

was designated the "Dominion of Canada" rather than the empire of Canada, because our British friends imagined that it would grate on our nerves to have any imperial designation of government in America. We must certainly feel grateful for this consideration of our fine feelings and our sensitive republicanism; in return for this distinct favor we might afford at least to refrain from any objection when the King of England seeks to amend and enlarge his already extensive title.

There are, so far as the question of title is concerned, at least two distinguished precedents. The King of Portugal calls himself, among other things, the "Sovereign of Brazil," while the king of Spain is officially known among other designations as "King of the West Indies." Brazil long ago passed out of the keeping of Portugal and the incidents are yet fresh in the public mind which marked the withdrawal of Spanish sovereignty from the West Indies.

Great Britain yet maintains authority over Canada, and there could be no serious objection if King Edward called himself "King," "Emperor," or "Sultan of Canada." The time will come when Canada will pass from the control of Great Britain, and when that time rolls around, even then, we will not object if the British monarch finds enjoyment in an empty title having reference to a rejected sovereignty.

Gompers Replies to Schwab.

In giving testimony before the industrial commission, Mr. Schwab, of the steel trust, took occasion to condemn labor organizations on the ground that they interfere with the advancement of the more efficient. Mr. Gompers, President of the Federation of labor, replied to the criticism as follows:

"It is a misstatement to say that we are endeavoring to fix one price for the wages of workmen of any one class. What we aim at is to establish a minimum of wages, below which a workingman will not be obliged to labor. Because a minimum is established it does not follow that a worker can not receive more than that.

"We are engaged in promoting the general welfare of the working classes, and are aiming at their general improvement rather than trying to get one preferred position for some particular individual. It may be true that there are cases where a laboring man advances beyond his co-laborers, but it is usually at the expense of others. Better the conditions of the craft generally and all will profit."

"Untrammelled by the Past."

In his speech delivered at Memphis, Mr. McKinley said: "We will solve the problems which confront us untrammelled by the past."

An American, who, although he belongs to the "past," was something of a man in his day, said there was but one lamp by which his feet were guided and that was the lamp of experience. In the solution of public problems men have not heretofore regarded history and experience as being unimportant. If Mr. McKinley meant anything at all by this statement, he must have meant that we would solve the problems which now confront us on other lines than those which would have been adopted by the founders of this government.

This "past" which seems so embarrassing to Mr. McKinley has many things which Amer-

ican statesmen have been glad to accept as beacon lights on stormy seas. The declaration of independence, the impassioned utterances of the orators of the revolutionary period, the warnings of Washington in his farewell address, the utterances of Lincoln and the men of his time—these are some of the things that embarrass the McKinley administration. That administration's policy is out of harmony with the things which were in perfect accord with American character and American principles; and so long as Mr. McKinley is determined to solve "the problems which confront us" on un-American lines he will be "untrammelled by the past." The chances are, however, that before Mr. McKinley accomplishes the solution of the problems that now confront us he will be compelled to appeal to the past and learn wisdom as well as patriotism from history.

Before and After.

During the campaign of 1900 the republican papers gave great prominence to those democrats who declared their intention of voting the republican ticket. On the morning of October 18, the La Crosse Chronicle printed an interview with Mr. Albert Hirschheimer in which that gentleman gave his reasons for voting for the re-election of Mr. McKinley.

A few days ago Mr. Hirschheimer's company sold out to a trust and the La Crosse Republican and Leader of May 8th contained an interview with Mr. Hirschheimer in which he gave the reasons for selling. He began business in 1865—seven years before silver was demonetized—and the agitation of the money question never drove him out of business but the trusts have forced him to sell. Below will be found extracts from his two interviews:

Before—October 18, 1900.

Said Mr. Hirschheimer: "I voted once for Abraham Lincoln, and for William McKinley four years ago, and these are the only exceptions to my voting for the nominees of the Democratic party on national candidates. I shall vote for the re-election of President McKinley.

"My reasons, you ask; I don't court newspaper notoriety, but I will give my reasons for voting for President McKinley. They are purely business reasons. We want stability in our financial affairs, as well as stability in our tariff laws. I do not consider that a high tariff or a low tariff makes much difference. The trouble comes from anticipating changes every two or four years. I submit that the commercial interests of the country should not be made the football in the game of the politicians.

After—May 8, 1901.

Said President A. Hirschheimer: "The Packers Package Company was forced to sell out to the trust. They control the tin output and they have been hindering us so during the past month that we have not been able to run our factory only one-half its capacity. They have refused to deliver us the tin ordered, shipping only one or two cars a week. Thus we either had to sell out to them or fight them. We could not do the latter thing, for we could not get the tin with which to make our product, and carry on the fight. Therefore, we simply had to sell out to the trust. It was either that or lose our money.

Lottery by Another Name.

Some of the newspapers have adopted a scheme for increasing circulation which has all the ear marks of the old Louisiana lottery. These papers announce enormous prizes to be given as a reward to those who guess nearest to

the population of a city or state, or the vote to be cast at some future date. As there is no possible means of determining either the population or the vote the game is as purely one of chance as a guess on a wheel of fortune or on the drawing of a lottery. Only those are allowed to guess who send the subscription price of the paper with the guess, and sometimes the subscribers are encouraged to guess a large number of times. The whole system is demoralizing; it encourages and cultivates the get-something-for-nothing idea which lies at the foundation of all gambling, whether at the card table or on the stock exchange. A lottery cannot run unless it takes in more than it pays out, therefore, the chances are always against the man who patronizes it. If he keeps investing the probability is that he will put in more than he takes out, and if he wins a prize early he is apt to waste the money because it came to him so easily.

It is not probable that the postoffice department will long tolerate these guessing contests, but while they are permitted they will exert a baleful influence upon the morals of the country.

The Richmond Times' Mistake

The Richmond (Virginia) Times, has been one of the most violent opponents of democratic principles as enunciated in the Chicago platform. Its zeal in the support of a republicanized democracy has only been equalled by the ability with which it has misrepresented the position of the democratic party upon public questions. In a recent editorial it repeats what it has so often said about those who are opposed to monopolies and other republican methods of enriching a few at the expense of the many. It takes for its text an editorial which appeared in the Atlanta Constitution, and after charging the Constitution with inconsistency says:

Everybody knows that Mr. Bryan's crusade was against poverty. He has insisted that there ought to be no such thing as poverty. He has made war upon millionaires and plutocrats, and the whole tendency of his gospel has been to put all men on the same plane and to make every man as rich as his neighbor. He does not believe, if we understand him, that there should be plutocrats on the one hand and hewers of wood and drawers of water on the other. He does not believe that there should be master and man, but that every man should be his own master and serve nobody but himself.

As I have defended the principles set forth in the platforms adopted in 1896 and 1900, it is not necessary to regard the Times' editorial as a personal criticism. It is rather directed against all members of the party who have supported the platforms referred to. While the democrats believe that there should be no such thing as a "plutocrat" or a "master," it is not true that they expect to eliminate poverty, neither do they expect to make every man as rich as his neighbor. The Times discloses either great ignorance or great insincerity in the language quoted. In accepting the presidential nomination in 1896 I quoted with approval the words of Andrew Jackson, to wit:

"Distinctions in society will always exist under every just government. Equality of talents, of