

# Commoner Comment.

Extracts From W. J. Bryan's Paper.

## WATERSON ON DESTINY.

In a recent issue of the Courier-Journal Mr. Waterson, that quaint and always interesting journalist, advises his party to raise the white flag and surrender to the republican party on the question of imperialism. He does not announce that he is convinced of the righteousness of the republican position, but he excuses himself by assuming that it is impossible to combat the forces which seem to be behind the republican party. He admits that imperialism is an innovation upon American principles and antagonistic to the teachings of the earlier statesmen. Here are his words:

"Let us say at once that the scheme of occupying a territory remote from our borders, of subduing a people alien to our character and institutions and of undertaking a system of colonial government over this territory and these peoples without their consent—is apparently in opposition to their will—is not merely a serious violation upon the original plan embodied by the constitution of the United States, and contemplated by the authors of that constitution, but that it is repugnant to the prudent counsels delivered by the wisest of our older statesmen, to say nothing about the teaching of history."

After a brief review of the past one hundred years, he conceals the republican doctrine of providence and says: "God moves in a mysterious way His wonders to perform. He made the Spanish war. He was not less behind Dewey in Manila than He was behind Shafter and Sampson and Schley at Santiago. What was His all-wise purpose? We know not. But there we were and there we are; and nothing is surer in the future than that we shall be there a century hence unless some power turns up strong enough to drive us out. Instead, therefore, of discussing the abstraction of imperialism, illustrated by the rights and wrongs of the Philippines, Mr. Bryan was more profitably engaged in considering how we may best administer possessions, which, for good or for evil, are with us to stay."

It will be noticed that he adopts the republican theory that God is responsible for what we have done; that it is a matter of destiny, and that we are being swayed by influences over which we have no control. The doctrine enunciated by the republicans since the Spanish war, and now indorsed by so great an editor as Mr. Waterson, is not only dangerous, but it is immoral. It is politically dangerous because it encourages the republican party to shirk responsibility for its sins and shield itself behind the pretense that it is working out the will of the Almighty; and it is immoral because it obliterates the distinction between right and wrong. The republican argument is built upon the theory that wrong done upon a large scale loses its evil character, and becomes an integral part of God's plan. It is in keeping with the tendency to call an embezzler a Napoleon of finance, provided the amount embezzled is large.

Mr. Waterson has not in the past been in the habit of defending his position with the philosophy which he now employs. In former years he was known as the special champion of "the star-eyed Goddess of Reform." When the democratic party went down to defeat, as it often did, he did not say: "God moves in a mysterious way His wonders to perform. He made protection and the republican party, and, therefore, we must bow to both." On the contrary, he raised the democratic banner aloft and appealed time and again to the intelligence of the American people. Neither has he been in the habit of excusing the crimes of individuals by attributing them to divine inspiration. When Governor Goebel was assassinated Mr. Waterson did not say: "God moves in a mysterious way His wonders to perform; He prompted the assassin to kill! We cannot understand His all-wise purpose, but there we were, and here we are, and there is nothing to be done about it."

Instead, he insisted that a murder had been committed and that the guilty should be brought to justice. When the Louisville and Nashville railroad entered the arena of politics, and began its work of corruption and intimidation, Mr. Waterson did not say: "God moves in a mysterious way His wonders to perform. This railroad company has sprung into existence and must be carrying out the purposes of an all-wise Ruler."

Far from it! He insisted that the railroad should keep out of politics; and attend to the business for which it was organized. There is no more reason for throwing upon the Almighty the responsibility for a war of conquest, and for an imperial policy which burdens our nation with a large army and suppresses the aspirations of distant peoples for self-government than there is to blame Him because one individual chooses to kill another, or because a great corporation attempts to control a state government. Questions must be decided by the application of fixed and immutable principles. Jefferson said: "I know of but one code of morality for men, whether acting singly or collectively;" and Franklin expressed the same idea, only in different language, when he said: "Justice is as strictly due between neighbor nations as between neighbor citizens. The highwayman is as much a robber when he plunders a gang as when single, and the nation that wages an unjust war is only a great gang."

Perhaps the Sultan of Turkey will agree to pay that \$100,000 on the day the administration keeps its promise to Cuba.

Attorney General Knox received his appointment because he was just the man to see that the trusts received exact justice—according to the true idea of justice.

