

## THE ISSUE AS IT NOW IS.

### Dispatches for and Against the Advisory Board of the A. P. A.

Editorial Opinions Culled From  
Papers in Various Parts of  
the Country.

The dispatches and opinions which follow are offered without any comment:

Says the *Butte Examiner*: The Wisconsin *Patriot*, in speaking of presidential candidates, remarked that if the Republican party should name Linton and Bradley as its standard-bearers next June, there would be no necessity of any other parties holding a convention, as Linton and Bradley would win hands down. We are inclined to believe that there is more truth than poetry in this remark. There is no doubt but what Linton is the choice of the great majority of the members who compose the patriotic organizations of this country. While Linton is but young in years, and in experience in legislative halls, yet during the three or four years that he has been in congress, he has not only proven himself the peer of the great majority of men who compose the national congress, but he has ever been the ready defender of American principles and institutions. His ready and fearless defense of these principles and institutions, is what has so endeared him to the minds and hearts of all true Americans. There are, at the present time, nearly fifty different patriotic organizations in this country, all of which, virtually, have been organized for the same purpose, that could, if they would but lay aside all past party affiliations, and unite in purpose as one party, elect any candidate they so desired. Of the delegates who will go to the Republican convention at St. Louis, the A. P. A.'s will undoubtedly have the balance of power, and could, if delegates who are members of other patriotic organizations would join them, elect Linton and Bradley, or Linton and Cullom, or Linton and Lincoln. We prefer Linton first on the ballots for president and vice-president. Linton is the man for the hour. He stands preeminently as the greatest champion of American principles that the last quarter of this century has seen. We are afraid of McKinley; we are afraid of Reed. The A. P. A.'s of Ohio once regarded McKinley as their friend, and in proof of this, thousands of A. P. A.'s who had long affiliated with the Democratic party, voted for him, thus assisting in swelling his majority for governor of Ohio to nearly 100,000. But McKinley has proven a traitor to our cause. He is even afraid to acknowledge that he is in sympathy with the principles that we have so earnestly espoused. While it is true that the states which are booming Reed for the presidency have incorporated in their platforms planks for which the A. P. A.'s are battling, yet Reed has not, and perhaps will not publicly declare himself. We can not afford to take any chances. Let us endeavor to nominate Linton, and no mistake will be made.

ST. LOUIS, Mo., April 25.—Friends of McKinley in this city claim to have secured positive evidence of a deep-laid plan of Chauncey I. Filley and his advisers to betray the Ohio candidate for the Republican nomination for the presidency and have sent the proofs to McKinley and his managers. It is said that McKinley's friends will fight Filley for delegate-at-large and will work for R. C. Kerens in his stead. It is known that Kerens recently called on McKinley by request and was later summoned to Washington for a conference with the Ohioan's manager.

McKinley's friends declare that the fight will be taken to the St. Joseph convention, and that they will contest every Filley delegate in this city and insist on the seating of their men. This, it is believed, will result in the throwing out of Filley and his delegates. The opposition has fully organized with ex-Congressman Nathan Frank, E. C. Hitchcock and C. H. Spencer in control. A mass meeting will be called to elect delegates to St. Joseph.

Kerens said last night that he had always been a firm friend of McKinley and wanted to see Missouri unanimous for him. Already six congressional districts had instructed for McKinley. He thought that the machine would be outwitted in the Kansas City and St. Louis districts and that the four delegates-at-large would be instructed to



When she tries to carry two kinds of water on one shoulder, she is bound to spill one.

vote for McKinley first, last and all the time.

The *Spirit of Seventy-Six*, of Seattle, Wash., says:

The matter published in this issue concerning McKinley and the National Advisory Board of the A. P. A. is all official except the press dispatch of April 20th from Cincinnati, and that is probably reliable. The investigation of the charges made against McKinley were no doubt full and fair, and the report of the advisory board will be accepted by the members of the order, whatever their personal feelings may have been. Romanists and their sympathizers claim that the opposition of the A. P. A. will only add strength to McKinley and insure his nomination on the first ballot. We differ with them to the extent of believing McKinley will never get the nomination, as the Republican party would not be so foolish as to force his nomination under the circumstances, although the "mickles" might like to see it done.

