OUT FOR M'KINLEY.

President Eliot, of Harvard, Supports Republican Ticket.

Personal and Political Histories of Candidates Make Them Preferable—Deplores Actions of Democrats.

President Charles W. Eliot, of Harvard university, contributes to the Outlook for October 20 an academic article on "Political Principles and Tendencies," in which he supports the republican national ticket. He says he regards the election next month not "as a supreme crisis, like the second election of Lincoln, but only one indispensable act in a long drama." Dr. Eliot takes the hopeful view. He points out that "the American people have long had a characteristic political and social enthusiasm. Their two steady, passionate sentiments are for the security, prosperity and honor of the republic, and for the spread among the white races of free institutions and of the good social conditions which grow out of them."

Sentiments of Americans.

At the outset Dr. Eliot says that it seems to him "those men and those parties that suppose the American people likely to be permanently guided in their political action by any sordid commercialism or other form of national selfishness are grievously mistaken. Some party managers and all mercenary voters are governed by mean motives, but the mass of the people is never much influenced by pecuniary consideration in politics.

"The American people have long had a characteristic political and social enthusiasm. Their two steady, passionate sentiments are for the security, prosperity and honor of the republic, and for the spread among the white races of free institutions and of the good social conditions which grow out of them. Whenever the people of the United States are to be called on for great exertions and sacrifices they have first to be persuaded that such exertions and sacrifices will contribute to one or other of these two causes which they have at heart. The various policies, whether domestic or foreign, of political parties should always be considered with reference to these fundamental national passions and sentiments."

Puts Sound Currency First.

He then takes up the three principal subjects in regard to the domestic policies which have engaged public attention during the last 35 years, and puts first the establishment of the gold standard and sound banking system, regarding which he says:

"The important gains which have lately been made on this subject are due to a majority of the republican party and a minority of the democratic; but at this moment the great cause of sound currency is particularly defended by the republican party alone."

The second fundamental topic of political discussion, in Mr. Eliot's opinion, "is a public service based on merit only." The most competent statesmen of both parties have promoted this reform, "but the mass of neither party is as yet to be trusted with it." He asks how this reform can be promoted at the present moment, and replies:

"The personal and political history of the candidates of the republican party should cause them to be preferred on this issue to the candidates of the democratic-populist party; for of the two candidates nominated by the latter party, one is a notorious spoilsman, and the other, being a civilian without military experience, accepted a colonelcy in time of war. That act speaks louder than orations. Moreover, recent experience shows that neither party can as yet be trusted to forego a spoils debauch at a complete change of the national administration."

Believes in Reciprocity.

The third important subject of political debate during the last 30 years has been the protective tariff, and Dr. Eliot inquires which of the two parties is likely, on the whole, to be able to adopt legislation tending toward freer trade. He thus answers his question:

"Since the democratic party has absolutely thrown away the low tariff position, which such leaders as Cleveland, Carlisle, Wilson and Russell won for it, the reciprocity doctrine of the republican party seems to afford the best immediate opportunity for liberal legislation, although it must be confessed that progress toward world-wide trade is more likely to come through the logic of events than through legislation—that is, through the increasing superiority of American industries and the manifest insufficiency of the home market.

"Against this chance of improving commercial and industrial conditions in reciprocity treaties must be set the strange subserviency of the republican party leaders to small groups of capitalists, who, having made great sums of money by means of high tariff legislation, are willing to make large contributions to republican campaign expenses in the expectation of preserving their special privileges. The 'machine' or 'boss' is, however, much the same corrupt and corrupting agency in both parties, Messrs. Quay and Platt being well matched by Messrs. Gorman and Croker."

Deplores Attacks on Judges.

Another "portentous" subject which has attracted much attention since 1892, he says, is the frequent outbreak of popular disorder and violence in various parts of the country, conspicuously the Chicago railroad strike of 1894, in which local mob rule was suppressed by the democratic national executive and the United States courts, with the approval of both political parties. Dr. Eliot concludes his discussion of this matter by saying:

"The striking thing about many recent outbreaks of mob violence has been that they have not been effectively dealt with by any public authority, national or local, republican or democrat. This alarming phenomenon is probably due in some measure to the absence in many parts of the country of an effective public force. Indeed, unlike European countries, the rural districts of the United States in general have no well-organized and trustworthy police, constabulary or militia. Hence the impunity with which trains are held up, country banks and railroad stations are robbed, and numerous crimes of violence are committed in secluded places on private properties and persons. Even in large cities race riots and strikes, accompanied by prolonged violence, have repeatedly taken place.

