

such a collection. It is, however, obvious that the workingman does not buy his food at wholesale. It is, therefore, clearly wrong to compare the workingman's wages with wholesale prices. The Democratic Text Book learnedly discourses on the stability of wholesale prices, while as a matter of fact, it is recognized by all authorities on prices that wholesale prices are exceedingly sensitive and that retail prices are more stable, never reaching relatively as high or as low levels as the former. But, leaving aside the question of stability, it is the retail price which the ordinary consumer is compelled to pay, and which, therefore, discloses the more accurately the cost of living. Further, it is stated in this Bulletin of the Bureau of Labor that these retail prices were secured directly from the books of sales of over 300 retail merchants—that these prices represent actual sales to consumers extending over each month of the fourteen-year period covered—that they represent every important center of industry in the country—and that the stores contributing the data are such as are largely patronized by the working class. It is understood that these prices will be published in the greatest detail for each city covered in the Eighteenth Annual Report of the Bureau, now in press—an evidence that the officials of the bureau have no doubt as to the integrity of their data.

As the final court, the Democratic managers suggest that the whole matter of cost of living be left to the housewives of the country. They do not permit recall the statement made in the criticized Bulletin that over 25,000 families contributed to the report—that the bureau has practically done already what is suggested—left the matter to the wives of over 25,000 representative workingmen.

Full of Misstatements.

The criticism of the wage data appears to be quite as futile as that of the figures for cost of living. It is full of misstatements of fact, as may be seen by reference to the Bulletin itself. The method of averaging imputed to the bureau was not used. Even the most cursory examination of the Bulletin could not fail to disclose the falsity of the premises upon which the entire criticism as to method is based. It has been charged in some quarters that the increase of 18.8 per cent. in wages shown by the bureau is greater than is actually the case, because the wages which form the basis of the report represent highly unionized centers, where wages have been increased most rapidly. This charge is readily refuted by comparing the Bulletin wages with the average of the minimum union wages shown for the same occupations, as compiled by the Secretary of the Building Contractors' Council of Chicago, Ill., and published by the Building Employers' Association of New York City. Bearing in mind that the union wages quoted are minimum wages and that the actual union wages would average considerably higher, the comparisons in a few occupations are as follows: Minimum union wages of masons in 29 cities average 54 cents per hour, while the average of the bureau is not quite 45 cents; minimum union wages of bricklayers in 29 cities average 57 1/2 cents per hour, while the average of the bureau is 54 1/2 cents; minimum union wages of structural iron workers in 25 cities average 49 1/2 cents per hour, while the average of the bureau is less than 41 1/2 cents; minimum union wages of plumbers in 28 cities average 47 1/2 cents per hour, while the average of the bureau is 43 1/2 cents. These examples might be multiplied, but those given are sufficient to show that the averages of the bureau are considerably lower than the average of minimum union wages, and are, therefore, fairly representative of both union and non-union labor in the occupations covered. The charge that an unjustifiable increase in wages is secured by the bureau by the collection of its figures from strongly unionized centers is readily refuted by the above facts.

The principal charges have been mentioned—the minor ones are equally unwarranted and unsupported by the facts. The report of the bureau represents the sum of a patient and painstaking investigation of nearly three years, and its permanent value cannot be lessened or obscured by partisan attacks. Its value as a scientific study of economic conditions and as a contribution to the somewhat meagre statistics of wages and cost of living has already been recognized both at home and abroad. The accuracy and excellence of the reports of this bureau of the government have never been seriously questioned during its eighteen years of existence. Under the able and conservative management of Commissioner Wright, it has always merited its reputation for the collection and presentation of facts, and so far as can be seen from a careful examination of its latest report, the charges made for partisan effect will not warrant the withdrawal of the confidence of the public.

Olney and Cleveland's Monumental Brass.

The Democratic donkey is trying to dance into power over the graves of United States soldiers who died for the freedom of Cuba. The result is already apparent. Gross stupidity could go no further than Richard Olney ventured in his recent speech. Grover Cleveland's laudation of the "experienced, undramatic Buchanan" was a record-breaker in the way of dull imperviousness to the feelings of national pride, but Olney, insulting the soldier dead, went beyond his chief.

