

AS THE FARMER SEES

REASONS WHY HE BELIEVES IN AND TRUSTS REPUBLICANS.

They Have Never Deceived Nor Betrayed His Interests and Have Aggressively Favored Legislation for His Benefit.

Each national campaign emphasizes the fact that the "farmer" vote must be reckoned with and catered to, and all parties put forth their best arguments when addressing the farmer. Away from the maddening crowd, untrammelled by the prejudices and false cries of the politician, the farmer calmly reads and thinks, and thinks and reads, and decides the question with a discerning judgment that leads to a decision which is honest and right.

In 1890 it was generally feared that the farmer would be deceived by the great promises made of the beneficent results to be attained by voting for free silver, but this was not so; the farmer might be deceived when away from home, but at his own fireside, with plenty of time to weigh the question, he decided for the gold standard, AND THE DEMOCRATIC PARTY AND ITS CANDIDATES ON THE NATIONAL TICKET NOW SAY THAT THE FARMER DECIDED RIGHT. In 1900 the cry was imperialism, and with his love of freedom it was said that the farmer might be stampeded, but again he allowed common sense and calm consideration to decide the question, and, seeing no danger of militarism or overthrow of the established government by the new order of things, forced upon us by the war with Spain, the farmer again cast his ballot for the Republican ticket, and time has proved that his judgment was good and his decision right.

Chaff Will Not Answer.

In the present campaign no new or striking issue is presented. The Democrats arraign the Republican party, vilify the President and hold forth glittering generalities, but definiteness is lacking, and what would be gained by the election of a Democratic President is not apparent. A general "calamity howl" is no argument, and to secure the farmer vote it is necessary to present more than chaff.

One term of a Democratic President, two years only of absolute Democratic administration, was sufficient to practically paralyze business throughout the nation, deprive the worker of the chance to earn an honest living, depress values and prices and make us the laughing stock and subject of ridicule of the nations of the world.

McKinley was elected, a Republican Congress enacted a consistent protective tariff, industry was revived, factories started, unemployed given work at the highest wages ever known, consumption stimulated, values restored, Spain defeated, Cuba freed, order established in the Philippine Islands and the people given civil liberty in its fullest sense and the opportunity of becoming a creditable part of the greatest nation on earth. The stability of the currency has been assured by the action of the Republican administration; the public debt reduced and interest charges lowered; laws passed that will bring the arid lands under cultivation, and that, too, without tax or cost to any person except the one directly benefited by the purchase of the land from the government.

Benefits of Protection.

The policy of protection which guards and develops the industries of our country, cardinal with the Republican party, is necessary to the prosperity of the farmer. A tariff on agricultural products may not increase the price if the demand does not equal the supply, but a tariff which protects American labor and home industries insures work at high wages, plenty of money and increased consumption, insuring high prices for farm products.

The farmer is indebted to the Republican party for the rural free delivery system. First suggested by the editor of a leading farm paper, himself a Republican, the idea was reported upon and recommended by a Republican Postmaster General, adopted and enlarged upon by the Republican party, appropriation made by a Republican Congress for an investigation and trial of the proposed system. A Democratic Postmaster General, supported by a Democratic President, refused to expend the appropriations and reported not only adversely to the system, but that the scheme was impracticable. Not until the Republicans were again in full power was the system given a fair trial, and its entire practicability, as well as the great benefit to be derived by the rural population, fully demonstrated. From a \$10,000,000 appropriation for the trial of the system it has grown to an appropriation of over \$20,000,000 under the friendly encouragement and aggressive business policy of Republican administrations. No other one thing could have been of such great benefit to the farmer; it has placed him in daily communication with the world, and from the seclusion of farm life he emerges and becomes a part and parcel of this great nation and is not only able to read of the doings throughout the world, but the facilities afforded for frequent and prompt communication enable him to take part in its affairs. The farmer is now recognized as a big, broad-minded business man, and the discovery is due to the rural free delivery system, established and fostered by the Republican party.

