

withdraw the amendment I offered. Our delegation is going to vote for New York's candidate for vice president. We are not going to do any thing that can by any possibility mar our chances for success, and if you think a record vote on this question would do that, I will withdraw the amendment. (Applause.)

Electing Postmasters.

Why should a president be permitted to turn the postoffice department into a partisan machine and use thousands of postmasters as paid agents to advance his political fortunes? He should not. Why should a member of congress be permitted to build up a personal organization composed of the postmasters recommended by him but paid by the government and use this organization to defeat other congressional aspirants in his own party? He should not. Why should a chief executive be permitted to fill the most frequented office in the community with a postmaster objectionable to the community and reward him for his services with the money paid in by the community? He should not. Why should the "Great Father at Washington," as the Indians call him, be permitted to electioneer among the colored voters of the north by appointing black postmasters in the south against the protest of the patrons of the office? He should not. And yet all these things are openly and notoriously done today. The election of postmasters by the people whom they are to serve will correct all these abuses. It is in harmony with democratic principles; it is consistent with the doctrine of local self-government. What objection can be raised to it? Can a president know the aspirants more intimately than the community and better judge of their qualifications? Is he more interested than the community in prompt, honest and efficient service? By leaving the appointment, the removal and rejection for cause in the hands of the president, but by restricting appointment to a list furnished by the community, the rights and interests of both the federal government and the various communities can be protected. Presidents and congressmen will then run on their own merits and not on the machines which they have built up; the public service will be improved and communities will be protected from the impositions that are now practiced upon them.

(Weekly papers are asked to send to The Commoner marked copies of their editorials on this subject.)

The President's Acceptance.

The president in his speech of acceptance, which will be found on another page, takes advantage of the division in the democratic party on the money question and boldly asserts his party's devotion to the gold standard but he does not discuss those phases of the question upon which he is likely to be called upon to act.

On the trust question he follows the republican platform in classing the trusts and the labor organizations together. This classification is made entirely in the interest of the trusts and his failure to specify any legislation against the trusts or any legislation in favor of labor shows that the trusts are to be unmolested and that labor is to be unaided if he is successful this fall.

On the tariff question he "stands pat." No revision of the tariff need be expected while he is in the white house.

His reference to imperialism is neither candid nor courageous. He boasts of what we have done for the Filipinos but he avoids the vital issue involved, namely, whether we are going to adhere to the doctrine of self-government or adopt a colonial policy, which if adopted, will nullify the principles set forth in the declaration of independence. He dodges nearly every issue.

Von Plehve's Assassination.

The assassination of M. Von Plehve, the Russian minister of the interior, calls attention again to the fatal errors of those who attempt by violence to right the abuses of government. According to Hon. Andrew D. White, late ambassador to Germany, he had aroused great resentment and made himself bitterly hated by his cruel and despotic methods, but his assassination will aggravate rather than relieve the situation. The bloody deeds of the nihilists have retarded reforms in the land of the czar; they have encouraged the advocates of militarism and embarrassed the friends of constitutional government.

While the punishment may sometimes seem deserved when the ruler has been merciless and unprincipled, yet the real punishment falls upon the innocent and earnest reformers whose protests against misrule are confounded with the threats of the violent and lawless. Mr. White is quoted as saying:

"At that time M. Plehve had not arrived at the position of full minister of the interior, but was the first assistant minister in that department, and in that capacity took up various American matters, especially the dealings of the Russian government with some of the American insurance companies. The Russian government had made the companies a great deal of trouble, and I was instructed from Washington to discuss the matter, General Bacheller, now judge of the international court in Egypt, very ably representing the companies.

"I think both General Bacheller and myself found M. Plehve very agreeable and, apparently, as far as his government allowed him, reasonable. I also met him socially at various times and found him agreeable and interesting.

"I was, therefore, greatly surprised at learning when he was promoted to the first place that his whole character seemed to change.

"His part in the horrible massacre and plunder of the Jews, men, women and children, at Kishineff, cause him to be regarded with abhorrence by the whole world. Even more frightful has been his connection with the destruction of the liberties of Finland. In my mind that is the most wicked thing in the history of the last two centuries. There is no time to go into it here further than to say that it has turned the best, the most civilized, the most educated and the most loyal province of the empire into a land in which the opposite of these characteristics is more highly developed than in any other part of the empire. Other things done by him were also calculated to bring most bitter hatred against him.

"He attempted to help his cause by a defense of his conduct toward Finland which was published in an American magazine. But it certainly must have failed to convince any thinking man at all aware of the circumstances.

"During two summers I lived mainly in Finland, coming frequently to St. Petersburg, and the transition in passing from the cultivation and civilization of Finland to the atmosphere of Russia was the most depressing I have ever known.

"I do not wonder at his assassination, although I deeply lament it. Among other reasons for this regret it will doubtless be made a pretext for new oppression and new cruelties toward the Finlanders. Assassination always defeats its purpose, and this will be no exception to the rule.

