

A clerk, writing to the New York World, provides food for considerable thought when he says: "The times, we are told, are generally prosperous, yet it is a kind of prosperity that 'has a string to it.' The drawback is this: Many men, like myself, have fixed incomes and earn no more than they did five years ago. Meanwhile the price of every necessity of life has greatly increased. The average bookkeeper, clerk or office employe has harder work than before making both ends meet. And congress will again refuse to lower the tariff!"

The administration must not imagine that the public has forgotten Maclay, the famous "historian" who wrote down Admiral Schley as a coward. Maclay is reported to have said that if the decision of the court of inquiry is favorable to Schley, he will revise his "history." The American people are not interested in this "history" or its revision. They are, however, interested in the question, "Will the administration permit Admiral Schley's detractor to remain in the navy department?"

The London Globe, commenting upon Secretary Hay's speech at the New York chamber of commerce banquet, says: "Mr. Hay's declaration of American foreign policies so completely accords in principle with British policies that it might have been spoken by an English secretary of state." Mr. Hay has created a similar impression on this side of the big pond. Indeed, some of the American paragraphers are wont to intimate that in sympathy Mr. Hay is considerably more of a Briton than he is an American.

The Indianapolis Journal says: "In spite of Mr. Bryan's criticism of Governor Durbin for not surrendering Governor Taylor, it may be doubted if even he would be willing to be tried for a political offense by a jury composed of twelve republicans." When did assassination become a "political" offense? Old-fashioned people were taught that assassination was a crime; and yet the Indianapolis Journal's idea that when the man assassinated happens to be a democrat it is a political offense seems to be entirely in keeping with the notion persistently cultivated in certain republican quarters these days.

The London Spectator urges the United States to formulate the Monroe doctrine and Great Britain to accept that doctrine. If we recall rightly, the Monroe doctrine was "formulated" many years ago. If anything new in the way of "formulation" was necessary, we had it in the Venezuelan case, when Richard Olney, then secretary of state, declared, "On American soil the United States is practically the sovereign, and its fiat is the law." And if we recall history correctly Great Britain seemed to "accept" the Monroe doctrine on that occasion. If our memory is not at fault, then, it would seem superfluous to act upon the Spectator's suggestion.

The Appeal to Reason, a socialist paper published at Girard, Kas., has been guilty of a brutal practical joke at the expense of the postal department. The Girard postmaster was notified that bundles of the Appeal to Reason should not be sent through the mails unless the proper amount of stamps was affixed. The editor thereupon sat down and wrote to a number of republican organs, enclosing postal orders and asking for a specified number of copies of a certain issue. The papers came, but without any stamps affixed, having been sent as second class matter in the

usual way. Then the editor called the attention of the Girard postmaster to the fact, and the postmaster asked the postoffice department for instructions. Immediately the order against the Appeal to Reason was rescinded. Such a mean advantage of the genial and unprejudiced Mr. Madden calls for universal reprobation.

A London cablegram to the Chicago Tribune, referring to a dinner given to Sir Thomas Lipton in London says that Lord Tweedmouth "in terms of exceptional heartiness proposed the health of Theodore Roosevelt, president of the United States." Then it is said that "the demonstration which followed rivaled the outburst of enthusiasm at the recent chamber of commerce dinner when the name of King Edward was pronounced. The great audience responded to a man, and the hall rang with the shouts and cheers of approval, each guest seeking to outshout his neighbor." While it is well to keep on good terms with all of our neighbors, it will be difficult for many American citizens to avoid the wish that the name of the president of the United States could be cheered as heartily and as cordially by the Dutchmen who are fighting for a republican form of government in South Africa, as it was by the representatives of an empire assembled at the London banquet table.