"In this state of affairs any attack on the independence of the judiciary is much to be deprecated. Such an attack is made for the second time in the platform of the democratic-populist party."

As to Foreign Policies.

Turning his attention to foreign policy, President Eliot says:

"Whenever a powerful nation goes to war no man can tell what the real issues are to be. The war for Cuba was no exception in this respect. It had inevitable consequences, which no mortal could have foreseen, and the gravest of these consequences are that the country is already committed beyond immediate recall to the maintenance of a large navy and a considerable army, and that it is involved in the struggles of the nations of Europe for new territory, influence and trade in the far east. Under these circumstances the patriotic citizen has to consider this fall whether the public interests are to be better advanced by maintaining in power the present administration, with all its shortcomings, or by providing a wholly untried one.

"In regard to foreign policy," Dr. Eliot continues, "it is not easy to state any material difference between the declared policies of the two great parties. President McKinley and Mr. Bryan use different phrases in describing their foreign policies; but when it came to action, in all probability their policies would be much alike."

He criticises the course of the administration in Cuba, Porto Rico and the Philippines, saying:

"President McKinley, in his unwonted function of sovereign and arbitrary ruler, committed a lamentable error in the tone of his proclamation to the Filipinos of December, 1898, and thereby involved his country in a cruel war—or rather a long series of military executions—with a semi-civilized but liberty-loving people who fought by our side against the Spaniards, and who ought to have been invariably addressed with the utmost consideration, not as purchased subjects or conquered foes, but as comrades and friends.

"His administration is responsible for gross delinquencies of public officers in Cuba, and for a less than generous treatment of the people of Porto Rico. It has also succumbed deplorably to a temptation which always besets rulers in time of war—the temptation to keep from the people the knowledge, not only of future plans, but of past events and of documentary evidence relating thereto. This is one of the worst incompatibilities between war and public liberty. It may be wholesome, under temporary excitements, to bear in mind that our free institutions have been two centuries and a half in attaining the present imperfect development, and that it will doubtless take as long to perfect them. It is almost the universal American belief that they are not destined to be destroyed."

Sees Danger in a Change.

On the other hand, he says:

"The patriotic citizen may well hesitate to contribute by vote or influence to a complete change of administration. President McKinley is now surrounded by cabinet officers of capacity and experience, and he has put good men at the head of affairs in Cuba, Porto Rico and the Philippines, while in case of a change in the presidency nobody can tell to what sort of persons the great offices of the government would be intrusted.

"It must be confessed that a peace-loving citizen, who would like to see his country keep her breath to cool her own hot porridge, cannot but be much at a loss how to select his immediate political associations. The republican administration, supported by a republican majority in congress, has, as a matter of fact, been fighting in foreign parts for two years and a half; the last democratic administration took a very imperious tone with Great Britain in an insignificant dispute about an unidentified portion of the boundary of Venezuela, and the actual democratic ticket, in spite of Mr. Bryan's definition of the paramount issue, is supported by eminent advocates of American participation in all the great contentions of the wide world.

"The war-hating citizen, who clings to a domestic definition of his country's business, is further embarrassed by the reflection that some wiespreading and pregnant benefits have already resulted from United States expansion in the West and East Indies—incontestably in Cuba, and probably in Porto Rico, the Philippines and China."

BRYAN SCORED BY A FRIEND.

A Nebraska Democrat Leaves the Party and Denounces the Candidate.

Matthew J. Gering, of Plattsmouth, Neb., the brilliant orator, democratic leader, and personal friend of W. J. Bryan, on October 20 left the democratic party. His change has created a big sensation. On the subject he says:

"I stumped the state for the party in 1896 and 1898, when I felt that it was no longer the democratic party; that it was wandering far from the teachings of Tilden and Jefferson. I have stayed with democracy for four years simply through my love of it, in the hope that it would come back to its old principles. Now, when it takes a direct stand against the government, I will support the statesmen and patriots who are at the nation's head.

