

cover, that it was fear of defeat which impelled Washington to decline a third nomination. Being a federalist he was the object of very violent attacks on the part of the democrats of his day, and recognizing the growing strength of his opponents he doubted, as I believe, his ability to again secure an election if he should run."

This will be interesting to those who have given Washington credit for honesty. It would detract somewhat from the fame of the "Father of His Country" if he really refused a third nomination because he feared defeat and then urged as a reason for his declination a lofty and patriotic sentiment. But now that the Declaration of Independence has been cast aside as rubbish and the constitution separated from the flag, Washington might as well go with the rest.

Meaning of Flag Changed.

In several of the speeches delivered by Mr. McKinley during the past three years he has said "Our flag does not mean one thing here and another thing in our new possessions." The policies which Mr. McKinley's administration is seeking to fasten upon our new possessions placed large interrogation marks after this reiterated statement of the president. But those interrogation marks have been forgotten in the fact that the decision of the United States Supreme Court formally and emphatically shows that our flag DOES mean one thing here and another thing in our new possessions.

The decision of the highest court in the land shows that our flag does mean one thing in the states and another thing in the territories, or the colonies, as you please.

The preamble to the federal constitution explains the purpose of that instrument to be "to form a more perfect union, establish justice, insure domestic tranquility, provide for the common defense, promote the general welfare and secure the blessings of liberty to ourselves and our posterity." Upon this preamble the fathers ordained and established the constitution for the United States of America. At the time of the adoption of that constitution there existed in this country the institution of human slavery. Since then that constitution has been amended—in some places as the result of calm and deliberate thought during the times of peace—in other instances as the result of civil war. But in every instance in which that constitution has been amended it has taken the direction of getting nearer and nearer to the Declaration of Independence, and nearer and nearer to the ideal republican government.

But after all these years of progress in the direction of the Declaration of Independence the United States Supreme Court holds that the constitution is for the benefit and advantage of the people of the states and for them only.

We have no means of ascertaining what the flag means except by consulting the constitution. By reading that constitution we will find that the flag here stands for equal privileges and immunities to all; that the flag here prohibits the enactment of any law that would deal unjustly with the people of any state; that

the flag here means that congress is denied the privilege of enacting any law or exercising any authority other than that expressly provided for in the constitution.

But under the recent decision of the United States Supreme Court what does the flag in our new possessions mean? In brief it means that congress may enact such laws as the members of congress deem advisable. While the flag here means liberty and justice, clearly and distinctly safeguarded by a written constitution, the flag in our new possessions means the whims and caprice of a body of men, created, it is true by the constitution, but under authority of this decision, acting entirely regardless of the constitution. Here the flag means liberty and justice; in our new possessions the flag may mean despotism and wrong. Here our flag means republicanism; in our new possessions the flag means colonial rule unrestricted by a written fundamental law. Here our flag is the emblem of certain well defined principles; in our new possessions the flag is a mere piece of bunting. Whatever respect it may command, whatever power it may wield, whatever influence it may exert will be due to the sharp point of the bayonet rather than to the love and affection of the people, fostered by a religious concern in the perpetuity of certain great principles and in the intelligent recognition of the wisdom and the justice of those principles.

"A Curious Issue."

If there are Americans who are too busy in the chase for the dollar to realize the dangers involved in the supreme court's decisions in the Porto Rican case, they may without great mental effort obtain an analysis of that decision as made by an Englishman.

The London Daily News, commenting upon the Porto Rican case, says it was the most important decision which this tribunal has ever been called upon to make. It regards this decision as "A curious issue to 120 years of triumphant democracy." Then the News adds:

"It is not progress, but retrogression; not the advancement of humanity, but that disheartening product of our times—the militarism of a democracy. We venture to think that the framers of the United States constitution would have laughed at the possibility of such a development as incredible. The decisions have extricated President McKinley from an uncommonly awkward position, but it is a lamentable headlong fall in the moral scale and a turning of the back on all that has been the special glory and distinction of the United States in order to join in the barbaric scramble for the waste places of the earth."