The *Boston American-Citizen* says:

The report of the National Advisory Board on presidential candidates leaves the American Protective Association in a very unsatisfactory and thoroughly discredited condition. There is a vast amount of questioning as to the wisdom or the reliability of the report as it has been presented. Since last week's issue of the *Citizen* much light has been thrown on the subject. It is pretty generally conceded that the evidence against McKinley comes wholly—or very largely—from disappointed office-seekers—from men who are not of the highest standing. Suspicion is also aroused by the sweeping endorsement of all the other candidates—Reed, Quay, Harrison, Allison, Cullom and Morton. We think it would be fool to that if McKinley is to be rejected because he has appointed Roman Catholics to office, then surely Morton should not be endorsed; for if this be guilt, then is the New York governor much more culpable than McKinley. Strange it is, too, that Matt Quay should receive the endorsement of the A. P. A. advisory board—a professional political "boss" of the most questionable character.

If the records of the men are to be considered, why is Harrison endorsed—the man who sent Pat Egan to Chili, and gave Kerwin, O'Meagher Condon, and others of the dynamite Fenian stripe, the highest offices in his gift? The fact that General Harrison kept General Morgan in office against the protests of Priest Stephan, may or may not be to his credit—it depends upon whether it was done from patriotism or pig-headedness.

The whole thing appears to be decidedly unfair. McKinley has been governor of a great state. As governor, he could not justly discriminate against every man because he was a Roman

Catholic—if the man was better fitted to fill the position than was the Protestant. The fact that the disappointed aspirant was an old soldier would certainly be in his favor in the mind of Governor McKinley—himself an old soldier—if other things had been equal. But we must remember that there is an immense difference in "old soldiers"—some were volunteers; some were drafted or went for the bounty that they got; others enlisted while intoxicated, or were "shanghaied." And there is also an immense amount of difference in the "old soldiers" as they are to-day—some are noble, high-minded, patriotic men; some are dangerous cranks; others are anything but a credit to the Grand Army. We imagine Governor McKinley knows all this and acts accordingly.

What has Reed ever done to merit the endorsement of the American Protective Association? Has he ever voted or spoken on the patriotic side when great measures were before congress? Are not his sentiments mirrored in the *Portland Press* and the *Lewiston Journal*—the two most virulent slanderers of the A. P. A.? Is not Dingley his acknowledged henchman, and is not Joe Manly his acknowledged generalissimo? And do not both these men openly proclaim their hostility to the A. P. A.? Who among the Reed leaders in Massachusetts—the Republican machine—are favorable to the patriotic orders?

The comparison between McKinley and Reed and some of the others is unfair, because McKinley, as governor, has had the appointment of many men to office, while Reed and the others have held no position which required them to choose men to fill public positions. We do not know what they would do under similar circumstances. The record of these other men, apparently, was not carefully investigated while in the case of McKinley several disappointed office-seekers sprang to the front immediately. Why was McKinley singled out as unfit, while the others were bunched as all right?

We believe the Supreme Advisory Board has acted unwisely. They allowed the investigation to go by default until all the delegates to St. Louis had been chosen, and then they sent broadcast a condemnation of McKinley and a virtual endorsement and recommendation of Reed—for that is what the report evidently means—Reed being McKinley's chief opponent.

They have acted unwisely in letting the matter go so long, and then not allowing it to go longer. If McKinley is really undesirable, they have played right into his hands. He has his delegates, all pledged; now his managers, if they are shrewd, will work the opposition of the A. P. A. for all it is worth among those who are first of all enemies of the A. P. A. It is a case

of "heads I win, tails you lose." If they had been wise they would have held back the report—now that it is so late until it was too late for McKinley's managers to work it to advantage.