"Bryan is going about the country a Robespiere and Danton rolled into one. He is using his oratory and magnetism to stir up discord between employer and workmen. He has such a grasp on the hearts of the people that clergymen and courtesan alike will throw their dollars into his campaign fund. But that is not statesmanship.

"McKinley is a pure-minded leader. He does not rant about his patriotism in public; it is something which he cherishes in his heart. Bryan flourishes his patriotism; he appeals to men's passions; he is developing into the most colossal demagogue of the age. He is urging men to oppose the government; he is pretending to them that the white house is a rendezvous of traitors. There is no such thing as militarism in America, and never can be. Every soldier in the United States army is a volunteer; no man can be pressed into the service under the army code. And if 100,000 troops maintained when outside hostilities exist are a menace to the nation, so also would 25,000 be a menace; there is no line of demarkation.

"Jefferson, the founder of democracy, did exactly what President McKinley is doing to-day. It was Dix who said: 'If any man hauls down the American flag, shoot him on the spot,' and it is Bryan who says: 'If any Filipino shoots an American soldier haul down the American flag.'"

Democrats Passed the Army Bill.

In all his speeches Mr. Bryan takes care to refer to the "dangers of militarism" and to talk of "a large standing army." He has repeatedly asserted that the president and the republican congress increased the army to 100,000 men "when no arm was raised against the nation anywhere in the world." In view of these assertions, Senator Scott, of West Virginia, recently took occasion to investigate the records at Washington in regard to the passage of the bill of February, 1899, which temporarily increased the army to its present size. The facts which he recalls show how utterly unfounded and insincere are Bryan's attempts to make people believe that the increase is a permanent one and due entirely to the republican party—Chicago Tribune.

BRYAN IS A BOXER.

That Is What Don M. Dickinson Calls Nebraskan.

Postmaster General Under Cleveland, an "American" Democrat, Comes Out Strongly Against the Popocrat Candidate.

A Washington special of October 22 announces that the following letter has been written by Don M. Dickinson, who was postmaster general in the first cabinet of President Cleveland, to a gentleman in that city:

"Dear Sir: Since the adoption of the Kansas City platform and his nomination I have never entertained a thought of voting for Mr. Bryan.

"I confess, however, that, in common with very many democrats, I hoped for a time that I might, with a clear conscience, stay away from the polls. But Mr. Bryan's speeches, particularly his later ones, have destroyed that illusion and convinced me that I must vote at the coming election.

"I criticise no man of different views who can reconcile himself to the other course, but as for me, with the light I have, I am forced to the conviction that I would be a recreant American, false to my country and false to my party as well, if I should take to the woods.

An American Democrat.

"I am a democrat on all the fundamental issues on which our party joined battle in the past with the republicans, the whigs and the federalists—a democrat without the prefix 'gold,' because my party has been the party of sound finance from Jefferson to Cleveland.

"I could not be a republican if I would, and I say the creed of democracy with all my old-time sincerity and faith.

"But I recognize scarcely a vestige of democrratic principle in either the Chicago or Kansas City platforms. The organization is in the hands of the populists, and by these the livery of true democracy has been stolen in which to serve all the devils that make for social disorder.

"Mr. Bryan is preaching the gospel of hate. Voicing that, he appeals to the envious, the discontented, the improvident, the incompetent and unworthy idle.

Calls Bryan a Boxer.

"The words of the Prophet Samuel were aptly quoted in Gen. Bragg's speech the other day as applying to Mr. Bryan and his following:

"'And everyone that was in distress, and everyone that was in debt, and everyone that was discontented gathered themselves unto him, and he became a captain over them.'

"But worse still, he endeavors to set friend against friend, neighbor against neighbor, family against family, section against section and nation against nation.

"He makes the always dangerous appeal to the evil in human nature.

"His postulates are Boxer and his propaganda is Boxer.

"He speaks no encouragement to the unsuccessful, but tells him to lay the blame at the door of his more fortunate neighbor, and that his sole remedy is to attack him.

Has No Word of Hope.

"He invariably speaks of creditors as 'merciless creditors,' and to the debtor he teaches that his friend who has loaned him money or trusted him is his enemy.

"When a man fails and becomes despondent he does not seek to inspire him with the American spirit of perseverance; he does not appeal to him to be up and doing and to try again, but he tells him to stop trying, and that the remedy is to pull down the more successful.

