

ELECTRIC FLASHES.
NEWS FROM ALL PARTS OF
THE WORLD.

CHINA WANTS PEACE

ASKS FOR "CESSATION OF HOSTILITIES."

Li Hung Chang Appointed Envoy Plenipotentiary to Negotiate with the Powers—Conger Will "Hold On" Till Relief Comes.

Washington: Indications of the desire of China for a peaceful settlement of her present difficulties have been multiplying for some time. Official evidence of that desire was presented to the department of state Sunday. It was in the form of an edict promulgated by the emperor, Kwang Hsu, appointing Earl Li Hung Chang as envoy plenipotentiary to negotiate with the powers for an "immediate cessation of hostilities," pending a solution of the problems which have grown out of the anti-foreign uprising in the empire. Earl Li is to act directly for the emperor, and a fair inference is that whatever terms of settlement he may reach with the powers will be approved by the imperial government.

During the day only one dispatch that was made public reached any of the government departments from China. A belated message from Minister Conger was transmitted to the war department by Gen. Chaffee. It expressed simply his ability to "hold on" until Gen. Chaffee should come to his relief. All the power of this government will be exerted to get that relief to him and the other imprisoned legationnaires at the earliest possible moment.

COLD BLOODED CRIME.

R. H. Ferrell Confesses to Murder of Express Messenger Lane.

Columbus, O.: R. H. Ferrell, a former employe of the Adams Express Company, has been arrested and confessed to the murder of Express Messenger Lane and the robbery of the safe on the Pennsylvania eastbound train Friday night. One thousand dollars of the money has been recovered.

Ferrell was to have been married Thursday to Miss Lillian Costlow, daughter of Patrick Costlow, an engineer on the Pennsylvania lines. He had been discharged from the employ of the Adams Express Company about three months ago, and had not since been able to secure employment. He confessed that the motive of the robbery was to secure money, of which he felt in great need on account of his approaching marriage. The money recovered he had given to Miss Costlow to keep for him, saying that it was money he had saved from his earnings.

He was at the home of his affianced and in her company when placed under arrest.

Ferrell is but 22 years of age. When the officers took him into custody he assumed a nonchalant demeanor, but when he found that he could no longer deceive the officers he made a full confession. The confession of Ferrell disclosed a premeditated and blood curdling crime that seemed almost impossible of belief to those who looked upon the man of gentlemanly and refined appearance, who reluctantly told the story of the murder and the robbery. He said that he had become desperate because of his inability to secure employment and a realization of the fact that he must have money to defray the expenses of his approaching marriage. The robbery had been carefully planned, and it included the murder of Express Messenger Lane.

GOOD NEWS FROM MACARTHUR

Grass Surrenders His Command to Twenty-Fourth Infantry.

Washington: The war department on Sunday received the following dispatch containing cheering news from Gen. MacArthur at Manila: "Manila, P. I., Adjutant General, Washington: Col. Grass on Aug. 12, in vicinity of Tayug, surrendered command to Col. Freeman, Twenty-fourth United States Infantry, consisting of one major, six captains, six lieutenants, 169 men, 101 rifles and 50 bolts. MacArthur."

ELEVEN INSTANTLY KILLED.

Special Train Strikes a Loaded Omnibus in Pennsylvania.

Scranton, Pa.: Eleven persons were instantly killed and eleven others, several of whom will die, were seriously injured Sunday night in a grade crossing accident three miles east of this city, by a passenger train on the Lehigh and New England Railroad crashing into an omnibus containing twenty-five persons. All the dead and wounded were in the bus, and but three escaped uninjured.

King Emanuel Takes Oath.

Rome: King Victor Emmanuel III. took a formal constitutional oath Saturday before parliament. The senate chamber was draped in mourning. The chamber was filled with senators, deputies, high officials of state and the diplomatic corps. All along the route to the parliament buildings large crowds assembled and the new king was given an ovation.

Constable Shoots Two.

Hopkinsville, Ky.: Constable John Wilson shot and killed Alexander and Dick White Sunday, while the latter were resisting arrest.

Sick Man's Terrible Deed.

Churubusco, Ind.: During a fit of temporary insanity, Sol Bear, who was lying at the point of death from illness, sprang from his bed, seized a shotgun and killed his son Isaac. The son was attending his father.

Sharkey to Wed a Belle.