Editor Morrow, of the *Cleveland Daily Leader*, which is acknowledged to be the most outspoken patriotic daily in the United States, says that McKinley is sound on patriotic lines. And this is echoed by Rev. J. L. Brandt, Rev. J. W. Hamilton, D.D., and scores of other patriotic men. To offset this testimony we have the word of a few obscure men who sent their reports to the advisory board.

The complaint is made that McKinley's managers (not McKinley himself)—Grosvenor and Hanna—treated the advisory board discourteously—refusing to see them. This is to be regretted, perhaps; but we do not see what bearing that has on McKinley's fitness for the presidency. There was a question of political acumen here; they probably reasoned that if it became known that they were conferring with the A. P. A., Mr. McKinley's enemies would use it to the utmost to injure him. Hanna and Grosvenor, are not wise, judged by A. P. A. standards. They doubtless would have received and conferred with Cardinal Gibbons or Archbishop Ireland. But we must remember that they are imbibing wisdom at every pore, and before McKinley is elected president of the United States they will be just as obsequious to the A. P. A. as they are to the Roman hierarchy. They will be in the condition of the colored brother who was kicked by the mule—"not so handsome as he used to be; but he knew a great deal more." That's what's the matter with Hanna and Grosvenor.

Dick Kerens has attached himself like a barnacle to McKinley's boom; O'Meagher Condon is for Morton; Archbishop Ireland is for Allison; and when the candidate is nominated they will all be for that one man. That is their usual course.

The *Citizen* is not for McKinley, or Reed, or Morton, or for any of the others until it knows more about them. But we consider it decidedly unwise and unjust in the Supreme Advisory Board to pick out McKinley as the target for abuse, simply on the evidence of a few obscure men; while the same advisory board gives a sweeping endorsement of Matt Quay, Morton, Reed, and all the others. And this opinion of the *Citizen* we know to be endorsed by many of the wisest and best-known men in the American Protective Association. As we have said before, suspicion is aroused by this condemnation of one man, and the sweeping endorsement of all others without investigation and without regard to character. It sounds like a revengeful cry of "Anything to beat McKinley!"

DETROIT, Mich., April 25.—"The name of Congressman W. S. Linton will be presented to the Republican convention in St. Louis." Colonel E. H. Sellers, the president of the National Council of the United Patriotic Associations, said to-day:

"The organization of which I am the president comprises some thirty patriotic societies throughout the country, with at least 5,000,000 voters. Mr. Linton, although not a candidate, will do his duty if nominated. There is a spontaneous demand for his candidacy. In the St. Louis convention we will have enough delegates to forcibly present his name, although he may not be nominated.

"The Executive Council of the A. P. A. organization, to which I and four others belong, have drawn up a platform which we will urge to be embodied in the Republican platform. Failing to nominate Linton, and also in the adoption of our platform, we shall insist that a candidate be nominated who is in harmony with our views, and shall be satisfied if we are given second place by nominating Governor Bradley of Kentucky."

"Suppose you don't succeed in anything?" the Colonel was asked.

"We will repeat our demands before the National Democratic Convention at Chicago. And in case our appeals are likewise ignored by that body we shall enter into the campaign independently. The American party will then be born and a convention called at St. Louis or Cincinnati—probably the latter city—and a new ticket placed in the field with W. S. Linton for president, and Governor Bradley for vice-president. This plan of action was decided on at a meeting of the executive council held in Washington last December. We have plenty of money—are fully equipped. With such a ticket we would sweep the country."

The colonel also said the association was opposed to McKinley. It does not favor Reed, although he has made concessions to it. Morton and Quay would be acceptable, while Allison is being conferred with. The association is dead against Cleveland, as he has ignored the order and has refused to confer with its committee.—*Dispatch to the Cincinnati Enquirer*, April 26.