"Where is the intelligent citizen who believes in his heart that his republican neighbors are not as good Americans and as good patriots as himself? And yet, in connection with his making a charge that the republicans demanded a larger army (an increase, by the way, that was voted for by the Bryan men of the senate and carried in the house with a minority vote of but 33), he has repeatedly said in his public speeches as he said at Indianapolis:

"'Why do they want it? So that they can build a fort near every large city and use the army to suppress by force the discontent that ought to be cured by remedial legislation!'

Teacher of Treason.

"This from a candidate for the presidency of the United States, using all the power of his eloquence to carry conviction, especially to our foreign-born workingmen, whose votes he solicits!

"What intelligent citizen loving his country, with a stake in home, in family or in property, however great his sympathy for the unhappy Boers, would, if he could, have had his government aggressively interfere for their protection at the risk of war with Great Britain?

"We seek no more wars. We want the friendship of all nations. But now, as ever, we stand 'at peace but ready to battle' with any of them for the integrity of our territory, the honor of our flag and the protection of Americans everywhere. Who believes that a man that seriously attacks that policy is a safe man to trust with power in this country?

"Imperialism? The theory of our government, fixed in organic law, cannot be changed in form or in substance unless our congress, with its house fresh from the people, and the supreme court of the United States are parties with the executive to the treasonable conspiracy.

"With a written constitution, the unique feature of our system of government and its sheet anchor is that great court at Washington, removed by the law of its establishment from partisan conflicts and from the influence of popular clamor, whose chief and exclusive function is to construe that constitution and its distribution of powers, and which can say to the congress: 'Thus far and no farther,' and to the chief executive: 'Thus far and no farther.'

"This talk about 'despotism' and 'despots' and 'airs of eastern potentates,' the exercise of 'royal powers,' 'governing without the consent of the governed,' 'King George III.' and the like, is not at all new in respect of the government of unorganized territories of the United States.

"All these phrases and epithets were used and applied to Jefferson and his administration of the newly acquired Louisiana purchase under the bill signed by him and drawn by Madison.

Old Cry Is Familiar.

"The same is practically true of Florida, when, following the Jefferson precedent, its government was debated. An amendment providing that all the principles of the constitution be 'declared to be applicable to the said territory as paramount acts' was voted down. Webster indorsed the same theory as to Florida in 1828.

"But these populists and Boxers set up a sort of joss and then desecrate our calendar by labeling it St. Jefferson.

"The Philippine question is a problem to be solved by the congress so far as the whole territory is concerned. It may be determined to withdraw the flag, as in Cuba.

"But in no place on earth must that flag be hauled down under fire.

"On the finance question, two or three respected friends use this logic substantially:

Wedded to Free Silver.

"'It is true that the Kansas City platform declares for national and commercial dishonor by the "immediate" free coinage of silver at 16 to 1 as legal tender.

"'It is true that the candidate who stands upon it has said "if there is anyone who believes a gold standard a good thing or that it must be maintained, I warn him not to cast his vote for me, because I promise him that it will not be maintained in this country longer than I am able to get rid of it."

"'It is true that the same candidate made it a condition of accepting the nomination that the declaration for free silver should be inserted in the platform. Nevertheless, by reason of republican legislation and a republican senate the candidate we support cannot accomplish the result he declares for.'

"Even it were true, which I deny, that Mr. Bryan, if elected, could not order the payment of the public obligations in silver, or that the mere election of such a man on such a platform would not destroy confidence in the credit and honor of the nation, and before inauguration drive gold out of the country and into hoarding places; now, even if it were true that such a declaration indorsed by the American people would not entail individual and commercial demoralization, as well as financial distress, still with all deference to men whom I respect, this logic seems to me the baldest sophistry.

Anarchist of Finance.

"It may be admitted that the man who proposes to have the nation make a debt paying dollar or labor-paying dollar out of 50 cents of silver and 50 cents of vacuum, is sincere in his views of political economy. So is the anarchist sincere, and his physical and moral courage (though perverted) cannot be questioned when, taking his life in his hand, he adopts assassination as a proper political method.

"Suppose in order to get the anarchist vote, the platform had indorsed assassination as a political means, and suppose the friends of the candidate appealed to us for votes on the ground that, although the declaration for assassination was in the platform, yet in fact it could never be made effectual, because the republican police protection was too perfect, would we listen to the proposition?