In spite of his activities in trust organization, J. Pierpont Morgan has time to devote to art. Recently Mr. Morgan purchased a picture known as the "Lost Duchess." It was claimed that this was what is called "a genuine Gainsborough," but a cablegram to the New York World from London says that this question is being considerably discussed in art circles. According to the World's correspondent, Gainsborough had "a marvelous trick of getting the expression of the eyes and the shape of the nose by a method all his own," and this feature is pointed out as missing in Mr. Morgan's picture. It is admitted, however, that the painting is "a most attractive one" and one eminent art critic offered Mr. Morgan \$50,000 more than he paid for the picture and the critic asserted that even at that price he would make a profit on it. Men who are engaged in the effort to solve the problem of existence may not speak with great authority on such a question; and yet the looker-on might be pardoned for saying that whether or not Mr. Morgan's picture is "a genuine Gainsborough" is not immensely material in the presence of the fact that according to all reports every one has been captivated by the painting, and its merits are so pronounced that an art critic of high standing has offered to give Mr. Morgan \$50,000 profit on his purchase. If this is true, why should it be necessary to discuss the question, "Is Morgan's picture a genuine Gainsborough?" May it not be, after all, that great artists are being born every day?

Oklahoma, New Mexico and Arizona territories are clamoring for admission into the union. The Washington correspondent of the Chicago Tribune says that there is "a strong sentiment manifested among congressmen favorable to the admission of Oklahoma, but decidedly adverse to the admission of Arizona and New Mexico." The Tribune's correspondent explains that the congressmen are a little puzzled as to how they will justify their action in favoring the promotion of Oklahoma while New Mexico and Arizona are kept in the kindergarten class, but they believe the figures will fully justify them in making the distinction. All three territories will be represented here this winter, and the leading men of each will labor with congress on the statehood proposition. The most insistent just now are the Arizona and New Mexico statesmen, but if the

opinions of congressmen already on the ground count for anything they might as well have staid at home. The feeling against elevating the two Mexican territories into states is surprisingly strong. Men who are ready and anxious to give Oklahoma a chance will vote and work against Arizona and New Mexico, and particularly the former. No doubt the republican congressmen are finding considerable difficulty in justifying the admission of Oklahoma and in refusing to admit Arizona and New Mexico. The republican platform of 1896 declared: "We favor admission of the remaining territories at the earliest practicable date, having due regard to the interests of the people in the territories and the United States." In 1900 the republican platform read: "We favor home rule for, and the early admission to statehood of New Mexico, Arizona and Oklahoma." Both New Mexico and Arizona have grown materially during the last five years, yet it is confidently predicted by republican newspapers that the republicans will not permit Arizona and New Mexico to become states. Probably the Baltimore Sun suggested the explanation when it referred to the fear that these new states would send democratic senators to Washington. According to the Sun, the interest of the republican party rather than the pledges of that party or general public welfare will become paramount in the consideration of this question.

The American people are considerably interested in the coal question and many of them will naturally congratulate any one who has been able to purchase coal at a reasonable price. The Chicago Tribune is responsible for the statement that the German emperor has placed orders in America for 300,000 tons of anthracite coal. The price which Emperor William will pay is from \$1.25 to \$2.00 less than the Chicago business man must pay for his coal. The contract is that the coal must cost not more than \$5.50 a ton at the docks in Germany. The Tribune, quoting a coal dealer in Chicago, says that on a similar order a Chicago merchant would have to pay at least \$6.75. It costs dealers in Chicago \$3.50 a ton to bring coal from Pennsylvania. From the mines to Buffalo \$2.00 is charged by the railroads and the lake freight of 70 or 80 cents and the expense of loading and unloading make up the \$3.50. According to the Tribune, the ability of the German emperor to buy American coal delivered at German docks for from \$1.25 to \$2.00 per ton less than the American business man is required to pay is explained "by the difference in the cost of transportation. The German coast is far away, but ocean freights are lower." Whatever the explanation may be, the fact remains that it is absurd that the German emperor should be able to purchase American coal, delivered at German docks, at a considerably smaller rate than that demanded of the American consumer. Certainly the difference in expense of ocean steamships and the railroad line cannot reasonably account for this great disadvantage to the American consumer. Unreasonable greed and the unfair advantage accorded to corporations in this country account for the disadvantage, and yet republican papers have a habit of denouncing any democrat who suggests that the time has come when we should "shackle cunning as in the past we have shackled force."

Henry Watterson is in favor of taking the constitution as the democratic platform. Wouldn't that be a little too specific? Why not have the candidate promise to do what he thinks is right and not hamper him by the constitution? That would be more in keeping with the Watterson philosophy. A democratic platform is not intended merely for the enunciation of general principles, but rather for the application of those principles to pending issues. The Kansas City platform indorsed the constitution and then applied it.