jury in certain cases of contempt.

The shallowness of Mr. Hill's criticism is shown by the fact that Mr. Hopkins, who was mayor of Chicago at the time of the riot and advised Governor Altgeld that state troops were not needed, was at the head of the Palmer and Buckner movement in Illinois and is now the leader of the reorganizers in that state.

The senate bill against government by injunction, endorsed in the above quoted plank, was supported by Mr. Hill in the senate and passed practically without opposition—but that was before the corporations discovered what was going on.

To thoroughly understand Mr. Hill's magazine article it must be remembered that it appeared soon after the election of 1896 when the bolting democrats were rejoicing in a republican victory and when they thought that they had entirely destroyed the democratic party as then organized. Deceived by the clamor of the great dailies, Mr. Hill supposed that defeat had destroyed the influence of those who had rescued the party from the domination of corporate wealth and that the men who had supported the republican ticket or the Palmer and Buckner ticket would be permitted to take control of the party and prepare for a sham battle over minor questions. He would not write such an article now. He is too adroit a politician to seek a nomination upon a platform as open and as candid as the one outlined in his article. He now deals in glittering generalities and imitates the notes of the dove as he pleads for peace and harmony. But it is well for democrats to understand his position upon public questions and to know that the peace for which he sues is peace with the foes of democracy and harmony with those who use the instrumentalities of government for public plunder and private gain.

#### Congressional Record Condensed.

At present the Congressional Record reaches but few people and it is so cumbersome that it is scarcely read by those who receive it. Why not condense it to a reasonable size and furnish it at cost to all who desire it? A weekly edition of the Congressional Record containing a brief account of all bills favorably reported, a more extended account of all bills discussed and the full text of all laws enacted, together with a summary of the arguments for and against them would enable the people to sit in judgment upon the conduct of their representatives and render a more intelligent verdict at the polls. A congressional committee composed of members of the various parties could supervise the publication and thus insure the presentation of the best arguments made on both sides of every controverted question. The paper could publish the messages of the president and condensed reports of the various departments so that readers would be informed of all that was done by the federal government. Such a paper would not interfere with the work of the country weekly, but by furnishing an authentic report of matters pertaining to the government would leave the country editor more space for editorial discussion of political issues. The coun-