The Republican party has always been aggressively in favor of legislation for the benefit of farmers, and the record will be considered and remembered when the farmer casts his vote.

The platforms of the Republican and Democratic parties are so similar on important subjects that the conclusion is inevitable that the latter followed the former for vote-catching purposes, and that the Democratic party is insincere

and asking support under false representations, and the farmer never favors or supports insincerity or fraud.

"MUD-SLINGING."

Democratic Newspapers Are Horrified When Facts Are Stated.

To charge that the President of the United States is so reckless and unscrupulous that he means, if elected, to grasp Mexico, the West Indies, Central America and South America, and consolidate all in one huge American empire—that is moderate and proper political discussion. "The candidate is the issue."

To recite, with scrupulous moderation, the historic facts concerning the entry into public life of the opposing candidate—facts that no man disputes, or dare dispute—that is "mud-throwing." To mention that his first political friends and creators were the ballot-box stuffers of Stony Hollow and Jockey Hill, but his debut as a political manager was, while a surrogate judge, as the State chairman for and personal representative of David B. Hill, who in gratitude made him a Supreme Court Justice; and that, when he needed a close friend to intrust with his bid to Bryanites for the Chief Judgeship of the Court of Appeals on the ground that he had voted for Bryan, he chose as such confidential representative the election thief Danforth—to mention these undisputed and indisputable facts, it seems according to the horrified Democratic organs, is "mud-slinging."

Well, shivering souls, if those facts imply "mud," then that is the sort of "mud" your candidate lives in. You invoke in vain a cast-off judicial robe to hide it. "The candidate is the issue."

ROOSEVELT GOOD ENOUGH.

The People Like the President's Democratic Ways.

[John S. Wise, of Virginia.] The people have seen more of Roosevelt—now as youth and cowboy and sportsman and naval secretary and police commissioner and soldier and governor and President to think themselves fair judges of his ingrained democratic and republican personality. They believe he would spring at and grapple with a usurper or a monarchist as fiercely as he would lasso a wild broncho or fight a Spaniard. And they like his democratic ways, more democratic far in action than the aristocratic and exclusiveness of Parker, with his colorless democratic platitudes.

Talk does not settle popular estimates of public men. Thousands—nay, hundreds of thousands—of Democrats see more real democracy in the vigorous, aggressive, wideawake Theodore Roosevelt than in the colorless, secretive Alton B. Parker. The platforms are mighty near together. The men are going to be a more decisive feature of this campaign than usual. And with my knowledge of the American people and the things which please their taste and fancy and fill their ideals of what real American manhood is I would, if I were a betting man, stake all I had that Roosevelt will be an easy winner.

Cheap Haricades.

It is droll, the attitude of the Democratic party in the present campaign. It has nominated candidates of moderate talents as figure-heads for the ventures of the discredited party, and expects the people to support them, while the Democratic National Committee and Tammany are expected to buy or steal success.

The Democratic party, with its unsonorous views, financial and economic, lies hopelessly behind Parker and those unnamed expectancies voiced by Williams, Bryan and other Democrats.

And Bryan promises to reorganize the party after the election! How? Evidently on lines of socialism, government and municipal ownership of telegraph and railroad lines, with all the sequence. What a vagueness of thought and promise! How may so-called leaders of any party expect to get the votes of sensible men upon a proposition so dim as this! The fault with the Democratic party, this year, is that it does not even furnish a good dissolving view.

Take Your Choice.

David B. Hill, the sponsor of the Democratic candidate for the Presidency, said at St. Louis that he "did not know now Parker stood on the money question." For thirty years Hill and Parker have been intimately associated, socially and politically. If the statement made by Hill is to be believed, then Parker is too secretive a man to elect to the Presidency; if false, then it was evidently made for the purpose of misleading the people; and if the people are to be deceived in one thing, why not in all the acts of the Democratic leaders?

Would It Be Wise?

It is conceded that the Democrats are not on record on the tariff question. This being the case, would it not be unwise to trust tariff revision to the party opposed to the principle of protection, the result being practically free trade, bringing industrial depression, hard times and the inevitable lowering of prices on farm products?