These New York "insurgents" should not prematurely rejoice over the Odelling of Uncle Tom Platt. Thomas is quite a hand at enjoying the last laugh in matters of this kind.

If Jefferson and Franklin were right, how can we delude ourselves with the doctrine of destiny which is being developed now? Yielding to a bad principle because it seems triumphant is simply an easy method of avoiding labor and sacrifice. It is a complacent but unsound philosophy, which teaches compromise with wrong merely because the enemy is strongly entrenched. No one has a right to assume that error will be permanently victorious. If some of our citizens condemn small crimes, but seem inclined to condone grand larceny and killing on a large scale, Mr. Waterson should remember his lecture on morals and point out to the deluded ones that a nation can, no more than an individual, avoid the consequences of transgression. If he believed the authors of the constitution and "the wisest of our statesmen" wrong he would be justified in repudiating their counsels, but believing them right it is surprising that he should be carried away by the brutal and barbarous doctrine upon which empires are built. His influence might help to restore American ideals; he cannot afford to aid in their overthrow.

The position of Mr. Waterson would be untenable, even if the issue of imperialism had been the only issue presented last fall and the people had deliberately indorsed the republican policy. Suppose the campaign of 1900 had been fought with no other question before the people, even then it would still be the duty of those who are conscientiously opposed to imperialism to continue the discussion, with the hope of convincing a majority of the people. But, as a matter of fact, there were a number of issues in the campaign. While imperialism was declared by the democratic convention to be paramount, every one knows that other questions entered into the contest, and it is also well known that the republican party constantly denied that it had any thought of attacking fundamental principles, or of converting a republic into an empire. The indictment brought against the republican party was so severe that a great many refused to believe the party capable of such intentions as were charged.

Then, too, the republicans sought cover behind the fact that a war was in progress. They circulated misleading reports from the Philippine islands, and declared that the lives of American soldiers were imperiled by the fact that the democrats were criticising the administration. What the democratic party needs is not advice to surrender, but courage to resist the attacks which are being made upon American doctrines and democratic principles. The campaign of 1896 was the first one in recent years when there was a radical issue between the parties. The republican party pretended to want international bimetalism, when it really wanted the gold standard. It won its victory under the cover of international bimetalism and as soon as the election was over, threw off the mask and came out for the gold standard. Many of the democratic papers which had supported the ticket, and all of the democratic papers which had deserted the party in that year, counseled the party to accept a decision, won by fraud, as conclusive of the question. And for four years the leading democratic dailies gave no assistance whatever to the democratic party in its fight against the money power.

In the campaign of 1900 the republican party practiced another fraud upon the people on the subject of imperialism, and now Mr. Waterson and a few other democratic editors advise the acceptance of the republican position on that question. On the trust question the republican party also practiced deception, and some of our democratic papers seem willing to concede the triumph of the trust principle. Nothing is to be gained from a party standpoint, and everything is to be lost from the standpoint of principle by Mr. Waterson's method of dealing with the questions at issue. He excuses the democratic party to indorse the colonial system, and then promises to send better carpet-baggers to Manila than the republicans have sent. Such a course would make our party a laughing stock.

No party is good enough to administer a colonial system honestly and for the benefit of the subjects, a nation that is selfish enough to want a colony is too selfish to do justice by it, and a party demoralized enough to indorse a colonial system would be impotent to administer it satisfactorily. The Commoner is pained to see so able and brilliant an editor as Mr. Waterson unconsciously lend his influence to the republican party. Far better that his voice should command a charge upon the republican stronghold than that it should call a retreat in the midst of a battle which must determine, not only the fate of this republic, but the fate of all republics for years to come.

The St. Louis Chronicle is charging that Mayor Wells was elected by fraud. This is adding insult to injury. To run seventeen thousand votes behind the national ticket and then owe his election to republican votes is bad enough, without having a suspicion cast upon his title. One of the most humorous remarks of the decade is the one to the effect that Philander Knox sacrifices a private income of \$50,000 a year as attorney for the Carnegie interests to accept an \$8,000 position in the president's cabinet.

Caesar had his Brutus, Charles his Cromwell, and McKinley has just given a Rodenberg to the civil service.

The discovery of a new island in the Philippine group would tend to make Mr. John A. T. Hull favor a special session of congress for concession insuring purposes.

If "La Discussion," the Havana newspaper which was suppressed by the Odelling and Silence, it might secure a new lease of life. Discussion is not popular in an empire.

