...LIANCES.

...erican Efforts to Get the United States Into England's Clutches.

Democracy is unalterably opposed to "entangling alliances with foreign powers."

McKinley and Hanna, who represent the republican party, favor foreign alliances and have undoubtedly made one with England.

During the Ohio campaign the democrats asserted that such an alliance had been made. Indeed, in their platform they declared against a secret or an open alliance with England or any other foreign power.

This attitude of the democracy frightened Mark Hanna, and he forced his secretary of state, John Hay, to come out with a most remarkable denial.

This letter of Secretary of State Hay was a startling innovation in diplomacy. Nothing but a political emergency in Hanna's Ohio could have compelled such a descent of the secretary of state into the muddy waters of political contest in one of the states of the union.

Heretofore the secretary of state, the first officer of the cabinet, has had his duties fixed by law, and his mission has been to deal with our foreign relations, and not with the domestic affairs of the several states of the union.

But, as the Cincinnati Enquirer says, "the poeite author of 'Jim Bludsoe' took 1½ columns of solid prose to contradict a six-line declaration of the democratic party, and so elaborate was the denial that it tended to confirm the belief of the existence of a secret alliance between England and the United States of America, instead of dispelling."

But now Joseph Chamberlain, secretary of state for the English colonies, declares that such an alliance exists.

To quote Chamberlain's own words establishes this claim. As reported by telegraph, Joseph Chamberlain said:

"It is especially gratifying to note the friendly relations existing between the Anglo-Saxon branches, and that the understanding between Great Britain and the United States is indeed a guarantee of the peace of the world."

And the peace of the world under this alliance—what is it?

Wholesale murder in the Philippines under the stars and stripes, wholesale murder in the Transvaal under the meteor banner of England.

Do democrats want this sort of peace? By no manner of means. Imperialism must suffer defeat at the hands of democrats in 1900.—Chicago Democrat.

AGRICULTURE PROTESTS.

The Administration Policy of Expansion Does Not Meet with General Approval.

The first response from the nation to the colonial policy seems to come from the agricultural classes. In conformity with the president's notion that the new possessions are as much a part of the United States as Florida, California or Alaska, Secretary of War Root proposes to abolish tariff barriers against goods of our own possessions. Immediately comes this protest from Springfield, O., from Herbert Myrick, editor of an agricultural paper. He telegraphed to the president as follows:

"We respectfully, but most vigorously protest against the admission of tropical produce free of duty or at reduced rates, as recommended by the secretary of war this morning. The protest is made in behalf of millions of American farmers, laborers and capital engaged in farm, domestic culture or manufacture of the beets, sugar cane, tobacco, cigars, sugar beets, vegetables, rice, etc. They will not submit to being ruined for the benefit of trusts employing coolie labor that inevitably will control production and manufactures in the tropics. That we speak with authority in behalf of these great interests will soon be demonstrated."

Such a protest as that may be expected to strike a protectionist judge-Kinley with great force. If this indignant policy of destiny shall upset McKinley's cherished protection-made prosperity the last condition may be worse than the first. The agriculturists to whom McKinley taught the doctrine of protection evidently remember it and now have enough to want the benefit of imperialism is a question of time. Commissioner Denby declares in a recent article, the protectionists may make the president turn his back on the policy of destiny in order to preserve his own personal policy of protection at home. Denby said:

"The cold, hard, practical question alone remains: Will the possession of these islands benefit us as a nation? If it will not set them free to-morrow and let their people, if they please, cut each other's throats or play what pranks they please. To this complexion we must come at last, that, unless it is beneficial for us to hold these islands, we should turn them loose."

When it comes to determining the cold, hard, practical question, "does it pay?" the president may hear protests from the nation more emphatic than even that of the agriculturists.—Utica Observer.

Closing of Mills.

McKinley hit upon a happy phrase three years ago, designed to keep the attention of the voters away from his attitude on the silver question—it was to the effect that it would be better to open the mills rather than the mints. For awhile after McKinley's election the process of opening the mills went on—not due in any way to his election but because the United States was participating in the world-wide recovery from seven years of lean picking. As soon as possible McKinley pushed through congress a bill for higher tariff protection, the trusts sprung up in a night and the process of shutting down the mills was begun and is in operation to this day. Scarce a day passes in which some trust does not shut down a few mills for the sake of limiting the output, creating an inadequate supply and thus giving excuse for high prices and increasing prices. Consolidation of office forces, reduction of number of traveling men, economy in rents, reduction of advertising expenses and many other means have been employed by the trusts to make more money with less expense than formerly.—Helena (Mont.) Independent.

— If Washington were to return to life about the first thing he would say after inquiring into McKinley's financial record would be for some consolation in his nearly 100 years of rest for the nation he fought to found, the flag, ignored; decorated in dependence and degraded in peace, crushed by a war of conquest, crushed by a war of conquest, crushed by a war of conquest