Tom Watson acknowledges that the condition of American workmen is now vastly improved, and that in their homes they enjoy conveniences of life which a king could not command some hundred years ago. If the Democracy had its way we would reverse the wheels of progress so that the workmen might enjoy the privations of life that were the common lot in the grand old days of Jeffersonian scarcity of bath tubs.

The helpfulness of the Germans toward each other has been one of the splendid lessons they have taught. Fidelity is always an admirable trait. The fidelity of Germans toward each other has been to me always one of their striking and admirable characteristics. Senator Fairbanks at Indianapolis, September 3, 1898.

Under the Republican policy of protection our home market affords our manufacturers and producers the best market in the world, even if we did not sell any of our products abroad. But protection has also made us the greatest exporting nation in the world.

China and India are "cheap" countries. Human labor is held very low in these lands and the result is that the masses are constantly steeped in poverty and menaced by starvation. In spite of the so-called cheapness the people do not get things.

THE PHILIPPINE ISSUE.

Marked Modification of Judge Parker's Position.

Nothing in the conduct of the Democratic party is more conducive to the public weal than the ease with which it abandons untenable issues after pledging eternal fealty to them.

For eight years it was indissolubly wedded to the free and unlimited coinage of silver at an arbitrary ratio—only, at the telegraphic behest of its candidate, to accept the gold standard as "firmly and irrevocably established" by the Republican party.

From time beyond the memory of the oldest voter the Democracy has been fulminating against "protectionism as a robbery"—only to have David B. Hill waive the tariff issue into the back yard and abysm of time, "because it is a question on which very few of us (Democrats) agree."

Nothing could have been "more beautiful to see" than the sham frenzy with which Democrats and "anti-imperialists" denounced the prompt action which the United States seized the opportunity and became possessed of the authority to dig and control the Isthmian canal—except the avidity with which the Democratic convention swallowed all its vociferous scruples and resolved that, "when entrusted with power it will construct the Panama canal speedily, honestly and economically." No wonder the mocking echo, "when entrusted with power," reverberated through the republic.

And now comes Alton B. Parker and draws the pen of ante-election expediency through the Philippine plank of his party. "We insist," reads that sibilant document, "that we ought to do for the Philippines what we have done already for the Cubans, and it is our duty to make that promise NOW."

At the first opportunity Judge Parker was given to unburden his soul over the wrong perpetrated in substituting American justice, liberty and security for Spanish cruelty, extortion and oppression in the Philippines, he modified the "now" in the above quotation with these Esonian words:

"The accident of war brought the Philippines into our possession and we are not at liberty to disorganize the responsibility which thus came to us, but that responsibility will be best subserved by preparing the islanders as rapidly as possible for self-government and giving to them assurances that it will come as soon as they are reasonably prepared for it."

When interrogated by John G. Milburn of Buffalo as to whether the Delphic phrase, "self-government," in the foregoing sentence was to be construed as "identical with independence political and territorial," he replied: "I am in hearty accord with that plank in the Democratic platform which advocates treating the Cubans, and I also favor making the promise to them NOW to take such action AS SOON AS IT CAN PRACTICALLY BE DONE."

Aye, there's the rub! Give the promise, and a Democratic promise at that, now, and redeem it "as soon as it can prudently be done."

Was there ever a more flagrant case of that juggling with words that gives the word of promise to the ear, but puts its fulfillment beyond the pale of living hope? Why promise now what in the expediency and wisdom of the future it may never be prudent to fulfill?

No wonder the Democratic New York Times scornfully declares that "the only perceptible difference between the Democratic position and the Republican position is that Judge Parker would tell the Filipinos now what is in store for them, and President Roosevelt would not. . . . There is nothing either in his speech or in his letter to Mr. Milburn which would in any other than a heedless anti-imperialist mind lead to the conclusions that were he in the White House he would pursue toward our possessions in the far East a policy different from that pursued by President Roosevelt."