The Trump Card.
"When in doubt, play trumps," Thus says Mr. Hoyle, Parker's chance still slumps, Spite of all his tom.

Why will Parker get Such terrific bumps? In this game, you bet, Roosevelt is trumps.

Bryan's Long Look Ahead.
Bryan declares that he is still "in the ring," and that his "heart is true to Poll." As David Bennett Hill has promised to retire from politics next January, Bryan thinks there may be a chance for the Bryan craze in 1908. But does he believe Hill?

If the full Republican vote be polled there will be no doubt about the election. If a few men in every precinct stay at home, Democracy and hard times may gain control.

The Republican who does not vote this year is not a Republican. Republicans DO things.

PARKER AND BUCHANAN.

Mr. Cleveland's Comparison Causes a Nation-Wide Smile.

When a ponderous person plants his feet in a shallow puddle there is likely to be a mighty splash. This is precisely what has happened as the result of President Cleveland's discovery of the "slight resemblance" between the candidates in 1856 and 1904.

The comparison of Roosevelt with Fremont because of their fancied resemblance as appealing to romantic sentiment and popular love for the spectacular, scarcely produced a ripple on the surface of political thought. But the likening of Judge Parker to James Buchanan as the model of what a "mature, undramatic and experienced" candidate for the Presidency should be, has provoked a joyful laughter clear across the continent.

If ex-President Cleveland had searched the roll of prominent Americans for a name less likely to arouse popular enthusiasm than that of James Buchanan he would have had to look among those whose records were positively odious to find it. There was nothing actively vicious or, what Mr. Cleveland would call, "perniciously active" about President Buchanan. He was not what, according to the sage of Buzzard's Bay, would be called an "offensive partisan."

But in the vital emergency that lowered above the Republic during his administration he was tried in the balance and found wanting. Where a man worthy to be President would have grasped the nettle of secession with the firm hand of American patriotism and crushed it in its incipency, Mr. Buchanan dallied with the question. He held that Congress was not competent to deal with the anti-slavery agitation, that it was a question for the individual States, and that it was better for all parties, including the slaves themselves, that it should remain so.

As President he deferred to pro-slavery leaders and quailed before their threats of secession. While he temporized the seceders perfected their plans. Instead of meeting their threats with the words and measures of an Andrew Jackson he took the illogical and impotent position that, while the States had a right to secede the nation, with a little n, had no power to prevent them doing so.

And this is the man of "mature, undramatic experience," who, in Mr. Cleveland's judgment, is the prototype of Judge Parker. Irresolute and ineffective as Mr. Buchanan was, we are not so sure but injustice is done him in comparing him with Judge Parker. He was certainly a man of greater maturity than the man from Esopus, not only in years but in experience with affairs and in knowledge of men. Everything that experience could teach of politics and statecraft Buchanan knew—only the intrinsic capacity to master them was lacking.

Judge Parker has had absolutely none of the experience and training that seemed to fit Mr. Buchanan for the Presidency. In 1877, at the age of twenty-five, he was elected surrogate of Ulster County, New York, and under the sheltering wing of David B. Hill he has vegetated in some judicial position ever since. That there is a certain parallelism between his weak, undramatic and vacillating utterances and those of Mr. Buchanan cannot be denied. Their views upon the unconstitutionality of the power of self-perpetuation in the Union and of the folly of an army and navy commensurate to the dignity and necessities of a great nation, are strikingly similar and equally false, barren and reactionary.

Buchanan lived to repent the "undramatic" moderation that warmed secession into life. He supported Lincoln's administration and lent all his influence to the prosecution of the war. But it does not appear that either Judge Parker or Henry Gassaway Davis, who also harks back to the days of Buchanan, follow his precept and example when in the fierce flame of civil war, he saw a bright light that taught him that the Union must be saved at all hazards. When he came to the conclusion that his country was more to him than his own interpretation of its constitution, Judge Parker and Mr. Davis quit his company and continue to steer their courses by the chart that ran his administration on the breakers.

The American people will never elect a counterfeit replica of James Buchanan to the Presidency, if they are warned in time; and, thanks to ex-President Cleveland, they recognize that Judge Parker has all of the failings and none of the redeeming qualities of President Buchanan.