## THE RAILROAD TRUST

PREPARING THE WAY FOR GOVERNMENT OWNERSHIP.

The Day Will Come When the People Will See the Light—Public Ownership of Public Franchise—The Capitulation of the Combines.

The story about the new company to control all the railroads of the United States may or may not be true. If it is not true today it will be tomorrow. It is merely the last, inevitable step in a process that has been going on steadily since our railroad system began and that has been making more rapid progress in the past few months than ever before.

If Mr. J. Pierpont Morgan, Mr. William K. Vanderbilt, Mr. James J. Hill, Mr. Edward D. Harriman, Mr. George J. Gould, Mr. John D. Rockefeller, Mr. Jacob H. Schiff and Mr. James Stillman, who have been named as the authors of this scheme, should undertake to control all the railroads of the United States, they could do it without any trouble. The only question is whether they think the time has yet come to take the step.

The railroad system of the United States was capitalized last year at twelve billion one hundred and sixty-seven million three hundred and twenty-seven thousand eight hundred and forty-nine dollars.

That is over twelve times the bonded national debt of the United States. It is four times the debt of Great Britain.

It is equal to the capital of a dozen Billion Dollar Trusts.

It represents over a hundred and twenty of the Hundred Million Dollar Trusts that were considered the monsters of finance a few years ago.

But the railroads are not so unmanageable when they are approached by the right men in the right way. Of their total capitalization the stock represents only \$5,742,181,181, of which a majority, giving a controlling interest, would amount to less than \$2,875,000,000. As many railroad stocks are selling far below par it is probable that a majority could be bought for \$2,000,000,000.

But it is not necessary for Mr. Morgan, Mr. Rockefeller and their associates to own a majority of the stock. When the late Cornelius Vanderbilt died it was found that he owned less than one per cent of the stock of the New York Central, the typical "Vanderbilt road." With \$500,000,000 in cash, their skill in manipulation and their control of banks, industrial enterprises and financial agencies of all sorts, the members of the proposed syndicate would have no trouble in securing the mastery of every railroad in the country.

When the Universal Railroad Trust comes, whether today, tomorrow or next week, it will handle revenues more than twice as great as those of the national government and employ ten times as many men as the United States keeps in its army on a war footing. And then the American policy—"Public Ownership of Public Franchises"—will be the central issue of practical politics.

## LET US BUY MOOSE BY ALL MEANS.

The state of New York, at the public expense, proposes to buy a hundred head of moose and turn them loose in the Adirondacks.

Moose used to be plentiful in the Adirondacks. When Thomas Jefferson was in Paris, more than a hundred years ago, he sent for a moose skeleton to prove to French naturalists that we had big animals on this continent. The naturalists had asserted that it was an inferior continent because it had no big animals.

Now our prosperous sportsmen have killed off all the moose in the Adirondack region it is proposed to get more and turn them out among the trees.

This seems to us a splendid and truly republican idea. One rich man in the Adirondacks owns seventy-five thousand acres and another owns one hundred thousand acres. They often invite their friends up there to shoot, and it is absolutely humiliating to have those friends walk around all day and never get a single moose.

The moose that are to be bought at public expense are to be brought from Canada and the Rocky Mountains, and it will probably not cost more than a hundred thousand dollars to land them in the Adirondacks.

It is impossible to estimate the pleasure, ozone and wholesome exercise that a dozen or more prosperous men will get by walking through the woods and killing these moose after they are turned adrift.

In a country like this, where we are so liberal with our public schools, where every child can find playgrounds near its house, where every mother receives care when ill, it seems only reasonable to purchase moose at the public expense for the gentlemen who own a hundred thousand acres of Adirondack land. Doubtless Governor Odell of New York will hasten to approve this moose idea.

## STORY OF THE ASPHALT WAR.

According to a Washington correspondent the trouble between the United States and Venezuela grows out of the dispute between two American asphalt companies and out of nothing else. Even the arrest and imprisonment of the American consular agent in the asphalt state of Bermudez arises out of that dispute.

The story is, in short, that what is known as the asphalt trust acquired certain rights in the asphalt lake on

the island of Trinidad from one Horatio R. Hamilton, who obtained a concession from the Venezuelan government near the end of 1888. These rights, as claimed by the trust, are so sweeping as to amount to a monopoly of all the asphalt deposits in the state of Bermudez.