Not progress, but retrogression, not humanity, but militarism—not the passing of another milestone in the path of civilization, but "a lamentable, headlong fall in the moral scale and a turning of the back on all that has been the special glory and distinction of the United States in order to join in the barbaric scramble for the waste places of the earth!"

Americans who can realize the truth of this arraignment must feel even more humiliated because of the source whence it comes.

The Porto Rican decision was indeed a "curious issue to 120 years of triumphant democracy."

Dooley Discusses Downes Case.

Mr. F. P. Dunne, the famous "Mr. Dooley," discusses the decision of the Supreme Court in the Downes case in a way that will not fail to please. He mingles philosophy with his humor, and shows the ridiculous side of the courts argument. The following is an extract:

"I see," said Mr. Dooley, "th' supreme court has decided th' constitution don't follow th' flag."

"Who said it did?" asked Mr. Hennessy.

"Some wan," said Mr. Dooley. "It happened a long time ago, an' I don't raymimber clearly how it come up, but some fellow said that ivrywhere th' constitution wint, th' flag was sure to go. 'I don't believe wan wurrud iv it,' says th' other fellow. 'Ye can't make me think th' constitution is goin' thrapezin' around ivrywhere a young liftinant in th' ar-rmy takes it into his head to stick a flag pole. It's too old. It's a home-stayin' constitution with a blue coat with brass buttons onto it, an' it walks with a goold-headed cane."

"It's old an' feeble, an' it prefers to set on th' front stoop an' amuse th' childer. It wudden't last a minyit in thim thropical climes. 'Twud get a pain in th' fourteenth amindmint an' die before th' doctors cud get ar-round to cut it out. No, sir, we'll keep it with us, an' threat it tenderly without too much hard wurruk, an' whin it plays out entirely we'll give it dacint buryal an' incorp-rate oursilves undher th' laws iv Noo Jarsey. That's what we'll do,' says he. 'But,' says th' other, 'if it wants to thtravel, why not lave it?' 'But it don't want to.' 'I say it does.' 'How'll we find out?' 'We'll ask th' supreme coort. They'll know what's good fr' it.'"

Mr. Dunne sizes up the situation about right when, in reply to Mr. Hennessy, he has Mr. Dooley say "No matter whether th' constitution follows th' flag or not, th' Supreme Court follows th' election returns." As Justice Brown was influenced by the destiny argument—in fact it seemed to control him—he would doubtless have sided with Judges Fuller, Harlan, Peckham and Brewer if the election had gone against Mr. McKinley.

Things That Never Die.

BY CHARLES DICKENS.

The pure, the bright, the beautiful,
That stirred our hearts in youth,
The impulses of wordless prayer,
The dreams of love and truth;
The longings after something lost,
The spirit's yearning cry,
The striving after better hopes—
These things can never die.

The timid hand stretched forth to aid
A brother in his need,
A kindly word in grief's dark hour
That proves a friend indeed;
The plea for mercy softly breathed,
When justice threatens nigh
The sorrow of a contrite heart—
These things shall never die.

The memory of a clasping hand,
The pressure of a kiss,
And all the trifles, sweet and frail,
That make up love's first bliss;
If with a firm, unchanging faith,
And holy trust and high,
Those hands have clasped, those lips have met—
These things shall never die.

The cruel and the bitter word,
That wounded as it fell;
The chilling want of sympathy
We feel, but never tell;
The hard repulse that chills the heart,
Whose hopes were bounding high,
In an unfading record kept—
These things shall never die.

Let nothing pass, for every hand
Must find some work to do;
Lose not a chance to waken love—
Be firm and just and true.
So shall light that cannot fade
Beam on thee from on high,
And angel voices say to thee—
These things shall never die.