Inventions of the Enemy.
Lacking material from which to create issues upon the past and present conduct of the Republican party, the Democrats have been taking a long and soulful look into the future, this fall, and their reports of what they see there in the dim time to come are fearsome.

But nobody is scared. The dreamer alone is disturbed by his nightmare, except for a chance neighbor who may hear and wonder at the awakening shrieks of the scolding of indignation. The visions of delirium portend nothing outside of the sufferer's personality. The conjured wreaths of the trance medium are visible only to the contortionist, and perhaps a few dupes at the contrived seance.

The country is not going to "the demotion bowwows." The people of the United States have no desire to start an empire upon the ruins of their republic. They will not even listen seriously to the suggestion of such a thing. The Philippine Islands are going to be taken care of. They will be free in the best sense of the word. The Panama canal has been started by honorable means, and it will so be finished. "God rules and the government at Washington still lives."

While the election of Roosevelt and Fairbanks is assured if all Republicans vote on November 8, the lower branch of Congress may be uncomformably close. No Republican should be induced, because of local or other influence, to vote for any Democratic candidate. Vote for the Republican nominee for Congress, because he will assist the President in carrying out Republican policies.

The thing for Republicans to do this year is to VOTE. The Democrats have the money of the trusts and can bring out to the polls all the ignorant, purchasable element. But they cannot bring out enough under any conditions to beat Roosevelt, if Republicans VOTE.

It used to be said of President Harrison that when one saw him close at

hand he seemed larger than he seemed at a distance. Of Grover Cleveland it was said that he was much more impressive at a distance than he was close at hand. President Roosevelt is the same seen near or seen far—always alert and wide awake, always energetic and busy, always doing something and accomplishing results, always master of the situation. This is the kind of man the people like. He has made a great President, and it would be rank ingratitude on the part of the people not to re-elect him.

ANTI-TRUST LAWS.

They Have Been Enforced Wherever Proper Cases Have Been Presented.

There are in the United States over 800 industrial trusts and organized monopolies. Their aggregate authorized capital amounts to \$21,798,547,327, such a stupendous sum as to make the petty capitalist gasp in astonishment. But it is not all tangible; a good deal is mere figures, scratches on paper. Many of the companies are playthings for financiers who require toys; others are dummies; others connate affairs. These corporations are born in every State, and State laws are responsible for their creation—laws with which the national government has nothing to do, and could not have, unless by usurpation; but it does take a hand when these concerns undertake interstate transactions in restraint of trade or foreign commerce. It is nothing against the Republican party that such corporations have a being; their own parents, the States that gave them birth, are the parties responsible for their wrong doing in those States. No federal court or officer can enforce the common law of a State; as for the United States, there is no common law, as Mr. Roosevelt has said. Mr. Parker takes issue with this declaration and dismisses it from his discussion by saying it is a question "not to be determined by the President or by a candidate for the presidency," but by the judiciary, and it has been judicially decided that common law principles could be applied in United States courts in interstate commerce cases.

There are United States statutes for such cases, so that Judge Parker's promise to "favor such further legislation within constitutional limitations as will best promote and safeguard the interests of the people" is entirely gratuitous unless he meditates a repeal of the laws already existing. These laws are of Republican creation and safeguard the interests of the people so far as State statutes will permit. A Republican Congress passed the Sherman anti-trust law and a Republican President approved it July 2, 1890. In 1903 a Republican Congress passed and a Republican President approved an act expediting anti-trust litigation. In the appropriation bill for 1903 was a paragraph providing funds for prosecuting such suits, and the deficiency bill for the same year authorized legal aid. The Elkins-Roberts law, passed and approved in 1903, bore upon this trust question and was the work of a Republican Congress and President.

The government has not flunked in enforcing the anti-trust laws where a proper case could be made out. It knocked the financial sawdust out of the Northern Securities Company in 1903. The Missouri "beef trust" case in 1903 ended with heavy fines against the defendants who were found guilty of violating the anti-trust law. In 1902 the President ordered the prosecution of certain Illinois packers for violating the Sherman anti-trust statute, and a permanent injunction was the result. These anti-trust suits are not the justice-of-the-peace affairs the Democrats are trying to make them out to be. The government must be sure it is right and able to carry its points before it acts; the best legal talent of the country is put up against it, and defeat for it would involve ruinous consequences.