The Times further expresses the opinion that "if the American people were asked to vote to-day upon the question of immediately granting independence to the Philippines, they would vote the proposition down ten to one, perhaps twenty to one, certainly by an exemplary majority. They would vote it down because they are not insane and because they are not heartless. If they were asked to vote upon the question whether we should 'make the promise now' they would laugh in the faces of those who asked them to take the trouble to express their will upon a mere question of expediency."

A promise now to do something which it may be prudent to do fifty or two hundred years hence, possibly never, would seem to almost reach the unscalable heights of Democratic folly. Certainly Judge Parker's promise now with its "as soon as it can prudently be done" condition, eliminates the Philippine issue from the Democratic category of Republican transgressions.

Imperialism of Steel. When the great iron and steel industry of the United States thrives, other American industries thrive. The Democratic party could not legislate to destroy the protection to the iron and steel industry without legislating to destroy the prosperity of the United States.

The millions of additional profit and wages that have come to the iron and steel industry under Republican rule would have been earned, if at all, by foreign nations, had Democratic policies prevailed during the last eight years. The gigantic rise of this industry during the last eight years added enormously to the wealth of the United States, and every branch of American industry and agriculture has been stimulated by it. "Prosperity at home and prestige abroad" has indeed been intimately connected with the increasing imperialism of steel, which once was Pauper but now is King.

Prosperity at Home, Prestige Abroad.

"Prosperity at Home and Prestige Abroad"—was a campaign phrase that appealed with great force to the American people in 1900. It should appeal to them with still greater force in 1904, for during the last four years of further Republican rule there have been still further great gains in the prosperity of the United States, and still further great increase in the respect entertained for the United States by all the nations of the world.

Democratic Party Divided.

The Democratic campaign managers are trying to hoodwink the mass of the party by saying all Democrats are working earnestly for the election of Parker.

The truth is, there is now more disaffection in the Democratic party than there was when Bryan was nominated the first time. Neither Bryan Democrats nor friends of W. R. Hearst will support Parker. In New York State the Bryanites have put a State Populist ticket in the field and will vote for Watson, the Populist nominee for the Presidency. In New Jersey the Hearstites have organized the "People's Democratic party" and will fight the regular organization. In Indiana and other States the free silver and Bryan Democrats are in arms and will worry the Parker party.

THE WORKINGMAN'S FRIEND.

Railway Firemen Pay a Notable Tribute to President Roosevelt.

No President ever received a more notable tribute from a labor organization than Theodore Roosevelt did at the convention of the Brotherhood of Locomotive Firemen held in Buffalo. A public meeting was held on the night of Sept. 13. Fully 5,000 persons were in attendance.

Grand Master Hannahan, in concluding an address, called attention to the fact that a New York newspaper had criticized the President because he had accepted an honorary membership in the Brotherhood of Locomotive Firemen. "Let me say," said Mr. Hannahan, "that if the President of the United States or any other of its citizens does nothing worse than accept membership in this organization he will neither merit the ill will nor deserve the censure of any of his fellow-men. (Cheers.)"

"If the rest of the public, and particularly those who are entrusted with the direction of our government and the management of the nation's greatest enterprises would do as the President and meet us upon a common level, there would be fewer strikes and less strife and more of peace and good-will in the industrial world."

"What has the President done for you?" shouted an intoxicated man, who stood near the stage door on the right. "What has the President done?" repeated Grand Master Hannahan. "The President has proven to the organized workmen of this country that he has an interest in their welfare by accepting an honorary membership in an organization of men whose faces are begrimed by smoke and dust, and who daily and hourly face the gravest dangers."

The monster audience burst into deafening cheers. The tumult rolled from wall to wall and back again. Men stood up on the benches, wildly waving their hats and cheering for the President. The demonstration was spontaneous and was general all over the hall. Finally it died down and some one in the audience shouted:

"Hurrah for Theodore Roosevelt!"

And again the crowds burst into cheers and when the second demonstration died out the intoxicated man was nowhere to be seen.