"Yet the logic is the same, and the analogy should not offend, for the turpitude of the two declarations would differ little in degree in the opinion of the two or three men who are endeavoring to so reason themselves into voting for Bryan.

Recalls a Bit of History.

"If there are any who, while differing radically with Mr. Bryan in these things, yet from political expediency think that they should vote 'with the organization,' let me call their attention to a bit of recent history—including anew an old lesson sadly learned even by Mr. Webster—'that political honesty is political expediency.'

"Memory in the northwest need go back less than two decades to recall the time when greenbackism dominated the democratic party. Within the same time we have witnessed the struggles of members of our party to escape their records as greenbackers.

"In every case the man with political ambition of prominence, on whom could be fastened the greenback record has passed protesting, into private life.

"While the republicans are responsible for many evils that beset us in our domestic economy, the crisis is such that this is no time to discuss them.

"The house is on fire; we must help our fellow occupants to put it out, however much we may have differed from them on the policies of housekeeping, and although against our protest they had persisted in the policy of using kerosene to start the kitchen stove.

Time for Honest Action.

"Let no democrat be influenced by false reports as to the attitude in this crisis of any man whom we have trusted, who, pointing to his record to speak for him now, may deem it unnecessary to speak again.

"We should never lose faith in the stability of the works of God—least of all in the noblest of them—an honest man.

"I take my place proudly by the side of Abram S. Hewitt, under whom I fought in the great battle for Tilden and democracy in 1876.

"Waiting in confidence the call of men like him to gather for the reorganization of my party, like him I conceive it to be my solemn duty to vote against Bryanizing the democratic party, and to rid the party and country of Bryanism; and so, like him, in the ranks of the true democracy, I shall go to the polls and cast my ballot for President McKinley.

"DON M. DICKINSON.

THINK IT OVER.

Facts and Figures That Will Interest Every One Who Has a Vote.

Exports of the United States for two years under the Dingley republican tariff	$2,458,505,683
Exports of the United States for the first two years under the Wilson democratic tariff	1,690,145,108
Balance in favor of republican tariff	$ 768,360,539
Exports of the United States for the year 1899	$1,450,000,000
Imports of the United States for the year 1899	727,000,000
Balance in our favor for 1899	$ 723,000,000
Savings bank deposits under democratic administration in 1895	$1,841,000,000
Savings bank deposits under republican administration in 1899	2,199,000,000
Increase under the prosperous McKinley administration	$ 358,000,000

Estimated number of idle men in the United States at the close of the last democratic administration, 2,000,000.

Estimated number of idle men in the United States at the close of McKinley's first term—none who were willing to work.

Estimated increase of wages under republican rule, from 15 to 25 per cent. —Judge.

In Croker's Power.

Mr. Bryan has conspicuously put himself in Croker's power and Croker will as relentlessly exact his pound of flesh, should Bryan win, as ever Shylock did. We don't know what Croker will demand, but what ever it may be he will get it. Mr. Bryan has never had any experience of that kind, and probably never will have any; but he has surrendered himself to the archconspirator against good government in New York, and if he should happen to pull through in November he may depend upon hearing from Mr. Croker. That would be sad for Bryan, but it would be worse for the country. Fortunately, we have no reason to lose any sleep by worrying over the prospect of it.—Rochester Democrat and Chronicle

Populistic "Patriotism."

Here is the patriotic sentiment voiced by a populist orator at Wellington: "The American flag in the hands of McKinley has become an emblem of the skull and crossbones, and it should be torn down and trampled under foot." —Kansas City Journal.

Eating Up the Profits.

Experts estimate that Croker's display of fireworks in honor of Bryan cost a sum equal to the profits of the ice trust for an entire week.—N. Y. Mail and Express.

THE G. O. P.

(Written for the American Economist.)

I'm no great politician an' I ain't got much t' say
Concernin' present candidates fer office, ner th' way
Th' lads in high-toned go'ment jobs their duties should discharge,
Ner whether no they're salaried too little er too large,
Who run th' vast affairs o' state in Washington, D. C.,
But I know that I'm a stan'by o' th'
G.
O.
P.

