

\$500,000 and the Charleston exposition \$150,000, with the understanding that these appropriations were not to be considered as a precedent.

An amendment was also agreed to authorizing the secretary of the treasury to pay the expenses incurred on account of the last illness and death of President McKinley, including compensation of physicians, \$45,000, provided that only such expenses be paid as are just and reasonable, no government employes to be paid any sum for personal or professional services.

A dispatch from Washington under date of June 26 says: The record of court-martial proceedings in the case of Major I. W. T. Waller of the marine corps, who was acquitted of the charge of illegally killing Filipino prisoners, was received at the war department today. It will be considered by Secretary Root in connection with the review of the testimony and findings of the court-martial in the case of Brigadier General J. H. Smith. The charges upon which both the officers named were tried arose out of the same transactions in the conduct of the Samar campaign.

The Waller case was closed with the approval of the action of the court-martial which acquitted him, but the Smith case was subject to the action of the president. Judge Advocate Davis is now preparing the case for his action. It is generally understood that the court found the charges against General Smith were not sustained and acquitted him.

Owing to the prominence of the case and the attention it has received in congress in the debate on the Philippine bill the action of the president in the matter is awaited with more than ordinary interest. The impression prevails that he will improve the opportunity to express his ideas on the subject of the conduct of military affairs in the Philippines.

Admiral Dewey made a statement

before the senate committee on the Philippines on June 26 concerning the early operations at Manila when he was in command of the American naval forces in those waters. He declared that the city of Manila has been surrendered to him at the time that the Spanish fleet was sunk, and that when the city did surrender it was in pursuance of a definite understanding between himself and the Spanish governor general. He referred to Aguinaldo's military operations and declared emphatically that he never had recognized Aguinaldo's government, nor had he ever given the Philippine republic the slightest recognition.

In 2002.

The shade of General Weyler was wandering along the banks of the Styx just as the sun went down.

"Hi, there, General Weyler," said a voice. "Wait for me a moment."

"Who are you and what do you want?" queried the shade of the general who established the reconcentrado camps in Cuba.

"I am one of your kind," said the voice. "I used to be in command in Samar, one of the Philippine islands, and I—"

The shade of Weyler faded away in disgust, remarking as it faded:

"Excuse me, please, I'm not down to your level, and even here one is allowed to select one's company."

And the wavelets of the Styx lapped the rocky banks and moaned and moaned.

A Baseless Counter-Charge.

The charge made by some of the republican senators and by some of the republican papers that the democrats by denouncing the atrocities in the Philippines are attacking the American army, is an absurd charge. A great pretense of patriotism is made by speaking of the democrats in connection with the army as firing on the rear, just as a great pretense of patriotism was made by the parrot-like reiteration of the word "Scuttle" in reference to the anti-imperialistic policy of the democrats.

The imperialist ship must be scuttled because it is a pirate ship. The army must be fired on from the rear, or front, or flank, or from any direction necessary to stop the perpetration of atrocities which are a disgrace not only to the army itself, but also to the American nation.

The democratic attack, however, is not an attack upon the army. The army obeys orders. The democrats yield to no one in admiration for the achievements of our army in the past. Bar the atrocities, which a part of the army has committed under orders, the fighting of our soldiers in the Philippines has been brave fighting, although in a bad cause. The army is not to blame for the badness of the cause, nor for the orders to torture, to "kill and burn," and to turn the land into a howling wilderness. The democrats are not blaming the private soldier, who, no doubt, is tempted to mutiny or desert at the dirty work he has been commanded to do. The democratic attack is directed against those persons who gave the orders and who are responsible for the cruelties, whether they be the officers in the islands or the officials, of however high a degree, at Washington. The investigating committee of the senate is endeavoring to find out who is to blame.

The administration by its own actions has put itself under suspicion. While courts martial of guilty officers have been ordered (is not this an attack on the army and firing on the rear?), the denial of the atrocities by the secretary of war when he knew them to exist, his suppression of the reports from the American governors of Tayabas and Batangas are ugly circumstances against him. Further, the assumption of the responsibility for the retaliatory measures of the army recently made by the secretary of war is very much of a piece with Gen-

eral Smith's confession of his own guilt and the issuance of the "kill and burn" order wherewith he was charged. While Secretary Root is not willing to indorse General Smith's atrocities, he does indorse General Bell's, which are nearly as bad. General Smith was tried by the court-martial after he had made his confession. The secretary of war, however, is on trial before a court-martial composed of the whole American people. The evidence is not all in, but we have enough of it, together with his own assumption of responsibility for the retaliatory measures, to point very strongly to the probability, which is almost certainty, of a finding of guilty. There is a higher official still with whom the investigation is concerned. If the secretary of war is guilty, is the president innocent? The president is the commander-in-chief of the army. The secretary of war is only his assistant. The president has retained the secretary of war after his suppression of the atrocity reports; was made known. Has not the president known what the secretary of war and the army have been doing? If not, was it not his duty to know?—Houston Post.

Mr. M'Carren's Mistake.

Senator Patrick H. McCarren, speaking at the opening of state democratic headquarters at Albany on Monday, took occasion to say:

"We read a good deal in the newspapers as to the position of William J. Bryan. If there ever was a man in the United States that owed absolute loyalty to the democratic party and its candidates, that man is Mr. Bryan. If it is true, as reported in the papers, that he will not support this or that man for office because of this or that reason, it is about time he was told to go away back and sit down. He has no right to do anything else than to advise every democrat to support the party platform and to vote for the party candidates."