During the demonstration the men on the stage sat silent and made no effort to check or urge on the remarkable oration which the President had received. The Brotherhood does not permit politics to influence its action, but its members, regardless of party, entertain a high opinion of President Roosevelt and will stand by him as firmly as he stands by them.

MR. DAVIS' CONTRIBUTION

Democratic Vice-Presidential Candidate Draws the Line at \$50,000.

A sept. telegram dated Cumberland, Md., Sept. 7, says:

"It is stated on reliable authority from Elkins that the campaign contribution of Henry G. Davis will not be anything like the amount the Democratic managers had expected. He has fixed the amount for all purposes at \$50,000 and his brother, Col. Thomas B. Davis of Keyser, W. Va., gave a similar amount. Mrs. Elkins and Mrs. Arthur Lee, daughters of Mr. Davis, are known to have objected to their father contributing large sums, and his son, John T. Davis, is said to have done likewise."

"Four years ago John T. Davis spent a large sum in four counties when his Uncle Tom was a candidate for Congress, but no results were obtained. Col. Davis being defeated by a large vote. Since then the Davises have little faith in politicians' judiciously expending money."

There's some sense in the Davis family, it appears. The ex-Senator himself has always succeeded in hanging on to his dollars.

How much better it will be to use some of papa's money to buy pretty bonnets and gowns with, than to throw them to the mocking-birds of the Democratic campaign committee!

And all for nothing, too!

Handicapped.

Marshall P. Wilder's most successful joke of the season has a political tinge to it that is calculated to make even a Democrat with any sense of its eternal aptness laugh. He tells of a teacher who asks a class of boys whether they would like to be President of the United States. Observing that amid the general enthusiasm of assent one boy was silent and disconsolate, she said:

"What's the matter, Willie? Don't you wish to be President?"

"Yes, but I can't," replied the boy.

"How do you know you can't?" she asked.

"Because I'm a Democrat."

That let him out.

Republican vs. Democratic Policy.

Organization does much to maintain the wages of labor, but organization of wage-earners does not provide consumers. Consumption of coal is always greatest when mills and factories are running full time. It is the policy of the Republican party to protect all industries by wise and beneficent laws, while it has been the policy of the Democratic party, as evidenced by the last Cleveland administration, to provide as much work as possible for the artisans of other countries by removing the protection the tariff affords American workmen.

The Democratic party has been fatally wrong on every phase of the money question from the resumption of specie payments after the war to the establishment of the gold standard, both of which it opposed. It is constitutionally unfit to deal with financial questions.

The story of the struggle on the edge of the arid belts is a record of heart-breaking disappointments and of failure for causes utterly beyond individual control. Under national irrigation these will occur happily no more.

NOTHING TO TAKE BACK.

How Will Bryan Explain His Hostility to Parker?

William Jennings Bryan has been officially engaged by the Democratic National Committee to make speeches in New York, Indiana and other places. The former candidate for the presidency has something of a reputation as an agile political contortionist, but he will have the time of his life explaining his record during the present campaign. Mr. Bryan has been on a good many sides of a good many different questions, and yet he lives to tell the tale. But just how he proposes to advocate the election of Parker is a mystery.

Bryan was opposed to Parker before the convention met at St. Louis. He was opposed to Parker every day during the sessions of that inharmonious gathering. When Parker sent his telegram supplementing the Democratic platform Mr. Bryan rose from a bed of sickness to denounce the nominee as a traitor and a dictator, and his dramatic appearance on that Saturday night was one of the most extraordinary episodes of an extraordinary convention. Bryan lashed Parker and he dared the convention to send a telegram to the nominee demanding his honest opinion on other well-known Democratic principles.

Later on Mr. Bryan, in his own paper, the Commoner, while the events in the convention were fresh before him, openly charged that Judge Parker was a party to a corrupt attempt to deceive the convention and that his nomination had been secured by improper means. It was then that the former candidate for the presidency put himself on record by saying in the Commoner of July 13, less than a week after the nomination: "I have nothing to take back."