I don't know how th' Coxeyites their medicine enjoyed,
Ner jest how many workin'men, long steadily employed,
Went tourin' on th' hog train under Grover's sovereign sway,
Ner how many ducks were massacred th' while at Buzzard's Bay;
But I think that in th' future there is men who'll wiser be,
An' with me will be a-shouting fer th'
G.
O.
P.

I don't know if th' nation's in th' hole er out o' debt,
Ner th' job that Dewey's lookin' fer, ner what he's apt t' get;
Ner th' fate o' Bryan, Stevenson, er any hidden chap
That's layin' low fer something soft, snug in th' nation's lap;
But I think on next election day a grand encore there'll be,
Fer him—our faithful servant o' th'
G.
O.
P.

Fer I think th' reins o' government to-day are in th' hands
O' one who knows th' people an' th' people's demands;
An' who's ample proved t' all th' world, thro' methods fair an' square,
That truth an' love an' justice grace th' presidential chair;
An' I, with many others, in a manner frank an' free,
Predict a long, bright future fer th'
G.
O.
P.

—George Bryant.

RIGHT TO THE POINT

Something About President McKinley's Letter of Acceptance.

Free Trade, Free Silver and "Imperialism" Shown Under the White Light of History, Fact and Truth.

More than ever honored in its observance is the custom of so framing letters of acceptance as to define political issues, plainly and clearly. Rightly letters of acceptance have come to be regarded as of more importance than party platforms. A party platform is of necessity a condensed generalization of principles and policies. A letter of acceptance permits of a more detailed form of expression and a more definite presentment of questions at issue. A notable example of this is furnished in the letter of acceptance written by President McKinley, September 8, in response to the formal notification of his nomination as the candidate of the republican party for reelection.

It is a message to the American people that cannot possibly fail to command the respect and confidence of everyone who reads it. The bitterest opponent of republicanism will not be able to point out a word or a sentence that any fair minded, patriotic citizen could cavil at. Even the political enemies of the president are constrained to acknowledge that the letter of acceptance is dignified, candid, able, lucid and impressive—in short, a model among state papers of this class. It is the hardest thing to answer or refute that Mr. Bryan and his followers have had or will have to tackle in this campaign.

President McKinley wastes no words and loses no time in getting down to business. In the opening paragraph he brings to the front the Bryanite purpose to destroy the gold standard and erect in its place the standard of free silver. After quoting the declarations in this year's platforms of the democratic party, the populist party and the silver party, the president says:

In all three platforms these parties announce that their effort shall be unceasing until the gold act shall be blotted from the statute books and the free and unlimited coinage of silver at 16 to 1 shall take its place.

So the issue is presented. It will be noted that the demand is for the immediate restoration of the free coinage of silver at 16 to 1. If another issue is paramount, this is immediate. It will admit of no delay and will suffer no postponement.

In this connection President McKinley puts a pointed question:

Will the American people, through indifference or fancied security, hazard the overthrow of the wise financial legislation of the last year and revive the danger of the silver standard with all of the inevitable evils of shattered confidence and general disaster which justly alarmed and aroused them in 1896?

Attention is directed to the vital fact, too apt to be overlooked by cheerful optimists who oppose Bryanism, that "the Chicago platform of 1896 is reaffirmed in its entirety by the Kansas City convention. Nothing has been omitted or recalled; so that all the perils that threatened are presented anew with the added force of a deliberate reaffirmation." This is true of free coinage and the destruction of the gold standard, and it is equally true of free trade and the destruction of the American protective tariff system. Sound money and protection are as much at stake in this campaign as they were in the campaign of 1896. Wisely and well does President McKinley remind the country of this important fact.

On the subject of the tariff the president is brief but emphatic. He says:

The republican party remains faithful to its principle of a tariff which supplies sufficient revenues for the government and adequate protection to our enterprises and producers; and of reciprocity, which opens foreign markets to the fruits of American labor and furnishes channels through which to market the surplus of American farms. The time honored principles of protection and reciprocity were the first pledges of republican victory to be written into public law.

Equally concise and direct is the president's indorsement of the maritime canal project to unite the waterways of the Atlantic and Pacific.

On the subject of trusts he is plain and unmistakable. Combinations which suppress competition and advance prices to the general consumer he denounces as "obnoxious to the common law and the public welfare." He adds:

Discrimination between what is injurious and what is useful and necessary in business operations is essential to the wise and effective treatment of this subject. Honest cooperation of capital is necessary to meet new business conditions and extend our rapidly increasing foreign trade, but conspiracies and combinations intended to restrict business, create monopolies and control prices should be effectively restrained.