What the Democrats might do in these trust matters no one, not even themselves, can guess; they can't do any better; they are likely to do worse.

THEODORE ROOSEVELT.

All hail to the man of clear vision
Whose mental and moral height
Gives, for outlook, a boundless horizon,
Who, seeing, dares face the light.
Three cheers for the man who can do things!
While others are wondering how!
Who, pledging himself to the truth and the right,
Has never forgotten his vow.

All hail to the man of true courage!
Who, never shirking the fight,
Would choose the paths that lead
through peace,
By a calmer and loftier sight.
Three cheers for the man who can see things!
With vision strong and fine,
Who has led the land, with unerring hand
To the Nation's foremost line.

To him, alone on the mountain,
Came the word that gave him power
To consecrate the Nation,
In the Nation's darkest hour.
All hail to the man God appointed
To do what our hero has done!
God bless to the Nation the glory
Which he, for the Nation, has won!
—E. B.

Repetition of Falshood.
Candidate Parker keeps right on asserting that "we have wasted more than \$650,000,000 of the people's money in the Philippines," notwithstanding the repeated demonstration, from actual figures, of the falsity of the statement. Anything to keep up the appearance of activity! And the father of lies is ever busy.

Too Dear at Any Price.
That the government's expenses are greater than they were in 1893 is true. But the expenditures are all for the work the people want done. There are things that are too dear at any price. One of these was the experience of the American people in 1893.

Has to Stand for It.
Poor Parker! With a sudden wrench He jumped from the judicial bench And sought the Presidential chair, But we will not let him sit there, And now he asks, with puzzled frown: "O, where, O, where, can I sit down?"

In the Background.
For instance, now, who knows when fate Will launch a man straight into fame? The Democratic candidate— Say, what the dickens is his name?

LABOR PROSPERITY.

Tangible Results That Are Traceable to Republican Policies.

The Democrats are silent as to the alleged benefits their party has brought to American workmen; this silence is something workmen should seriously consider, turning the matter over and over in their minds before they cast their ballots.

In saying "benefits" the word is meant to cover the most substantial good obtainable as a result for labor—the best wages and the fewest hours of work. Such results are not within the power of the President to directly produce, but they do come from wise legislation—the enactment and enforcement of national laws that are to bring prosperity.

Democrats are "mum" because what they might show would be so much to their discredit as to at once turn all classes of laborers away from the Democratic party. The most they venture to say is in their national platform; and that utterance is to suggest the enactment of impartial laws for both labor and capital; but the Republican platform is wider, longer, stronger and more comprehensive. Neither of those documents promises the laborer higher wages or that he may work fewer hours to get them. But what the Republicans do promise in platform, and speech, and documents, showing how it will be done, backing it with forty years of incontestable proofs, is the maintenance of the government on such economic foundations as experience has given assurance are for the prosperity of the first and administration next that shall be wise and comprehensive as to public interest. The Republicans have established themselves as a power capable of producing and maintaining a condition in national affairs of the greatest benefit to the working classes; but in showing this is also demonstrated the fact that the Democrats have hurt labor in all its various lines by laws created and conditions established that have brought disasters for which there was neither avoidance nor remedy under their management of federal affairs.

Since the Cleveland administration of 1893 to 1897 the Republicans have changed labor matters wonderfully for the better. Take the wages of 1896, the last year of his term, for a basis. Last year (1906), as a result of Republican finances and laws, a blacksmith got over 32 per cent. more wages per hour and worked 3 per cent. less hours per week than in 1896; carpenters received over 31 per cent. increase per hour and worked over 9 per cent. less hours per week; painters' wages increased nearly 26 per cent. per hour, and their hours of labor were reduced nearly 9 per cent. of the hours per week; bricklayers were given by an increase of 26 per cent. in wages per hour and by a reduction of 7 per cent. per hour for labor time; unskilled labor went up 18 per cent. per hour, with a gain also in the reduction of almost 5 per cent. in the number of hours of work per week. Other occupations—iron molders, machinists, masons, stone cutters, etc.—all have had their wages per hour increased and their time for the week decreased as among the appreciable weekly results of Republican power at Washington. Another feature of this labor condition for the period mentioned was in the increase in the number of workers. The Republican prosperity following Mr. Cleveland's administration was such that, in 1903 as against 1893, there was over 49 per cent. more blacksmiths, 23 per cent. more bricklayers, 21 per cent. more carpenters, 26 per cent. more laborers, and 10 per cent. more painters. Everywhere more work, more men, higher wages and fewer hours of labor.