New York: Tom Sharkey, who received his quietus at the hands of Rahlin several weeks ago, is engaged to be married soon to Miss Jennie Tuttle, who is better known as "The Belle of Sheepshead Bay."

William J. Bryan's Indianapolis speech.



HON. WILLIAM JENNINGS BRYAN.

HON. WILLIAM J. BRYAN, addressing the members of the Notification Committee at Indianapolis, said that at an early day and in a more formal manner he would accept the nomination which they tendered. At that time he promises to fully discuss the various questions covered by the Democratic platform, limiting his remarks before the committee to a few observations upon the general character of the contest, and upon the question which is declared to be of paramount importance in this campaign. Mr. Bryan spoke substantially as follows:

When I say that the contest of 1900 is a contest between democracy on the one hand and plutocracy on the other, I do not mean to say that all our opponents have deliberately chosen to give to organized wealth a predominating influence in the affairs of the government, but I do assert that on the important issues of the day the Republican party is dominated by those influences which constantly tend to elevate pecuniary considerations and ignore human rights.

The Democratic party is not making war upon the honest acquisition of wealth; it has no desire to discourage industry, economy and thrift. On the contrary, it gives to every citizen the greatest possible stimulus to honest toil, when it promises him protection in the enjoyment of the proceeds of his labor. Property rights are most secure when human rights are respected. Democracy strives for a civilization in which every member of society will share according to his merits.

Against us are arrayed a comparatively small, but politically and financially powerful, number who really profit by Republican policies; but with them are associated a large number who, because of their attachment to their party name, are giving their support to doctrines antagonistic to the former teachings of their own party. Republicans who used to advocate bimetallism, now try to convince themselves that the gold standard is attached to the greenback are now seeking an excuse for giving national banks control of the nation's paper money; Republicans who used to boast that the Republican party was paying off the national debt are now seeking for reasons to support a perpetual and increasing debt; Republicans who formerly abhorred a trust, now beguile themselves with the delusion that there are good trusts and bad trusts, while, in their minds, the line between the two is becoming more and more obscure; Republicans who, in times past, congratulated the country upon the small expense of our standing army, are now making light of the obligation which they are assuming by their increase in the permanent military establishment; Republicans who gloried in our independence when the nation was less powerful, now look with favor upon a foreign alliance, represented by the three years' war, which has condemned "forcible annexation" as an immoral and even criminal, are now sure that it is both immoral and criminal to oppose forcible annexation. That partisanship has already blinded many to present facts is certainly how large a portion of the Republican party can be drawn over to the new policies remains to be seen.

Abandon Early Ideals.

In attempting to press economic questions upon the country, the present administration involves the very structure of our government, the Republican leaders give new evidence of their abandonment of the earlier ideals of the party and of their complete subservency to pecuniary considerations. They should not be permitted to evade the stupendous and far-reaching issue which they have deliberately brought into the arena of politics. When the President, supported by a practically unanimous vote of the Senate, entered upon a war with Spain for the purpose of aiding the struggling patriots of Cuba, the country, without regard to party, applauded. Although the Democrats recognized that the administration would necessarily gain a political advantage from the conduct of a war which, in the very nature of the case, must soon end in a complete victory, they sided with the Republicans in the support which they gave to the President. When the war was over and the Republican leaders began to suggest the propriety of a colonial policy, opposition at once manifested itself. When the President finally laid before the Senate a treaty which recognized the independence of Cuba, but provided for the cession of the Philippine Islands to the United States, the menace of imperialism became so apparent that many preferred to reject the treaty and risk the ill effects of a military expedition to take the chance of correcting the errors of the treaty by the independent action of this country.

I was among the number of those who believed it better to ratify the treaty and end the war, release the volunteers, remove the expense for war expenditures, and then give to the Filipinos the independence which might be forced from Spain by a new treaty. I thought it safer to trust the American people to give independence to the Filipinos than to trust the accomplishment of that purpose to diplomacy with an unfriendly nation. The title of Spain being extinguished, we were at liberty to deal with the Filipinos according to American principles. The Bacon resolution, introduced a month before hostilities broke out at Manila, promised independence to the Filipinos on the same terms that it was promised to the Cubans. I supported this resolution and believe that its adoption prior to the breaking out of hostilities would have prevented bloodshed, and that its adoption at any subsequent time would have ended hostilities.

