

which the multi-millionaires have been enriching themselves. Every session of congress will develop just such differences and can you wonder that we, who are marked for the disfavor of the powerful influences at Washington should want a governor who is in sympathy with what we are trying to do—should want the whole state government to be in harmony with the progressive movement for better laws? You will understand, I am sure, that I have given you the reason why I want to see Warren Garst nominated for governor. In addition to the work that he would do so splendidly at home, it would be comforting at Washington to know that the governor of the state was lifting up his voice to aid us in the struggle in which we are constantly engaged.

Is Peoples' Movement

"The present members of the house of representatives from this district and from the Ninth congressional district and the First congressional district are devoted followers of Aldrich and of Cannon, of Payne and of Dalzell and they have voted and they will vote in the future, if they are returned to congress, just as the Aldrich-Cannon organization determines they ought to vote. Is it strange that Dolliver and myself, who are in the midst of one of the fiercest conflicts ever seen in the national congress for principles that we believe to be vital to the welfare of the party, of the party as well as of the country, should want Prouty and Byers and Darrah and Bookhart in the house of representatives instead of Hull, Smith, Towner, or Kennedy?"

"There is nothing personal in the situation. I covet the support and confidence of every man in Iowa, but it is in the highest degree illogical for any man to help me to a seat in the senate of the United States, or to believe that I ought to remain there, to stand for the nomination of Hull, of Smith, of Towner or of Kennedy. The sooner we realize that this division in the ranks of the republican plurality is not ephemeral, the sooner we appreciate that it is a movement of the people and not merely to gratify personal ambitions, the sooner we will become conscious of a great and everlasting truth."

MR. BRYAN AT NEBRASKA CITY

On the evening of May 16 Mr. Bryan spoke at Nebraska City, Neb., on the initiative and referendum. He said:

"I am here for three reasons. First, because I like to come to Nebraska City. It was in my district when I was a member of congress, and the people of this county have been loyal friends in all my campaigns. I might justify my coming, therefore, on the ground that I find a real pleasure in coming. The second reason for coming is that I desire to refute the charge that has gone out over the country to the effect that you are opposed to free speech, and would prevent the discussion of a public question. The action of your county commissioners in refusing to allow me to speak in the court house has been construed by the newspapers as indicating that you are so opposed to my position on the initiative and referendum that you are not willing that I should use, for the presentation of my views, the court house, which is usually open for public meetings. By coming here and speaking in a larger hall than the court house I prove that those who desire to discuss a pending question will be accorded a hearing in your city and county. The third reason for my coming is that the very fact that an attempt was made to prevent my speaking here discloses the character of the opposition to the initiative and referendum, and I can use this attempt to prevent discussion as a text. I could ask nothing better than that the opponents of the initiative and referendum should do everywhere what they have done here, for nothing would add such impetus to our cause as the attempt on the part of our opponents to prevent the discussion of the subject. Free speech lies at the foundation of free government, and he who opposes free speech betrays the spirit of the despot, even if he is powerless to enforce the despotism that he favors. Freedom of speech can be defended from every standpoint. The mind must be free to think and the tongue must be free to speak if there is to be intellectual progress. The evils that may follow from erroneous arguments are infinitely less than the evils that follow from the suppression of thought. And then, any evils that may follow from free speech are sure to be corrected, while the evils that follow from the suppression of thought are much more difficult to correct.

"Freedom of speech is necessary to political

progress. Jefferson, the greatest of democrats, was a most devoted champion of free speech, and Lincoln, who quoted Jefferson as much as any democrat ever has, was likewise a champion of free speech.

"Moral progress depends also upon freedom of speech. The conscience must be allowed to cry out against what it believes to be wrong, and those who are opposed to free speech confess that they are not prepared to defend the thing for which they stand. The initiative and referendum are advocated because they give the people a chance to express themselves on every question, and those who stand back of the liquor traffic are very short-sighted when they oppose the initiative and referendum. They say they are afraid that if the initiative and referendum are incorporated in our organic law by a constitutional amendment the question of county option will be presented. Let us analyze their position. When they are opposed to the submission of the initiative and referendum they admit that they are afraid that if submitted it would be adopted, and that means that they are not willing that we shall have a local machinery in this state by which the people may express themselves on a public question. The attitude of the saloon interests is, therefore, that they are so opposed to county option that they are not willing that the people shall have the right to vote upon this question or any other question; in other words they would defeat popular government as it is expressed in the initiative and referendum rather than have the county option question submitted to a vote, and some of them in this country go so far as to oppose the public discussion of the initiative and referendum for fear that reforms may be adopted, and that from its adoption the question of county option may be submitted to the people. They thus make the liquor question a paramount issue, for when they make it a determining issue with themselves they must expect that others will also recognize it as a question that must be settled. It is not certain yet whether a special session of the legislature will be called, but if it is not called it is because the liquor interests are opposed to the initiative and referendum. If the liquor interests can control enough senators to prevent the submission of the question notwithstanding the fact that the democratic governor favors the initiative and referendum, notwithstanding the fact that a majority of the democratic senators and members favor the initiative and referendum, and notwithstanding the fact that an overwhelming majority of the democrats of the state favor it and a large majority of republicans also—if this is the condition then it would seem that we must settle the liquor question at once whether we want to or not, in order that we may take up other questions the consideration of which is now obstructed by the liquor interests. The liquor interests are responsible for the forcing of the county option question into the arena of politics, and they have only themselves to blame for the results that shall follow the growing indignation against the impudence, the insolence, and the sordidness of the liquor interests."