Does not that show that a Republican administration of the government stands for labor prosperity? Such an administration had first to get the country out of the quicksands of Democratic inefficiency, which took more than one year. After that the possibilities for getting work and the wages for doing it were increased for working people, until now the United States is the golden land for the rest of the world. If the Republicans have accomplished this great good for labor, and the Democrats have made a botch of the attempt whenever they had a chance, common sense and the pocket-book should keep the workmen with the Republicans, who have put up the proofs of well-doing.

The man who advocates the destruction of all trusts and corporations is a political quack and demagogue. Large corporations employ hundreds of thousands of men. To destroy them would throw an army of workmen out of employment. The thing to do is to enforce the laws against corporations and trusts which are violating them and thus put all on a law-obeying basis. That has been President Roosevelt's policy and will continue to be.

Kuropatkin and Oyama between them have not yet succeeded in sacrificing 100,000 lives in the bloody struggle over Manchuria, but Judge Parker, with one snap of his free-trade jaw, has added over 100,000 to the death list in the Philippines. It is evident the Judge needs an automatic air-brake on his mouth or he may decimate the universe before the American voters get a chance to relegate him to innocuous oblivion.

It is estimated that this year's harvest is the most valuable ever gathered on American farms. A rough estimate shows an aggregate value for corn, wheat, oats, rye, barley, buckwheat, hay, potatoes and cotton of no less than \$5,200,000,000 against \$3,073,000,000 last year. These enormous figures suggest 3,200,000,000 reasons why the American farmer will vote the Republican ticket this fall.

A man must think he has a sure thing when he is willing to bet 4 to 1 on Roosevelt, and a man must be willing to say good by to his money when he takes the small or Parker end of such odds. But these are the odds to-day that paralleled the odds on McKinley at the close of the campaign in 1900.

Judge Parker has not yet announced whether he stands with David B. Hill on the anti-government-by-injunction issue or adheres to the principles he maintained as a sitting magistrate.

"It's all over but the shouting," sounds well, but the fact remains that no election is decided until the ballots are cast. Don't forget to vote early on November 8th.

If a large vote be cast for Watson, the Populist candidate, in communities where

Byran sentiment is strong, it will be evidence that the friends of Mr. Bryan resent the Hill-Sheehan-Parker telegram trick. But if Bryan Democrats wish to more strongly resent the trick played on them at Esopus and St. Louis they can vote for Roosevelt, and if they do not care to do that there is a third course open—they may stay at home on election day.

PARKER'S FAILURE.

Inability to Arouse Other Interest or Enthusiasm.

Alton B. Parker made an unfortunate impression by his speech of acceptance. This impression was deepened by his long-delayed and much-corrected letter. By these two efforts the Democratic candidate must be judged, for he has never done anything noteworthy, nor said anything to be remembered, either before or since his nomination.

Upon every point raised by the candidate in his two utterances Mr. Parker has failed to carry the sympathies or the judgment of the people. In the first place the lack of mental grasp revealed by the man named for the highest office in the gift of the people is painfully evident to the most careless reader of his formal statements of opinions and convictions upon national issues.

The effect is that of a narrow intelligence laboring to meet expectations founded upon an estimate it cannot fulfill. The absence of anything like broad views of national questions is felt, naturally, when one remembers that the utterances under examination are put forth for the set purpose of gaining the suffrages of the entire people of this immense country.

"WEIGHED AND FOUND WANTING," is the verdict already passed upon Mr. Parker's intellectual make-up, by the intelligent, instructed, thoughtful men and women of his own party, as well as those of the Republican persuasion.