But in 1897 some Venezuelans claimed to have discovered new deposits in Bermudez, and some two years later sold out their claims to certain persons in Syracuse, N. Y. These persons secured a concession from the new president of Venezuela, who became president in the usual Spanish-American way, and proceeded to take possession. The trust resisted, the Venezuelan government sustained the Syracuse concessionaires and the two companies have been quarreling violently ever since. The Venezuelan government has resented the interference of the American minister and consular agents, who seem to have espoused the cause of the trust unreservedly.

The trust relies upon a clause in the concession to Hamilton which stipulates that it "shall remain in force for twenty-five years, commencing from this date, Dec. 7, 1888, and during that time the government shall not grant equal rights in the state of Bermudez to any other person." The trust claims that the present government has assumed to grant "equal rights" to the Syracuse company, and has therefore violated the stipulation quoted.

According to this story the contention of the trust may be correct. That, however, is a matter to be settled by the courts of Venezuela and not by the American minister to that country nor by the state department in Washington, much less by the parties to the dispute.

It is interesting to note that according to the account given by Mr. Curtis the trust is fighting for nothing but the exclusive right until about 1914 to take asphalt from a deposit which is apparently inexhaustible.

The statement is made that the asphalt comes up boiling in the Trinidad lake and that what is taken out is quickly replaced from the interior source of supply. It cannot be contended, therefore, that the operations of the Syracuse company would diminish the supply from which the trust is drawing. The latter is making its fight not to prevent encroachment on its supply, but to keep another company from competing with it in supplying the markets with asphalt.

Our representatives in Venezuela have evidently been taking sides with monopoly in a matter which should be settled in the courts.

## THE MORGAN CANAL STORY.

State department officials are said to make a "sweeping denial" of the statement that J. Pierpont Morgan has been in consultation with the powers that be in Washington about the completion of the Panama canal by private enterprise.

Nevertheless the statement is reiterated in its essential features. It is said that while it is unquestionably true that Mr. Morgan has made no overtures to that department he has talked with the president in his private office at the white house and informed him that if his assistance and that of congress can be assured the project will not cost the United States a dollar.

Furthermore, we are assured that even the state department has practically admitted that it is in possession of information that Mr. Morgan and his associates are in a position to take immediate possession of the Panama canal and proceed with the work. Yet it denies that he has made any overtures for the purpose of securing the aid of the government in carrying out the enterprise.

If Mr. Morgan and his associates have an "option," as the state department is said to admit, we may depend on it he has some business to transact with the government of the United States. He has the option with a view to taking possession until he knows what the government is going to do. He will want to know, first, whether the government is determined to construct a canal at its own expense, for we are not to suppose that he intends to go ahead anyhow and take the risk of having a government canal to compete against.

If, then, he has the option it is not merely credible, but highly probable, that though he may not have talked matters over with officials of the state department he has talked with someone who can speak with more authority than even Secretary Hay.

## AN APOSTLE OF "GET THERE."

Tom L. Johnson has always been known as a hustler, but even his enemies did not expect him to put such triple expansion energy into his hustling as he has this week. It was expected that he would take office ten days after the election, according to the usual custom. That would have given time for the retiring mayor to sign an ordinance giving away most of Cleveland's water front to a corporation. An injunction temporarily prevented this action, and by hurrying the election board in the canvass of the vote Mr. Johnson succeeded in getting his certificate, taking the oath of office, filing his bond and taking possession of the mayor's desk just thirty-seven minutes before the injunction expired.

That explains some of Johnson's successes as a leader. He knows what he wants and goes as straight to his mark as a Krag-Jorgensen bullet. The public interests will not be sacrificed while he is on hand or anywhere in the neighborhood. And he can be a good way off and still get there in time.

## TRADE FOLLOWS FLAG

FOR THE REASON THAT ARMIES WILL CONSUME.

Why Our Exports to Asiatic Countries Have Increased During the Past Two Years—A Republican Paper Calls Attention to the Matter.

The Philadelphia North American, an enterprising and outspoken Republican paper, editorially says as follows:

**Soldiers Make Markets.**  
"The Treasury Department, thru the Bureau of Statistics, deprecates the great falling off in exports from the United States to China since the beginning of hostilities. It puts the loss at 50 per cent in the last seven months. In practically all of the articles other than those required by the troops in the field there has been a marked decrease, the reduction being greatest in those articles which enter into the daily requirements of the life of the native people."