Mr. Bryan then proceeded to discuss the initiative and referendum as a method of legislation, and its connection with the liquor question.

ANTI-INCOME TAX METHODS

It will be remembered that the income tax law of 1894 was declared unconstitutional by the supreme court by a majority of one, and it will also be remembered that that majority of one was secured through one judge's change of opinion between the two arguments. It now seems that the resolution ratifying the income tax was defeated in the New York assembly by one vote, and that that one vote was cast by a democratic representative named Friend, who changed his vote. It seems that Friend's seat was contested, and the election committee was under the control of the combination that was fighting the income tax. Mr. Murray, a progressive republican from New York City, was leading the fight in favor of the amendment, and when Friend voted against the income tax Murray denounced Friend for his change of position. According to the New York Times Mr. Murray, pointing his finger at Friend, said: "This man, in reversing his action on the income tax admitted that he had to do so to save his seat. If there is an ounce of courage in the soul that he has presumed to possess let him stand up in this presence and square that statement with his sworn obligation as a member of the assembly." After Friend had changed his vote on the income tax

the contest was decided in his favor and he was seated by the assembly.

The Springfield Republican, commenting on Friend's flop, says:

"It now appears that ratification of the income tax amendment by the New York assembly was prevented by the 'flop' of a democratic member, named Friend, whose seat therein was under contest. He had been elected on the face of the returns in a New York City district by a score or so of votes. His republican opponent contested the result, and an assembly committee has been having a recount. This committee is controlled by machine republicans who are opposed to the income-tax amendment. At one time in the count the committee found the republican contestant ahead, and Friend had voted for the amendment when it first came up. The last ballot-box, however, turned a republican plurality of about twenty into a plurality for Friend of three, and so he keeps his seat and then votes against the income tax amendment. He explains his 'flop' by saying he has been convinced by Governor Hughes' 'cogent' argument against the amendment, but as this argument had been before him long before he voted on the amendment the first time, there are cries that his change-about is related in some way to the recount. He himself says he hopes the publicity he is now getting will help his law business. But for his ratting, the income tax amendment would today stand ratified by the assembly of the state most counted on to vote it down."

How proud the capitalistic opponents of the income tax must be of the methods which they employed! And how proud Governor Hughes must be of the "cogent" reasons that were sufficient to convert Mr. Friend. The friends of the income tax have reason to congratulate themselves upon the strength of their cause. Either Governor Hughes has very little influence in the state, or else the income tax sentiment is very strong in New York. If it requires all of Governor Hughes' influence, added to the influence of the predatory corporations and the election committee, to defeat the income tax amendment by one vote, and that a vote coerced by the threat of expulsion, how large would the majority in favor of the income tax amendment be without Governor Hughes' opposition, or with his support?

JEFFERSON'S VIEWS

The Saturday Evening Post says so many good things and strikes so many blows for cleaner politics and better government that one does not feel like condemning it harshly for an occasional mistake. It finds fault with Mr. Bryan's statement that Jefferson's views continue their majestic march around the earth. It asserts that the democratic party is weak and unable to grapple effectively with modern problems in proportion as it is guided by Jefferson's views. It declares "that the reforms that have won most popular approval of late years have been gained precisely by increasing the power of the government and setting bounds upon individual liberty—for example, the liberty of directors to run a railroad as they please." The editor of the Post was not at himself when he gave this example, for no well informed person would accuse Jefferson of endorsing the kind of individual liberty displayed by a railroad director who would run the railroad as he pleased. There is a wide difference between the liberty of the individual when he acts for himself and the liberty of an individual who acts for others. Jefferson drew that distinction with great exactness, and while he insisted that the individual should not be unnecessarily restricted, he was the champion of restrictions upon those who acted in a representative capacity. No one has gone farther than he in insisting that the representative should be not only restricted but carefully watched.

If the editor of the Saturday Evening Post will study the views of Jefferson, he will find that whatever progress we have made in reforms has been made along Jeffersonian lines and that we would have made still greater reforms had Jeffersonian principles been more fully applied.

GLADNESS

If you have a word of cheer,
Speak it where the sad may hear;
Can you coin a thought of light?
Give it wings and speed its flight;
Do you know a little song?
Pass the roundelay along;
Scatter gladness, joy and mirth
All along the ways of earth.
—A. M. Worden, in Progress Magazine.