With the emotional, enthusiastic and more or less irrational masses of the people, Mr. Parker's failure is still more conspicuous. He has none of the fire of sentiment, the eloquence, the magnetism which drew the proletariat irresistibly to Bryan in the early days of the free silver mania. Parker repeats:

And, so, the Democratic candidate has failed. He has neither the powerful individuality of the last President elected by his party, nor the popular qualities of that party's candidate in 1900 and 1896. Dull, secretive, cold, Mr. Parker is utterly unable to arouse enthusiasm, or even interest, in his candidacy. No shuffling, no shifting of ground such as he has attempted in the matter of the pension order, the trust suits, the Philippine and other problems, could for one moment hoodwink a wide-awake people. His defeat was written in the book of fate long before David Bennett Hill had fixed upon him that hateful glance which sees only what can be of use to the most selfish and unscrupulous master of political wire-pulling in existence.

LINCOLN TO SCHURZ.

Letter Written Thirty-Eight Years Ago that is Appropriate Now.

Mr. Carl Schurz made a long speech at Cooper Union in October, 1900, in which he assailed President McKinley and denounced the policy of his administration.

It is appropriate, therefore, that this letter of Abraham Lincoln to this same Mr. Carl Schurz should now be read again by the people. It was written thirty-eight years ago, having been dated Nov. 24, 1862, or in the second year of the war for the Union:

I have just received and read your letter of the 20th. The report of it is that we lost the late elections and the administration is falling because the war is unsuccessful, and that I must not flatter myself that I am not justly blamed for it. I certainly know that if the war falls, the administration falls, and that I will be blamed for it, whether I deserve it or not. And I ought to be blamed if I could do better. You think I could not do better; therefore I blame you for blaming me.

I understand you now to be willing to accept the help of men who are not Republicans, provided they have "heart in it." Agreed. I want no others. But who is to be the judge of hearts, or of "heart in it"? If I must dissent on my own judgment and take yours, I must also take that of others; and by the time I should reject all I should be advised to reject. I should have none but Republicans or others—not even yourself.

For be assured, my dear Sir, there are men who have "heart in it" that think you are performing your part as poorly as you think I am performing mine.

This has been printed before, but it bears reading many times as an exhibition of the spirit of the patient, forbearing, humorous Lincoln under the jabbing of a chronic fault-finder who owed to him only gratitude and profound respect. Besides, it has a special application to the long speech of Mr. Carl Schurz.

Edward Atkinson, one of the so-called anti-imperialists, recently prepared a newspaper article in which he attempted to show that the Philippines may have cost, indirectly, over a billion dollars. The letter probably was prepared for the benefit of Judge Parker, for the Democratic candidate gives Atkinson as authority for the statement that the taxpayers have paid nearly a billion and a quarter dollars for the islands. What was Atkinson paid for his misleading article?

What kind of a President would Parker make if he should not prove more accurate and reliable as a chief executive than he does as a campaign talker? Parker says the Philippines cost \$1,200,000,000, but the records show that the total amount paid out for the islands is only \$189,000,000. It is becoming apparent that "Annas," instead of "Alton" should be the first name of the Democratic candidate.

"If a tariff law is passed under which the country prospers, as the country has prospered under the present tariff law, then all classes will share in the prosperity. If a tariff law is passed aiming at preventing the prosperity of some of our people, it is as certain as anything can be that this aim will be achieved only by cutting down the prosperity of all of our people."—Roosevelt's letter of acceptance.

Judge Parker says he is in favor of the Panama canal, but opposed to the methods by which its construction was secured. No method that a Republican administration could have adopted would have met his approval. The only method ever pursued by the Democratic party was one of trifling and delay.

Don't nullify your vote for Roosevelt and Fairbanks by failing to support the Republican candidate for Congress. A Republican Congress is as necessary as a Republican President.

AN ABSURD BUGABOO

DEMOCRATIC CRY OF "IMPERIALISM" AN INSULT.

Parker's Expressed Alarm Over the Power of the President and Fear of What Republicans Will Do is Merely Amusing Twaddle.