It seems a curious thing to find a man who has "nothing to take back," appearing on the stump favoring the election of Alton B. Parker for the presidency. If Mr. Bryan has "nothing to take back," he should in common honesty when he appears on the stump in Indiana and elsewhere, repeat to his audiences exactly what he said in the Commoner of July 13, which was printed exactly one week after the Democratic convention was called to order and only four days after Judge Parker was nominated for the presidency and had sent his telegram repudiating the Democratic platform.

In this issue of the Commoner Mr. Bryan said: "It was a plain and deliberate attempt to deceive the party. The New York platform was vague and purposely so, because the advocates of Judge Parker were trying to secure votes from among the people who would have opposed his views had they known them. The nomination was secured, therefore, by crooked and indefensible methods."

As an exhibition of political gymnastics Bryan's campaign speech for Parker ought to be worth going miles to hear. If, as he says, he has "nothing to take back," how will he explain matters to the people? What did he mean when he said in the Commoner: "The nomination of Judge Parker virtually nullifies the anti-trust plank?" Was it true on July 13 that Parker's nomination had been secured "by crooked means"? If it was true then is it not true now?

Mr. Bryan in the Commoner said: "I shall not appeal for votes for the ticket on false grounds." How can he appear on the stump, therefore, and seriously ask the workmen of the country to vote for the Democratic nominee after the Commoner had declared that "The labor plank as prepared by Judge Parker's friends on the subcommittee was a straddling, meaningless plank?"

Was Mr. Bryan lying when he said in his paper, "A Democratic victory will mean very little, if any, progress so long as the party is under control of the Wall street element?"

If the party was under the control of the Wall street element when Mr. Bryan wrote that editorial, is it not just as much under the same control while he is on the stump?

Perhaps Mr. Bryan can explain away these things. Perhaps he can answer these questions.

TAMMANY "TAR WATER."

Will It Prove an Acceptable Beverage to Respectable Democrats?

Judge Parker's "admission," addressed to his waning supporters, in his speech to the visiting editors, has in it, for all its rhodomontade, a shadow of the pathetic.

It is little wonder that there are discussions in the Democratic camp, as said gentlemen from the South, East and West, men who have certain traditions of respectability to reckon with, find that their candidate is and always has been cheek by jowl with David Bennett Hill and hand in glove with Tammany.

Judge Parker, recognizing the dangers of his position, but unable to shake off the political associates and methods by which he has risen, pleads fervently for "the elimination of personal, factional and unimportant differences involving no surrender of principle." Such elimination, he declares, "is essential to success."

But will the Democrats drink the Tammany "tar water?"

There is something to be said—or there WAS—in favor, even, of "tar water." Bishop Berkeley in his famous eulogy upon that old-fashioned but unpleasant mixture declared: "IT IS OF A NATURE SO MILD AND BENEFICENT AND PROPORTIONED TO THE HUMAN CONSTITUTION AS TO WARM WITHOUT HEATING, TO CHEER BUT NOT INEBRIATE."

Still, tar water went out of fashion!

A man who is weak enough to put his candidacy in their (Hill's and Bennett's) hands before the convention would not be strong enough to resist their influence after election, if he were by any possibility successful.—William J. Bryan.

Forty years of practical control of the government by the Republican party covers the whole period of modern progress. The only intervals of reaction or failure to progress were when the Democratic party was in power.

History shows that a Democratic tariff has always been followed by business adversity and a Republican tariff by business prosperity. Why not accept the verdict of history?

The Democratic party is like the man who was in favor of prohibition but "agin" the enforcement. It favors a Panama Canal, but opposes the measures necessary to obtain it.

"AS MAINE GOES."

In each campaign they look to Maine.

To make the future outcome plain, For each one knows That as Maine goes, That as Maine goes, The tide of public judgment flows.

One time Maine "went" — bent for Kent.

And every one knew what that meant, This year the State Has struck a gait That sets Republicans elate.

At Esopus

There is a fuss, Because the votes are going thus; And Gassaway,

So blithe and gay, Must write checks till election day.

The Texans shout

And jeer and flout Because their State is not in doubt; But D. B. Hill

Has had a chill And thinks that he had best keep still.

