

yet the ordinary games of chance are innocent amusement in comparison with the greater games played where cliques, corners and false rumors affect the market and drive prices up or down to suit the purpose of those in control.

No one will undertake to defend gambling from a moral or an economic standpoint, but why do the crusaders exhaust their energy upon the petty offenders and remain silent in the presence of big gamblers who, besides bringing ruin to thousands, lend a sort of respectability to schemes for obtaining something for nothing?

The total amount of money lost at the card table, the wheel of fortune and other games which are declared to be illegal is insignificant in comparison with the amount lost in speculation on the boards of trade and stock exchanges. Then, too, in small gambling the parties to the games and their immediate families are usually the only ones pecuniarily affected, while speculation upon the market injures the producers, consumers and legitimate dealers who try to conduct their business honestly and who themselves do not deal in futures or options.

If the ministers who discourse eloquently on sin in the slums of the cities will arraign the speculating pew holders, they will find it easier to cure the more hideous but less harmful kinds of gambling.

If the educators who have faith in the power of public opinion to remedy evil will endeavor to create a sentiment against gambling in stocks and grain and produce, they will find it easier to prevent gambling among their students. The mania for making a fortune in short order is corrupting society and undermining the business integrity as well as the morality of many communities.

A Bad Symptom.

The Cleveland Leader in a recent issue contained an editorial which must have grated upon the sensibilities of such of its readers as believe in American principles. It said:

One need not be suspected of the slightest leaning toward any form of hereditary government if he admits freely that many monarchies are far better governed than most of the republics of South America. The conditions which are chronic in countries like Venezuela and the United States of Colombia are a reproach to the name of democracy. They burlesque free institutions.

It is a bad symptom when a great daily offers a gratuitous insult to the republics of South America in order to show its respect for a monarchy. The first part of the item is a very lame apology for what follows and instead of relieving the editor from suspicion shows that he was conscious that his words if properly construed would prove him to be a sympathizer with the European idea of government.

The Worm Turns.

The testimony of J. M. Langley of the Merchants Association of New York before the Industrial commission would indicate that the New York merchants are getting a taste of the corporate domination which they seemed willing to support so long as people in other parts of the country were the victims. It looks

as if the worm is about to turn. According to a press dispatch he said:

The railroads are a power that amount to arbitrary taxation and in the making of these classifications, which really amount to rate-making, the merchants have no representation. The changes, he said, in the territory south of the Ohio and east of the Mississippi, amounted to an advance of about two-thirds in 200 items of classification and a complaint he had made was dismissed by the road as too general in spite of the wholesale nature of the advance. He cites a large number of instances of alleged discrimination between carload and less than carload rates which he claimed to be unjustifiable.

He referred to the system of inspection of freight at transfer points by inspectors employed by the roads and railroad associations, and charges that rates are often cut by the inspectors "looking the other way" in inspecting freight for the large and more powerful shippers. This right to open freight consignments, the witness said, was assumed by the road and the merchants did not object. Objection, he stated, would not inure to their interests.

It is possible that discrimination may become so intolerable that the New York merchants will be forced to cast in their lot with those who believe in compelling corporations to treat the public fairly.

When Harmony is Possible.

There is no word more pleasant to the ear than "harmony;" there is no condition more delightful to contemplate or to enjoy than "harmony"; and there is no phrase more shamefully abused than "harmony."

Just now some men who were formerly democrats are pleading loudly for "harmony" and they offer to deliver their particular and peculiar brand of "harmony" post paid to any part of the country—west and south preferred. Their promises and guarantees read like the advertisement of a sorceress. "Estranged friends reconciled, waning love revived, obstacles to reunion removed, lost property found and a happy and prosperous life ensured."—This is but a partial catalogue of the good things held out by the sooth-sayers who ply their avocation under the guise of reorganizers.

No one should be deceived by this pretended desire for harmony. No process has ever been discovered for welding together into one harmonious party men who differ in conviction and desire the triumph of opposite principles. There can be no difference of opinion among intelligent and honest men as to the basis of real or permanent harmony.

In Webster's dictionary harmony is defined as "concord and agreement in facts, opinions, manners, interests, etc." This is the only foundation upon which useful or enduring harmony can rest.

There was harmony in the democratic party until 1892. In that year Mr. Cleveland ran for president upon a platform which was clear and definite on the tariff question, but ambiguous on the money question. One part of the platform was emphasized in the east and another part in the south, while in the west the democrats were advised by the democratic national committee to vote the populist ticket in

order to defeat the republican electors in states where the democrats were known to be in the minority. Following these instructions the democrats helped to carry Kansas, Colorado, Idaho and Nevada for the populist candidates and almost carried the state of Nebraska.

When Mr. Cleveland took his seat he surrounded himself with a cabinet composed of men who, on the money question, dissented from the views of the majority of the democrats who voted for him. Instead of calling Congress together to consider the tariff question which had been made the paramount issue and about which nearly all democrats agreed, he waited until summer and then convened congress in extraordinary session to consider a financial measure proposed by Senator John Sherman a year before. This measure was forced through congress by a disgraceful use of patronage, and received the support of a larger percentage of the republican congressmen than of the democratic congressmen. Soon afterwards a bill was passed to coin the seignorage—a bill which was supported by a majority of the democrats and opposed by a majority of the republicans. Mr. Cleveland vetoed this bill at the demand of New York financiers.

A little later he made a contract with the Rothschild-Morgan syndicate for the sale of gold bonds and then asked Congress to ratify the contract, but a democratic congress refused to do it. Then came the election of 1894 which gave the republicans a majority of over one hundred and forty in Congress. To understand the change which took place in two years (and that, too before the party standard was placed "in unfamiliar hands," as Mr. Cleveland would say) it is only necessary to remember that the democrats had a majority of ninety-two in the preceding Congress. In this new Congress, elected in '94, New York had only six democrats, Pennsylvania two, Ohio two, Illinois one, and Indiana none.

At that election the republicans carried eleven of the fifteen districts of Missouri and Mr. Hill was defeated for Governor in New York by 156,108.

Of the twenty-nine senators whose terms began the following March eighteen were republicans, ten were democrats and one a populist.

In the spring of 1895 it became apparent that the next national convention would have to deal with the money question. On April 13, Mr. Cleveland wrote a letter to a Sound Money League in Chicago defending his own financial views and opposing those which he knew to be entertained by a majority of his party. Near the conclusion of the letter he said: "Disguise it as we may, the line of battle is drawn between the forces of safe currency and those of silver monometallism." The following month, Mr. Carlisle, then secretary of the treasury, went to Memphis and attempted to organize the southern democracy in support of the president's position.

In June of that year the democrats who favored bimetalism sent delegates to a meeting at Memphis and at that meeting the National Silver Committee was appointed. Then fol-