The best service which can be rendered to labor is to afford it an opportunity for steady and remunerative employment and give it every encouragement for advancement. The policy that subserves this end is the true American policy. The last three years have been more satisfactory to American workingmen than many preceding years. Any change of the present industrial or financial policy of the government would be disastrous to their highest interests. With prosperity at home and an increasing foreign market for American products, employment should continue to wait upon labor, and with the present gold standard the workingman is secured against payments for his labor in a depreciated currency. For labor a short day is better than a short dollar; one will lighten the burdens, the other lessens the rewards of toil. The one will promote contentment and independence; the other penury and want. The wages of labor should be adequate to keep the home in comfort, educate the children, and, with thrift and economy, lay something by for the days of infirmity and old age.

The restoration of the American merchant marine receives attention as follows:

Ninety-one per cent. of our exports and imports are now carried by foreign ships. For ocean transportation we pay annually to foreign shipowners over $165,000,000. We ought to own the ships for our carrying trade with the world, and we ought to build them in American shipyards and man them with American sailors. Our own citizens should receive the transportation charges now paid to foreigners. I have called the attention of congress to this subject in my several annual messages.

A considerable portion of the letter of acceptance is devoted to the subject of territorial expansion and the questions that have come up in that connection. In order that the facts and conditions may be made clear to every mind President McKinley constitutes himself for the time being a historian, and an admirable historian he proves to be. Never before has the whole story of our acquisition of Porto Rico and the Philippine islands been more truthfully or more candidly presented. Certainly the "anti-imperialism" bugbear has never been so thoroughly squelched. Every line of this cogent recital breathes pure patriotism, love of liberty and a determination to discharge the heavy tasks thrust upon the government by the outcome of the Spanish war in a lofty spirit of true republicanism—the type of republicanism that from 1861 up to the present moment has never varied in its devotion to human freedom and human progress. As a specimen of invincible logic, what have Mr. Bryan and his "anti-imperialistic" supporters to say, what can they say, in reply to this extract from President McKinley's letter of acceptance?

Would not our adversaries have sent Dewey's fleet to Manila to capture and destroy the Spanish sea power there, or, dispatching it there, would they have withdrawn it after the destruction of the Spanish fleet; and if the latter, whither would they have directed it to sail? Where would it have gone? What port in the orient was open to it? Do our adversaries condemn the expedition under the command of Gen. Merritt to strengthen Dewey in the distant ocean and assist in our triumph over Spain, with which nation we were at war? Was it not our highest duty to strike Spain at every vulnerable point, that the war might be successfully concluded at the earliest practicable moment?

And was it not our duty to protect the lives and property of those who came within our control by the fortunes of war? Could we have come away at any time between May 1, 1898, and the conclusion of peace without a stain upon our good name?

Could we have come away without dishonor at any time after the ratification of the peace treaty by the senate of the United States?

There has been no time since the destruction of the enemy's fleet when we could or should have left the Philippine archipelago. After the treaty of peace was ratified no power but congress could surrender our sovereignty or alienate a foot of the territory thus acquired. The congress has not seen fit to do the one or the other, and the president had no authority to do either if he had been so inclined, which he was not. So long as the sovereignty remains in us it is the duty of the executive, whoever he may be, to uphold that sovereignty, and if it be attacked to suppress its assailants. Would our political adversaries do less?

No honest man can read the president's exposition of the question of territorial expansion without feeling increased admiration for the patriot and statesman who presides over the destinies of this great republic. No "anti-imperialist" can read it without feeling ashamed of himself.

TWO ENDS OF A BAD TICKET.

A Prosperity Row.

A new source of trouble has [illegible] out of McKinley prosperity in [illegible]sas. At Salina two farmers [illegible] quarreling over which had the [illegible] money on deposit in a local [illegible]. After they had jawed each [illegible] awhile and raised a crowd they [illegible] off to the bank to settle it, and [illegible] last the crowd saw of them as [illegible] went down the street they were [illegible]ing their fists and wagging [illegible] heads with great earnestness.—Kansas City (Mo.) Journal.