

can form no judgment without a more complete knowledge of the essential facts and real merits of the case than it now has or than it can possibly obtain from the special pleadings certain to be put forth by each side in case their dispute should bring natural causes, the loss of business being such that the burden should be, and is equitably distributed between capitalist and wage workers, the public and congress should know it, and if it is caused by misconduct in the past financial or other operations of any railroad, then everybody should know it, especially if the excuse of unfriendly legislation as a method of covering up past business misconduct by the railroad managers, or as a justification for failure to treat fairly the wage earning employes of the company. Moreover, an industrial conflict between a railroad corporation and its employes offers peculiar opportunities to any small number of evil disposed persons to defy life and property and foment public discord. Of course, if life and property and public order are endangered, prompt and drastic measures for their protection becomes the first plain duty. All other duties then become subordinate to the preservation of the public peace, and the real merits of the controversy are necessarily lost from view. This vital consideration should ever be kept in mind by all law-abiding and far-sighted members of labor organizations. It is sincerely to be hoped, therefore, that any wage controversy that may arise between the railroads and their employes may find a peaceful solution through the methods of conciliation and arbitration, already provided for by congress, which have proven so effective during the past year. To this end the commission should be in a position to have available for any board of conciliation or arbitration relevant data pertaining to such carriers as may become involved in industrial disputes. Should conciliation fail to effect a settlement and arbitration be rejected, accurate information should be available in order to develop a properly informed public opinion. I therefore ask you to make such investigation both of your records and any means at your command as will enable you to furnish data concerning such conditions obtaining on the Louisville & Nashville and any other roads as may relate, directly or indirectly, to the real merits of possibly impending controversy."

AN ASSOCIATED Press dispatch under date of Guthrie, Okla., February 19, follows: "Judge A. H. Houston in the district court here today sustained a demurrer filed by Attorney General West in an injunction suit brought by the Noble state bank against the state banking board and the bank commissioner regarding the condition of a state bank tax, on the ground that there was not sufficient facts in the petition to constitute a cause of action. This is the first test on the Oklahoma guarantee deposit law. In passing on the case Judge Houston stated that under the police powers of the state given by the act the defendants have the power to collect the tax, as the banks that are allowed to do business in this state are corporations and that they are as much accountable to the legislature as any other corporation which serves the public."

FORMER SECRETARY of the Treasury Shaw was recently charged with having criticised Mr. Roosevelt and condemning the Taft candidacy. From Kansas City Mr. Shaw gave to the Associated Press this statement: "I am not seeking to defeat any man's nomination for the presidency. There is not a man whose name is mentioned who is not my personal friend and for whom I would not cross the continent to bestow a kindness. That I prefer some does not imply that I would lift my hand against others. I am intensely interested in business conditions. The number of men out of employment and the number soon to be dismissed is to me alarming. The interest of these men and the effect of their enforced idleness upon business generally far transcends any candidate's ambition. I wish that factionalism within the party to which I belong might cease, and that a convention of broad-minded, patriotic, unselfish and unambitious men, uninstructed and unpledged, might gather in Chicago on June 16, next, and in the light of conditions as they then exist select a man who is believed to be most likely to lead the party to victory, and whose election will best conserve the moral and industrial interests of the country—the nominee of such a convention, if such a convention can be had, will be elected, whoever he may be, for the party then will be united. If there are then

as many men out of employment as there were in June, 1896, the party will probably take cognizance of the fact and govern itself accordingly, unless instructions have rendered such a course impossible."

JOHN S. BEARD, a lawyer of Pensacola, Fla., wrote to the New York World the following self-explanatory letter: "The pamphlet entitled 'The Map of Bryanism—Twelve Years of Demagoguery and Defeat,' with a request for an expression of your (my) opinion in regard thereto, has been received. I shall frankly give my opinion, which is—the pamphlet is untrue, unfair and unjust, both in its statements of well-known recent and current political events and in its conclusions. To detail its misstatements of facts and unfair and illogical conclusions would necessitate a pamphlet as voluminous as the one criticised. To the extent that this pamphlet is regarded at all, it will intensify the support of Mr. Bryan's friends and probably make for him a supporter out of every intelligent democratic reader who was doubtful before, but who despises mendacity and injustice. The democratic people in this section have faith in Mr. Bryan's fidelity and know of the World's infidelity to democratic principles, policies and candidates. The World is not considered democratic and will not be accepted as a democratic leader or counsellor. The democratic people remember with resentment that the World ardently advocated Judge Parker's nomination in 1904, and then basely deserted the party during the heat of the campaign. This pamphlet only demonstrates that the World is as untrue to the facts of history as it is to the democratic party. You have my opinion; I hope that you like it; you know that it is true, and just, but you will not publish it."