Such an attack on the part of Senator McCarren, or any other member of the New York democracy, is not only uncalled for, but absolutely unjust and brutal, and cannot but have an influence directly opposed to that which is desired by those who really wish to promote harmony in the party ranks. It is but fair to say that those whom Mr. McCarren desired to please by his insinuating invective can have no sympathy with the sentiments expressed nor can they imagine for a moment that such expression can conduce to anything but dissension, instead of harmony.

Neither Mr. Bryan nor his most loyal friends have ever had any quarrel with those men who, known as gold democrats, have never concealed their sentiments or sought to create the impression that they were other than what they appeared. It is the middle-of-the-road democrats, those who, while pretending to uphold the platforms of 1896 and 1900, have really lost no opportunity to play into the hands of the republicans and to secretly knife the democratic party upon any and every occasion, who have displeased the six and a half millions of democratic voters who evinced their allegiance to those platforms at the last presidential election. One can respect a candid avowal of difference of opinion; but treachery and stealth command neither respect nor confidence. The sooner these "middle-of-the-road democrats" awake to a realization of the fact that, no matter in which part of the state they may be, no matter how powerful they deem themselves, their true character and real motives are known—the sooner they realize that they are deceiving no one but themselves, the better it will be for all concerned. Mr. McCarren's attack on Mr. Bryan was not only an insult to the latter, but an insult to every one of the 600,000 voters in this state who cast the ballots for Mr. Bryan two years ago.

BOYS WHO MAKE MONEY

In a dainty little booklet, 25 out of some 3000 bright boys tell in their own way just how they have made a success of selling

THE SATURDAY EVENING POST

Pictures of the boys—letters telling how they built up a paying business outside of school hours. Interesting stories of real business tact.

We will furnish you with Ten Copies the first week Free of Charge, to be sold at Five Cents a Copy; you can then send us the wholesale price for as many as you find you can sell the next week. If you want to try it, address

BOYS' DEPARTMENT
The Curtis Publishing Company, Philadelphia



Mr. Bryan owes loyalty to the democratic party; yes. But he owes no loyalty to those who, for years past, have been doing their utmost to disrupt that party; he owes no loyalty to those who, under the guise of pretended democracy, have sought to inculcate republican principles wherever and whenever possible; he owes no loyalty to those who have blown hot and cold as their personal interests seemed to command. Mr. Bryan owes his loyalty to those six and a half millions of democrats who voted for him as the presidential candidate of the democratic party in 1900; and, so far as The Times is informed, Mr. Bryan has no intention of repudiating that claim or dishonoring that loyalty.

In what manner, we ask, is Mr. Bryan interfering in the affairs of the democratic party of New York? Upon what information or assumption has Senator McCarren based his attack upon this man, whose steadfastness of character, whose nobility of mind, has been proven over and over again, and whose personal following today is numerically greater than that of any other democrat who was ever honored with a presidential nomination?

As to Mr. Bryan's intents and purposes, we may not speak with authority, save that which comes from an intimate knowledge of the man's loyal characteristics; even though he should repudiate the action of the convention and refuse to abide by its dictum, he would, in accordance with the theory of those who did that very thing six years ago, and again two years ago, thereby simply proclaim himself a bigger man than the convention, and a greater democrat than any other; but it is fair to assume that Mr. Bryan intends to do in 1904 as he has done in the past—to lend the support of his influence and personality to the candidate of the democratic party, and so retain the reputation which he has fairly achieved—a reputation for steadfast honesty of purpose, devotion to democratic principles, and integrity of action. The leaders of democracy, in state and in nation, may do far worse than to pattern their conduct after that of the Hon. William Jennings Bryan.—Buffalo (N. Y.) Times.

Topeka (Kas.) Farmers' Advocate: The Boer war just closed will teach all nations to not be so ready to go to war with a weaker antagonist, especially when that weaker country is fighting to support the principles of freedom. Through all the ages will the Boer spectacle be pointed out as a fearful example of what should and does come to the oppressor.

Red Wing (Minn.) Argus: This administration is not like the Swede in the story who thought it was a joke when he was slugged for a Norwegian. The administration, every time it gets a belt in the solar plexus raises the cry, "What do you mean by attacking the army?"

OUR CLUBBING LIST

Do you wish to take another paper or magazine with THE COMMONER? Here is our clubbing list. The subscription price given in this list pays for THE COMMONER and the other publication both for one year. Subscriptions may be either new or renewal, except for Public Opinion and Literary Digest. All must be for one year. Send to

THE COMMONER,
Lincoln, Neb.

NOTE—Clubbing offers in which the Thrice-a-Week World, or World-Herald, or Farm, Stock and Home, or Kansas City World appears, are not open to the residents of the respective cities in which the papers named are published.

	Club Price.
Arena	\$2.75
Atlanta Constitution	1.35
Barnum's Midland Farmer	1.00
Central Farmer	1.35
Cincinnati Enquirer	1.35
Cosmopolitan	1.65
Family Circle	1.00
Farm and Home	1.00
Farmers' Advocate	1.50
Farm, Stock and Home	1.00
Feather and Farmer	1.00
Home and Farm	1.00
Indianapolis Sentinel	1.00
Irrigation Age	1.25
Kansas Farmer	1.35
Kansas City World (dly. ex. Sun.)	2.50
Literary Digest (new)	3.00
Missouri Valley Farmer	1.00
Nebraska Independent	1.35
Thrice-a-Week World	1.35
Pilgrim	1.25
Practical Farmer	1.35
Public	2.25
Public Opinion (new)	3.00
Review of Reviews	2.75
Rocky Mountain News	1.50
Seattle Times	1.35
Southern Mercury	1.50
Springfield Republican	1.65
Success	1.65
Vick's Family Magazine	1.00
Western Poultry News	1.00
World-Herald	1.35