

tained a passive attitude. Great Britain was at first disposed to sign the proposed note, but after a confidential report from Washington, declined either to sign such a note as the Austrian ambassador proposed, or to take any further steps. Afterwards Austria and France made direct offers of intervention, but ceased their efforts after the declaration of war.

One may accept as true the interpretation which the British ministry seems desirous of putting upon this situation, and one may be truly thankful for any friendly disposition manifested toward the United States by Great Britain; but even if Great Britain were more friendly than she really is, even though her friendship were more sincere and disinterested than we have the right to believe it to be, the fact could not persuade the American people that it was their duty to transfer their sympathy in the South African war from the republic to the empire. The American people will hope that we may always be on good terms with Great Britain, but not at the expense of our natural sympathies, our purest sentiments, and our best traditions.

A Visit to the East.

The editor of The Commoner has just returned from a three weeks' trip through the east. Nearly a week of the time was spent in Pennsylvania, three days were devoted to Massachusetts, two to Connecticut, two to Michigan, and one each to Wisconsin and Ohio. He celebrated Jackson's Day at Wooster, O., and New Haven, Conn. At Boston he discussed "The Patriot in Peace" at a non-partisan banquet, and at Cambridge he delivered before the students of Harvard university his lecture on "A Conquering Nation." The lecture was also delivered in the following college towns: Madison, Wis., Albion and Hillsdale, Mich., and Waynesburg and Washington, Pa.

The republican papers have treated him more courteously on this trip than on former occasions and their generosity is appreciated. Some of them, however, have criticised him for lecturing at meetings where an admission is charged. The State, of Columbia, S. C., thus justifies lecturing as a means of reaching the public:

Mr. Bryan has been on another trip to New England. In the 1896 campaign he referred to that bleak soil as "the enemy's country," but since then his receptions there have been so warm and cordial that Mr. Bryan must now feel quite at home among the Puritans.

On his last trip he met with the greatest cordiality from public men and the masses. His speeches were numerous, several being "Jackson's Day" orations at public dinners, others were lectures to which admission was charged and one being an address before the Harvard students. Yet persons there and elsewhere have been speculating concerning Mr. Bryan's motive in taking the tour, assigning it to a desire to parade himself as a presidential candidate or to an egotistical craving to keep himself in the public eye. Mr. Bryan's word on this subject is as good as any one else's opinion, and he stated in one of his speeches what he has said before that his life would be devoted to the discussion of public questions. This ought to be explanation enough.

Mr. Bryan evidently regards such lecturing tours as supplementary to the work he is doing in The Commoner—the dissemination and enforcement of democratic principles. It is surely an honorable and honest vocation. That it is likewise a means of support is not discredit-able. If Mr. Bryan were wealthy we do not doubt he would circulate The Commoner free and talk for nothing, but he has to earn his daily bread like the most of us, and since the people want to read what he writes and hear what he says there is no reason why he should not charge for his paper and his speeches. If The Commoner is worth anything it is worth \$1.00 per year, and if a lecture by Mr. Bryan is worth paying for at all it is worth 50 cents or \$1.00 per person—the price of admission to a baseball game. As a matter of fact the admission to the paid lectures Mr. Bryan gave in New England was 25 and 50 cents; it could hardly have been less.

Mr. Bryan has stated through The Commoner and on the platform that he intends to devote his

life to the study and discussion of public questions. The newspaper and the platform furnish the best opportunities for reaching the people. The paper is within the means of all who desire to read it and reaches a larger number than can be reached by lectures. And yet there are many who attend a meeting who would not subscribe for the paper, and a lecture affords a better means than a campaign speech for the calm consideration of the principles of government. Editorial work and lecturing go well together, the former furnishing material that can be utilized in a speech while an audience supplies an inspiration that is lacking in the editorial sanctum. Both writing and speaking furnish such agreeable occupation that one does not notice the loss of a little thing like the presidency.

Pinching Wool Growers.

Mr. A. J. Blakely of Grinnell, Ia., wrote the following letter in reply to an inquiry addressed to him by the American Wool and Cotton Reporter. The letter is reproduced because it gives the views of a wool grower on the effect of the combination which has been formed among woolen manufacturers. For years the sheep raiser has been asked to vote the republican ticket on the promise that he would receive a special benefit at the hands of a republican administration, and instead of recognizing the justice of the Jeffersonian maxim, "Equal rights to all and special privileges to none," many of the wool growers have thought themselves justified in trying to secure a pecuniary advantage from a tariff which imposed burdens upon those who, instead of raising sheep, had to buy woolen goods. The republican leaders now think, as might have been expected, that the manufacturers are more important than the wool grower and more entitled to consideration. Therefore the manufacturers are allowed to combine against the wool grower. When the doctrine of favoritism is once established the natural and inevitable tendency is to favor the big man as against the little man, and the trust seems to be the biggest man and the one to be favored at the expense of all the rest of the people. Mr. Blakely says:

Frank P. Bennett, Esq., Publisher Wool and Cotton Reporter, Boston, Mass.—Dear Sir: Yours received asking my estimate of stocks of wool here. There are no stocks of wool in this region. I bought some last spring for the Amana Society Manufacturers at Homestead, Ia. There is just one little bunch of 25 fleeces of chaffy wool in this township. I know there is but little in the county and I think the same is true of the state of Iowa. We were never so bare of wool here. In my opinion, however, it makes little difference how much wool is in the country, since the big manufacturers of the east made their great combination a year and a half ago, to buy wool at their own prices. The tariff is of little help or consequence to the wool growers so long as these conspirators openly violate the anti-trust law and control the price of the whole product of the country.

The attorney general and the administration take no notice of the matter nor try to bring the violators of the law to justice. Wool ought to be as high as two years ago. There is much less wool in the United States than then and less in the world, and the substitute cotton is higher. The woolen mills have been and are well employed and the duty on cloths enables them to sell at good prices. Wool commission men don't dare to say anything about the matter for fear the trust will not buy of them. The administration is responsible for the non-enforcement of the law and the wool growers will so hold them.

Justification.

In delivering the opinion of the supreme court in the insular cases, Justice Brown said:

Grave apprehensions of danger are felt by many eminent men—a fear lest an unrestrained possession of power on the part of congress may lead to unjust and oppressive legislation, in which the natural rights of territories or their inhabitants may be en-

gulfed, find no justification in the action of congress in the past century, nor in the conduct of the British parliament toward its outlying possessions since the American revolution.

The St. Louis Globe-Democrat, a republican paper, furnishes in a recent issue an interesting illustration of the conduct of the British parliament toward its "outlying possessions." This republican paper points out that the figures recently given by the registrar general show that the decline in Ireland's population continues. The census taken in April, 1901, shows the population of Ireland to be 4,456,546. The registrar general's estimate indicates that this number will be considerably lower next April than it was a year ago. The census of Ireland taken in 1821 showed a population of 6,801,827. For many years the population grew. In 1841 there were 8,175,125 people in Ireland. Ten years later, in 1851, the population had decreased to 6,552,385 and the decline has continued since that time.

The Globe-Democrat attributes the loss of 1,600,000 people in 1846 to the failure of the potato crop, but it explains that in reality the decline was greater than this for the growth in population probably continued along through the famine; and it estimates that there was a probable loss in population of 2,000,000 between 1846 and 1851. A large portion of this 2,000,000, according to this republican paper, represented "deaths by starvation and other complaints superinduced by lack of food;" the rest of this was caused by emigration, the most of this being to the United States.

"The population of Ireland in this last half century," says the Globe-Democrat, "has been one of the tragedies of history, but the calamity has had its compensations." And then this republican paper explains that the compensations rest in the fact that those Irish people who have emigrated to the United States have vastly improved their condition. And, having pointed out the unhappy conditions which these people have suffered at home, this republican paper says "here is the ultimate cause of the vast emigration from Ireland to the United States."

This showing is interesting and instructive when we recall the fact that Justice Brown in delivering the opinion of the supreme court in the insular cases, pointed to the history of England toward its "outlying possessions" as assurance that the "grave apprehensions" of danger felt in the United States concerning the colonial policy were without justification in the conduct of the British.

Mark the Contrast.

The republicans recently had a love feast down in Missouri and the time was largely devoted to boasting of the prosperous condition of the country, the republican party, of course, receiving all the credit. One of the speakers said: "Since Grover left the White house the American people have been living on chicken and pie," and then he proceeded to enlarge upon Missouri's share of the prosperity. About the same time that this partisan glorification was going on the St. Louis Post-Dispatch published the following item of news:

After selling his shoes for 10 cents to buy bread for his family, Theodore Cabbia walked in his stocking feet to his home at 1223 North Seventh street, carrying two loaves which he had purchased with the money received for his shoes.

Although alms might have been secured from the Carr street police station or from other sources, Cabbia was too proud to seek assistance until all his own resources were exhausted.

Policeman Kappan of the Fourth district discovered the condition of the family and relief was furnished by Captain Boyd from the Carr street station.

When the policeman visited the house the room occupied by the Cabbia family had been cold for more than twenty-four hours, the last fuel having been used on Sunday.

Six children were huddled about their mother, who was vainly trying to keep them warm and hush their cries for food.

The man said that a few crusts of bread had been the only food of the family for several days and that he had been compelled to sell his shoes because of his inability to get employment as a laborer.

The children ranged in age from 4 to 13 years.

When the democrats were in power the republicans could see no one employed; when they are in power themselves they never hear of any one out of work.