THE TORONTO World printed this leading editorial: "Toronto has had within her gates for twenty-four hours a man. Though a citizen of the United States, garbed otherwise than we, speaking with an accent and mannerism unusual to us, thinking from facts and impressions gathered elsewhere, yet he is kin to us in that he typifies our ideal of what a man should be. Stripped of whatever may be theatric about him, William Jennings Bryan is a man, and he has attained his exalted place in the affections of his people by reason of his disinterestedness and his steadfast advocacy of principles and policies for the betterment of his people. No one can hear this man speak without exclaiming, 'He is sincere.' And in his sincerity lies his strength. It has not been easy for him to reach his present place in the estimation of English-speaking people. But one can easily imagine that it is not Bryan who has changed, but the people. From the first Bryan has been what he now is, a man, and it has been by reason of his virile manhood, in which the chief ingredient is sincerity of purpose, that he has won. Bryan, the man, is worthy of emulation by our public men. Toronto is happy to have had the privilege of having a man within her gates."

THE SPRINGFIELD (Mass.) Republican says: "The unobstructed landing at Manila last week of Sixto Lopez marks a complete return to sanity of the government in the Philippines concerning former native adherents of the Philippine republic. Mr. Lopez's case, perhaps, was unique. He refused to take the oath of allegiance to the United States for reasons of conscience, and when he attempted peaceably to enter Luzon some time ago to visit his estates the authorities promptly expelled him from the islands. He must take the oath, they declared, or he must stay away, in spite of his personal interests in the archipelago. Since then Mr. Lopez had resided in Asiatic seaports and had engaged in business enterprises. The change in the official attitude toward Mr. Lopez began to be observed some months ago when Governor-General Smith consented to write to the French governor of Saigon recommending this Filipino to his attention and even urging that facilities should be given to him for the exportation of cattle. Mr. Lopez subsequently received the first and only privilege from Cochin China in that branch of commerce, his original cattle exportation amounting to 10,000 head. Whether or not his importance as a commercial factor, thus demonstrated, has had much influence in changing the official attitude of the Philippine government it is impossible to say, but it is certain that Sixto Lopez is no longer under the ban. In being allowed to land last week at Manila with-

out taking the oath of allegiance, Mr. Lopez has found the government at last tolerant of his presence in his own home, and this means a triumph for sweet reasonableness in the government of the islands. Mr. Lopez himself scores a personal triumph. But it is a private matter with him whether he will swear allegiance, and the government need feel no concern over his presence within its jurisdiction."

Turn on the Searchlight.

Congressman Hitchcock of Nebraska has written to the New York World this letter:

To the Editor of The World: Complying with your invitation to express my opinion on your pamphlet "The Map of Bryanism," I advise you that it strikes me as cunning but unfair. For that reason its influence among well-informed people is not likely to be great.

The contrast between the map of 1892 and 1896 purports to show a decline of democracy, but that decline had occurred in 1894—two years before Bryan became the democratic leader. To make a fair showing your first map should represent 1894 and not 1892. Compared with 1894, which was the last campaign under the old democratic regime, the 1896 map would show a considerable gain in democracy.

To suppress the map of 1894 strikes me as a trick unworthy of a great paper like the World.

Again, you suppress the map of 1904, which if published would show the immense deficiency of democracy in that year under a reactionary leader as compared either with 1896 or 1900 under Bryan.

The map of 1907, moreover, is a gross misrepresentation. I have read day by day your editorial efforts to show Bryan's weaknesses. Let me give you several propositions to consider:

First—No democrat ever polled as many votes as Bryan received in 1896, with most of the great leaders playing traitor, with most of the great newspapers against him, with practically no campaign fund to meet the millions at the republican disposal.

Second—In 1900 he practically held his enormous popular following against a highly popular president running for re-election after a successful war and aided by the full dinner pail and another great corruption fund.

Third—In those campaigns he ran better in Ohio against Ohio's favorite son than Parker did against Roosevelt in 1904. He ran better in New York in 1900 against McKinley than Parker, New York's favorite son, did against Roosevelt in 1904. He polled more votes in the great debatable states of Indiana, Illinois, and Ohio than any democratic candidate before or since. He carried more republican states in 1896 than any democrat ever carried, and nearly as many in 1900. He was beaten in some democratic states by the use of a corruption fund contributed by the very men and interests later denounced by the World but then working with the World.

Your objection to Bryan can not possibly be his weakness, because the figures show his strength. Nor can you hope to defeat him for nomination, because that is a practically assured fact. The only construction which can be placed on your attitude is that you know he is to be nominated and you propose to do the cause of democracy all the damage you can while posing as its supporter, because your power to injure will be reduced when you appear in your true light as its foe during the campaign. As a newspaper man I have always entertained the greatest admiration for the World and its remarkable publisher, and I am at a loss to understand the motives for the seemingly insane crusade which it now carries on against Bryan.

G. M. HITCHCOCK,
M. C., Second Nebraska District.
Washington, February 10.

Probably Mr. Hitchcock would not be surprised if he knew the extent of Mr. Pulitzer's financial interest in corporations that are to be regulated. But Mr. Pulitzer will not take the people into his confidence. That is one subject on which he does not care to have the light shine.