Of all the absurd bugaboos in politics the most ridiculous one is that produced by the Democrats and labeled "imperialism," which, as applied at present, is designed to carry the idea of a Republic being "dictator" instead of President. The suggestion is of itself childish; still, when uttered through human megaphones of the Democratic party, it acquires a hearing if not an importance. Judge Parker, in his letter of acceptance, declares imperialism "a vital issue" and of "overwhelming importance," simply because the growth of the nation under successful Republican administrations has been so vast and rapid as to require system in its management—business-like conceptions and executions of purposes. This is an inexorable condition for success in national as well as in individual affairs; but the Democrats cannot or will not submit to it. Centralization of power does not mean usurpation, but does show the Republicans are not leaving "loose ends" around in their sagacious management of public matters. No State can truthfully complain that their rights or dignities have suffered from federal interference; that would be usurpation to be instantly resented by each and every State in the Union as a matter of self-preservation.

Why Democrats Are Wrong.

Because a Republican Congress and a Republican President, managing the Republic for a Republican majority of the people, conducted the government as a business proposition of the vastest magnitude, using no means except good common sense and the powers delegated by the national constitution, and because the Democrats never have and never will do the same, however much they may promise, is the plain reason for their outcry of "imperialism." This conservation of utilities for public good and employment by the nation's business managers maddens the Democrats, because they have been impotent with their opportunities. Judge Parker is alarmed at the power of the President. "It almost equals that of many monarchs," he declares. Why should it not? It is under constitutional limitations, and corralled by a cordon of States and the will of the people. If a Democratic President were appointed and regarded the welfare of the nation as more important than that of his party, would he not be likely to do as the Republicans have done? If he failed to try he would be recreant to his trust, but not, perhaps, to his party.

But Judge Parker goes farther in his fear of that Republicanism may do for the country. In doing this he deliberately insults that majority of the people who have believed in the Republican party, whose principles and practice have, in the last forty—less eight—years made the United States what it is today. He writes: "The magnitude of the country and its diversity of interests and population"—diversity of population applies to honest-minded foreigners who have come here to be rid of dictators and imperialists, to men who should resent at the polls and in the marketplace their patriotic and "would enable a determined, ambitious, and able executive (that does not mean a Democrat, but Mr. Roosevelt) unimpaired of constitutional limitations and fired with the last of power, to go far in the usurpation of authority and the aggrandizement of personal power before the situation could be fully appreciated or the people be aroused." Such an utterance is twaddle; there is not a sign of statesmanship about it. It is a vigorous Democratic echo from Gen. Grant's political campaigns. It might not be worth thinking about had not the chairman of the Democratic State Central Committee of Connecticut brought out the same sentiment in saying of the Connecticut Democrats—"they fear he (Roosevelt) may become ambitious to carve out for himself a place in history, and that in doing this he may embroil us with foreign nations." This indicates unity of echo; but no one is scared—but the Democrats. But they insult those of our citizens of alien descent by intimating that Mr. Roosevelt might steal the government without their suspecting anything of the kind—by asserting that it is, even now, supported as it is by foreign-born and native voters, a "beneficial despotism."

Mr. Roosevelt does not agree with this view of the situation. He has written: "We have striven both for civic righteousness and for national greatness; and we have faith to believe that our hands will be upheld by all who feel love of country and trust in the uplifting of mankind." Mr. Roosevelt's sentiments are, all of them, those of a patriot; against him are those of political tricksters and demagogues.

The Real Return.

When the returns are in at last They'll show Democracy is spurned And that by a percentage vast The President has been returned.

A Question for H. Gassaway.
"Buchanan's times," you say, were best Of all the times you ever saw. Is not your memory suppressed— Now, how about Methusalem?

In Wall street the Democrats say President Roosevelt is too strenuous in his attitude towards corporations, while in the West they charge that he is a friend of the trusts. They ought to try and get together.

A vote for Judge Parker is a vote of censure on President Roosevelt. Is any patriotic American willing to take that position towards one of the best Presidents and best administrations the country has ever had?

If you hitch up your horses to drive to the voting place on election day you may as well take along with you one or more Republican voters who might not care to walk to the polls.

We now look to Judge Parker to take up the cry against government by injunction to which his David B. Hill has given vociferous utterance.

Be sure to cast your vote November 8th. You'll never be sorry if you do; you may be sorry if you don't.