"Evidently what is needed to stimulate trade with China is to send a larger force of American troops across the Pacific. Then the volume of exports from this country will rise rapidly. Consider how commerce with the Philippines has grown. Only a few weeks ago the Bureau of Statistics gave out a statement showing how our imports into the Philippines, since 50,000 troops had been stationed in the islands, had increased nearly tenfold. True, they had risen last year to only \$1,650,000, of which about one-fifth was represented by whisky and beer for the officers and men, and as much more by fodder for animals used in connection with the army, but the per cent increase was most flattering. Of course, if the troops had remained at home the whisky and beer would not have been consumed in the Philippines, and our trade with the islands would not have grown so fast in other lines, so that the world would have known nothing about the extent of our business."

"The conclusion to be drawn from the Treasury Department's reports on Oriental trade is obviously this: If the Chinese and Malays will not purchase as much from us as we want to sell them, we must send armies abroad to compel them to buy. If they still refuse to help build up our foreign trade, our soldiers and the camp followers will be of the greatest assistance in making a favorable report. The Bureau of Statistics has proved what an excellent plan it is to export American soldiers to the Philippines to buy American exports."

Would you call this an "eye opener?" If so, shall we open our eyes and look? And what shall we see? We shall see the doctrine, "trade follows the flag," is a delusion and a snare. It is not right to get trade by the sword, and such attempts usually fail, as they should. When such attempts succeed, the cost is greater than the gain. It does not pay, and it should not pay.

On the contrary, our trade has entered many parts of the world where we would not even think of sending our bayonets, and there our "arts of peace" are winning notable victories. From a military point of view, we are at peace with Great Britain; yet we have gone in her own territory in Africa and built bridges, winning over British contractors on account of superior skill, more prompt completion of contract, and lower prices. This is but one illustration of our invasion of British territory, heretofore considered secure to the English iron-masters. As a consequence, our iron and steel interests are flourishing; but the cruel part of it is that the working men in the iron districts of England are suffering. The point I wish to show is this: These trade victories have not been won by bayonets, nor have they "followed the flag." They have been won by the arts of peace. Do you see it?

This is only a small part of the story. Our agricultural and other machinery is very extensively used in Germany, Russia and all over Europe—all over the world, in fact. Our locomotives, sewing machines, typewriters, etc., are known in every country and every clime. No "following the flag" in this. These trade "expansions" have been going on for a very long time, and are continually increasing, but if we beat our tools of the peaceful arts into bayonets and swords, we may expect our extensive and "expanding" trade relations to rapidly contract.

It is strange that many people don't see anything but the "band-wagon effect." With them the band-wagon is the whole circus; a military dress parade is the whole national existence! Let us get over our "band-wagon days" and our "drum-major days," and in the consciousness of full-fledged faculties, let us look at facts as they are, and also consider right and justice, as we would wish right and justice for our selves.—C. F. Taylor, Philadelphia.

## OUR TAX BURDEN.

Probable appropriations of the Fifty-sixth congress, \$1,500,000,000; per capita, \$20. Money in circulation in the United States Jan. 1, 1901, \$2,173,251,879; per capita, \$28.19.

"This simple statement gives a better idea of the wholesale raiding of the treasury by the present congress than a page of figures. It is not exaggerated; indeed the amount of the appropriations is more likely underestimated."

## Bewildering Figures.

"Not since the civil war has the per capita of expenditures been so high, and not since the year 1858, when the effects of the great sectional struggle had not yet been felt at the treasury,

has it been half so high. This is remarkable, but it is also true. More startling still is the fact that only in three of the four years that that great war lasted did the per capita of expenditures exceed the present amount, and then, with the exception of 1864, by only a few dollars. The following table shows the per capita of expenditures each year from 1837 to 1901, the figures for the last named year being conservatively estimated:

Year.	Net Expense.	Per Capita Exp.
1837.....	\$37,243,496.00	\$2.38
1838.....	33,865,059.00	2.10
1839.....	26,899,128.00	1.62
1840.....	24,317,579.00	1.42
1841.....	26,565,873.00	1.51
1842.....	25,205,761.00	1.39
1843 (6 mos.).....	11,858,075.00	1.27
1844.....	22,337,571.00	1.16
1845.....	22,937,408.00	1.15
1846.....	27,766,925.00	1.35
1847.....	57,281,412.00	2.71
1848.....	45,877,225.00	2.08
1849.....	45,051,657.00	2.09
1850.....	39,543,492.00	1.71
1851.....	47,709,017.00	1.99
1852.....	44,194,919.00	1.78
1853.....	48,184,111.00	1.83
1854.....	58,044,862.00	2.20
1855.....	59,742,668.00	2.19
1856.....	69,571,026.00	2.48
1857.....	67,795,708.00	2.34
1858.....	74,185,270.00	2.49
1859.....	69,070,977.00	2.26
1860.....	63,130,598.00	2.01
1861.....	66,546,645.00	2.03
1862.....	474,761,819.00	14.52
1863.....	714,740,725.00	21.42
1864.....	865,322,614.00	25.42
1865.....	1,297,555,224.00	37.34
1866.....	529,809,417.00	14.68
1867.....	357,542,675.00	9.87
1868.....	377,340,285.00	10.21
1869.....	322,865,278.00	8.55
1870.....	309,653,561.00	8.03
1871.....	292,177,188.00	7.39
1872.....	277,517,963.00	6.84
1873.....	290,345,245.00	6.97
1874.....	302,633,873.00	7.07
1875.....	274,623,393.00	6.25
1876.....	265,101,085.00	5.87
1877.....	241,334,475.00	5.21
1878.....	236,964,327.00	4.98
1879.....	168,947,884.00	5.46
1880.....	287,642,958.00	5.34
1881.....	260,712,888.00	5.08
1882.....	257,981,440.00	4.91
1883.....	265,408,138.00	4.91
1884.....	244,126,244.00	4.44
1885.....	260,226,935.00	4.63
1886.....	242,483,138.00	4.22
1887.....	267,332,179.00	4.66
1888.....	267,942,801.00	4.46
1889.....	299,288,978.00	4.83
1890.....	318,040,710.00	5.07
1891.....	365,773,905.25	5.73
1892.....	345,023,330.58	5.30
1893.....	283,477,954.49	5.48
1894.....	367,525,279.83	5.73
1895.....	356,195,298.29	5.16
1896.....	352,179,446.08	5.01
1897.....	365,774,159.57	5.11
1898.....	443,368,582.80	6.07
1899.....	605,072,179.85	8.14
1900.....	487,718,791.71	6.29
1901-1902 est.	1,500,000,000.00	20.00

"The appropriations for the fiscal year made by the present congress at its first session was \$710,150,862. The regular annual estimates of appropriations already made for 1902 amount to \$743,474,804. Accepting these figures the total of appropriations for the Fifty-sixth congress would be \$1,453,625,666."—Philadelphia North American.

## How Did You Like It?

How does the above story impress you? I do not believe that taxes are necessarily a burden. Taxes usually are, and always should be, the best possible investment that we can make. When we consider that, for the taxes we pay, we get all the difference between government and anarchy, we must realize that we get more for the amount we pay in taxes than for any other expenditure. But while all this is true, we have a right to inquire into the manner in which our money is spent, and we have a right to require a satisfactory accounting.

I favor a growing increase in taxation if accompanied by a growth in governmental functions—that is, governmental service. Just cast your eye down the above table again, and you will see that the notable increases in taxation have been for military purposes. Military operations are not always worth their cost. However, if our postal functions were expanded so as to cover the service now done by the express companies, that kind of "expansion" would be worth something. If it need not cost anything, for if presently planned and managed it would pay expenses at rates far below the present express charges. But the express companies have their men in both houses of congress, and they will see that the people do not get that kind of "expansion." They will keep the people amused with the "expansion" which is accompanied by martial music, blue uniforms and brass buttons, the waving of flags, etc., but they will see that the people do not get the expansion of governmental functions, which will mean greater daily service to us all. So the telegraph companies will see that we do not get a government telegraph, and the banks will see that the people do not get postal savings banks, and the railroads will see that we do not get government railroads. All this would be fatal to speculation and lucrative investments for the few. The people will decide differently when they know enough.

## Were on the Wrong Side.

Minnneapolis Times: Senator Hanna says the Ohio elections were nothing but local affairs. Very true, and it is unfortunate indeed that Mr. Hanna's party was so uniformly on the side that did not suit the people who did the voting.

## Bewildering Figures.

"Not since the civil war has the per capita of expenditures been so high, and not since the year 1858, when the effects of the great sectional struggle had not yet been felt at the treasury,