SAVANNAH, April 22.—W. J. H. Traynor, supreme president of the American Protective Association, is in Savannah, organizing the Georgia state council of the order. Delegates are here from different cities and towns representing about 15,000 members in this state. In Savannah there are 2,000 members. Discussing national politics, Mr. Traynor said that the opposition of the A. P. A. would defeat the nomination of McKinley by the Republicans. If McKinley should be nominated, said Traynor, he would be defeated at the

polls in November by the A. P. A. vote, if the Democratic party put up a good man with a clean record, one who is known to be true to American principles and not a truckler to the Catholics.

"Do you charge Major McKinley with being that kind of a man?" Traynor was asked.

"I certainly do," he replied. "A review of his political career brings to light many incidents showing that he has deliberately catered to the Catholic vote for no other reason than because it was a vote that he thought could be influenced in his behalf by special favors. It was generally understood that, while governor, McKinley was unduly under the influence of Bishop Watterson of the Catholic diocese of Columbus. A leading citizen of Toledo showed me a letter a few days ago, received in answer to one written to McKinley, charging McKinley with allowing under his administration the use of public funds in buying Catholic paraphernalia for the use of priests in the prisons, other churches furnishing their own supplies. McKinley made an equivocal denial of this, if I am not mistaken, throwing it on others. While governor he appointed more Roman Catholics to office than any other Republican governor Ohio has had. In other ways he has shown a desire to curry favor with the Catholics."

"Will the A. P. A. vote as a unit, admitting that the facts are as you claim?" Traynor was asked.

"The A. P. A. will most assuredly do so," he replied. "Any one who has traveled through the north and west and talked with the hundreds of thousands of voters who are in this patriotic organization knows that they are in earnest. They are not to be trifled with. McKinley and his managers will learn that the A. P. A. is a considerably bigger and stronger thing than they are."—*Dispatch to the New York Sun*, April 23.

The *Central Star of Empire of Kearney, Neb.*, says: "No compromise with Rome. No pope or papal army wanted in this republic. For president of the United States in 1897: That good, true, loyal, popular American Republican, Hon. W. S. Linton of Michigan. Be sure and talk for, and write for, and vote for, that noble defender of your rights and your liberties, your homes and your churches, your Bibles and your schools, and all your free institutions of America—W. S. Linton. Other men are trading off their country's liberties for votes to get into office."

WASHINGTON, April 25.—It is stated on excellent authority that the National Advisory Board of the A. P. A. will soon meet again to pass upon the religious records of the men whose names have been mentioned for the Democratic nomination. The records of Cleveland, Carlisle, Russell, Pattison, Olney, Bland, Boies, Tillman, Matthews, Campbell and others will be gone over and the order will be notified which of these men are objectionable and which can pass muster. It is probable, however, that the Democratic National Convention will adopt a plank condemning the order, and if it does, the order will have the whole party to fight and not an individual aspirant for the presidency. In the Massachusetts Democratic Convention the principal speaker condemned the order and his utterances seemed to meet the sentiments of the members of the convention. Elsewhere Democratic orators have taken the same stand.

The order's attack on "Silver Dick" Bland would have been made at the last meeting of the advisory board if any member had had any idea that he would be endorsed by any state as an aspirant for the Democratic nomination. It is claimed by the order that he was one of its victims in the landslide last year, the opposition to him at that time being based on the ground that he had voted for sectarian appropriations while a member of the house, the fact that Mrs. Bland was a Catholic and that she was rearing her children in that faith being apparently too petty to be considered.

A member of the advisory board, who talked with the *Star* correspondent about the Bland family during the advisory board meeting, told the following story of the conversion of Mrs. Bland to Catholicism:

"Years ago, when she was living in Washington with her husband and children, she was taken seriously ill and her life was despaired of. Among the many visitors were a number of Catholic ladies and several Sisters of Mercy. Their attention to Mrs. Bland was so assiduous, so unselfish and so devoted that she was so impressed, and on recovering joined the Catholic church."

From authoritative sources it is (Contained on page 5.)