Much pain is felt

Beneath the belt Of those opposed to Roosevelt; They have the blues

At this great news— They know that Roosevelt can't lose.

The record shows

That as Maine goes The tide of public judgment flows— The fight is vain,

For all explain That they will have to vote with Maine.

PENSION ORDER, NO. 78.

President Roosevelt's Action is in Line with Law and Precedent.

The groundless character of the charge that President Roosevelt has exceeded his constitutional powers is shown clearly by examination of the facts and the laws concerned in the executive action known as the "age pension order" issued last March by direction of the President.

Anyone who will take the trouble to read the act of June 27, 1890, as amended May 9, 1900, will find a clear basis to begin with. It directs who shall have pensions, and how the amount of the pension, in each case, shall be determined, as follows:

All persons who served 90 days or more in the military or naval service of the United States during the late war of the rebellion and who have been honorably discharged therefrom, and who are now or who may hereafter be suffering from a mental or physical disability of a permanent character, shall, upon making due proof of the fact according to such rules and regulations as the Secretary of the Interior may provide, be placed upon the list of individuals to whom pensions shall be paid, and shall be entitled to receive a pension not exceeding \$12 per month, and not less than \$6 per month, proportioned to the degree of disability, such and every disability shall be duly considered, and the aggregate of the disabilities shown shall be rated.

Thus, as plain as words can make it, is authority given to the Secretary of the Interior to determine what pension shall be paid to any applicant for pension who served ninety days in the War of Rebellion, was honorably discharged, and who is disabled for the performance of manual labor by any cause other than the results of his own vicious habits.

The Supreme Court has decided that upon the point of establishing the rate of pension to be paid, within the limits prescribed by the law the Secretary of the Interior has entire control. The only check or supervision upon him is from the President of the United States, whom the general laws specifically direct shall have control of the Commissioner of Pensions and the administration of the pension system.

Therefore, it was directly in line with the duties imposed upon him according to section 471, U. S. Revised Statutes, that President Roosevelt gave the celebrated order which has been called an evidence of "usurpation," "imperialism," "a desire to override the constitution," "a looting of the treasury," and other hard names, by excitable Democrats. The section of the Revised Statutes referred to reads as follows:

"The Commissioner of Pensions shall perform, under the direction of the Secretary of the Interior, such duties in the execution of the various pension and bounty laws as may be prescribed by the President."

President Roosevelt, in his pension order, did no more than his plain duty, acting strictly within the powers conferred upon him by the Congress of the United States.

Parker's Election Would Unsettle Business.

Eugene A. Merrill, president of the Minnesota Loan and Trust Company of Minneapolis, in an interview in the Commercial West of Minneapolis says:

"Much has been said concerning the insignificance of the coming election so far as it relates to business. It has been urged that the maintenance of the gold standard is assured, etc., but, while the theory of the case is excellent, yet as a matter of fact the man with money to invest does not want to be necessarily involved in unsettling of conditions through a change of administration. The policy of the party in power is pretty well known and its continuance in office will predetermine no difficulties. The policy of the opposition may be ever so clearly conjectured, but its accession to control would, I think, cause some contraction in business and financial enterprises, at least temporarily until the safety and conservatism now talked of should be more substantially demonstrated."

Taggart Is Fascinated.

Tom Taggart is so fascinated by the inscrutable mystery behind Judge Parker's speech of acceptance that he cannot lay it aside long enough to take his meals. He pores over it in his bath at French Lick Springs and drops to sleep reading it in bed. He declares that the elusive mystery of what it all means becomes clearer with every perusal, and that by the close of the campaign he confidently expects that it will be as clear as the water of his own Plato spring.

A Sure Sign.

Now we know that David B. Hill intends to quit politics next January. He has disclaimed calling President Roosevelt "a fraud." That a little innocuous thing like that when he has exhausted the vocabulary of vituperation upon the Republican half of the American people for "high on 40 years" is surely a sign that David is setting his house in order and wants to depart for political life at peace with all men.