"I can only account for M. Plehve's atrocious, reactionary and despotic conduct since he came to the position of minister on the theory that he felt that the clique in control of the Winter palace, men and women, who seem to have brought the present emperor into subjection to them, obliged M. Plehve, as a condition of his tenure of office, to do their will.

"His ambition doubtless led him to adopt their radical and religious hatred, as well as their detestation of anything like constitutional government."

Merely For History's Sake.

Some one charged that the Louisville Courier-Journal prior to 1896 "fought for free silver and against the gold standard tooth and toe-nail." Mr. Watterson replying to this charge says that it is true that one of his editorial writers from 1879 to 1886 did write in favor of bimetalism, but Mr. Watterson says that "in 1888, 1892 and 1896 the Courier-Journal took the dead line of an honest dollar," and he adds:

As chairman of the platform committee in the national democratic convention of 1888, its editor was instrumental in excluding free silver from that platform. He supported the exclusion, it was excluded from the platform by an open vote in the convention of 1892. In 1896, the issue having become paramount, the Courier-Journal took its life in its hand and opposed the free silver action of its party, not abating its opposition until the danger of a degraded currency no longer menaced either the money or the integrity of the nation.

Merely for the purpose of keeping history straight, it may be said that the platform reported to the national democratic convention in 1888 by Chairman Henry Watterson specifically reaffirmed the democratic platform of 1884.

The democratic platform of 1884 said: "We believe in honest money, the gold and silver coin-

age of the constitution and a circulating medium convertible into such money without loss."

The democratic platform reported to the convention of 1888 by Chairman Henry Watterson, said: "The democratic party of the United States in national convention assembled, renews the pledge of its fidelity to democratic faith and reaffirms the platform adopted by its representatives in the convention of 1884."

The platform of 1892 declared in favor of "the use of both gold and silver as the standard money of the country and to the coinage of both gold and silver without discriminating against either metal or charge for mintage."

It is difficult to understand how Mr. Watterson kept silver out of the platform of 1888 when that platform, by reaffirming the platform of 1884, defined "honest money" as being "the gold and silver coinage of the constitution."

It is difficult to understand how Mr. Watterson excluded silver from the platform of 1892 when he permitted to be written in the 1892 platform the promise that silver, as well as gold, would be the standard money of the country, and also that silver, as well as gold, would be coined without discrimination and without charge for mintage.

So far as the claim that Mr. Watterson never abated his opposition to a degraded currency is concerned, the talented editor of the Courier-Journal might explain how it happened that he permitted to be written into the platform of 1892 a recommendation in favor of the repeal of the ten per cent tax on state bank issues.

Abundance of Money.

In an article on the "quantitative theory," the New York Commercial said that "a great abundance of money in a country is not an unmixed blessing," adding that it can be shown that "at some periods exceptionally large volumes of currency—especially of gold—have been a direct moving cause of financial and commercial depression."

A reader of the Commercial writes to that paper to say that the statement seems "not a little strange," and asks that the Commercial give an instance.

The Commercial quotes from a statement made by Walter Bagehot, the British financier-essayist, as follows:

At particular times a great many stupid people have a great deal of stupid money. Saving persons often have only the faculty of saving; they accumulate ably and contemplate their accumulations with approbation—but what to do with them they do not know. * * * At intervals, the money of these people—the blind capital, as we call it, of the country—is practically large and craving; it seeks for some one to devour it, and then there is "plethora"; it finds some one, and there is "speculation"; it is devoured, and there is "panic."

The Commercial also recalls the indemnity paid by France to Germany just after the Franco-Prussian war. The payment of this indemnity added largely to the volume of money in Germany. The Commercial explains:

That money "craved" investment—and then the wildest of wild-cat enterprises were launched; both privately and in government affairs an era of extravagance ensued; the inevitable financial crisis followed, and then came general depression and "hard times."

It was in that situation that one of the "funny papers" in Germany labelled a cartoon with this exclamation, half in jest, half in earnest: "Let us have another war! Let us be beaten and pay a big indemnity! Then we shall be prosperous again!"

According to the first illustration presented by the Commercial, an abundance of money is "not an unmixed blessing," because "it seeks for some one to devour it and then there is 'plethora'; it finds some one and then there is 'speculation'; it is devoured and then there is 'panic.'" But is it not true that when it is "devoured" there is no longer "an abundance of money?"

The Commercial's second illustration is on a par with the first. Neither is particularly valuable in establishing the Commercial's claim. It is true that at all times in the world's history, problems of one kind and another have arisen and history repeats itself; but the Commercial will find it difficult to convince its readers that public interests are less secure at times when there is an abundance of money than at times when "money is scarce and therefore dear," so scarce, indeed, that "money becomes the master and everything else the servant."