The treaty had been rejected, considerable time would have necessarily elapsed before a new treaty could have been agreed upon and ratified and during that time the question would have been agitating the public mind. If the Bacon resolution had been adopted by the Senate and carried out by the President, either at the time of the ratification of the treaty or at any time afterwards, it would have taken the question of imperialism out of politics and left the American people free to deal with their domestic problems. But the resolution was defeated by the vote of the Republican President, and from that time to this a Republican Congress has refused to take any action whatever in the matter.

Cowardly Evasion.

When hostilities broke out at Manila Republican speakers and Republican editors at once sought to lay the blame upon those who had delayed the ratification of the treaty, and during the progress of the war, the same Republicans have accused the opponents of imperialism of giving encouragement to the Filipinos. This is a cowardly evasion of responsibility.

If it is right for the United States to hold the Philippine Islands permanently and imitate European empires in the gov-

ernment of colonies, the Republican party ought to state its position and defend it, but it must expect the subject races to protest against such a policy and to resist to the extent of their ability. The Filipinos do not need any encouragement from Americans now living. Our whole history has been an encouragement. Those who would have this nation enter upon a career of empire must consider not only the effect of imperialism on the Filipinos, but they must also calculate its effect upon our own nation. We cannot repudiate the principle of self-government in the Philippines without weakening that principle here.

Imperialism Not Expansion.

Our opponents, conscious of the weakness of their cause, seek to confuse imperialism with expansion, and have even dared to claim Jefferson as a supporter of their policy. Jefferson spoke so freely and used language with such precision that no one can be ignorant of his views. On one occasion he declared: "If there be one principle more deeply rooted than any other in the mind of every American, it is that we should have nothing to do with conquest, and not again a government of the world; if it is not in our principles; it is inconsistent with our government."

The forcible annexation of territory to be governed by arbitrary power, differs as much from the acquisition of territory to be built up into states as monarchy differs from a democracy. The Democratic party does not oppose expansion, when expansion enlarges the area of the republic and incorporates land which can be settled by American citizens, and when it gives to the people who are willing to become citizens and are capable of discharging their duties as such. The acquisition of the Louisiana territory, Florida, Texas and other territories which have been secured from time to time, enlarged the republic, and the constitution followed the flag into the new territory. It is now proposed to seize upon distant territory already more densely populated than our own country, to be built up into states, not a government, for which there is no warrant in our constitution or our laws. Even the argument that this earth belongs to those who desire to cultivate it and have the physical power to acquire it cannot be used to justify the appropriation of the Philippine Islands by the United States, for if the islands were uninhabited American citizens would not be willing to go there and till the soil. The white race will not live so near the equator.

A colonial policy means that we shall send to the Philippines a few traders, a few task masters and a few office-holders, and an army large enough to support their authority, and the rule of the people while they rule the natives.

If we have an imperial policy we must have a large standing army as its natural and necessary complement. The spirit which will carry the heads and necks of the Philippine Islands will justify the seizure of other islands and the domination of other people, and wars of conquest we can expect a certain, if not rapid growth of our military establishment. The only way to increase in our regular army is intended by the Republican leaders is not a mere matter of conjecture, but a matter of fact.

Menace of a Big Army.

A large standing army is not only a pecuniary burden to the people and, if accompanied by compulsory service, a constant source of irritation, but it ever a menace to a Republican form of government. A small standing army and a well-equipped and well-disciplined State militia are sufficient in ordinary times, and in any emergency the nation should be able to raise its own army. The dependence upon the volunteers who come from all occupations at their country's call and return to productive labor when their services are no longer required—men who fight when the country needs fighters and work when the country needs workers.

The Republican platform assumes that the Philippine Islands will be retained under American sovereignty, and we have a right to demand of the Republican leaders a discussion of the future status of the Filipino. Is he to be a citizen or a subject? Are we to bring into the body politic eight or ten million Asiatics, so different from us in race and history that amalgamation is impossible? Are we to share with us in making the laws and shaping the destiny of this nation? No Republican of prominence has been bold enough to advocate such a proposition. The Democratic platform describes the situation when it says that the Filipinos cannot be citizens without endangering our civilization. Who will dispute it? And what is the alternative? If the Filipino is not to be a citizen, shall we make him a subject? On that question the Democratic platform speaks with emphasis. It declares that the Filipino cannot be a subject without endangering our form of government. A republic can have no subjects.

The whole difference between a monarchy and a republic may be summed up in one sentence. In a monarchy the king gives to the people what he believes to be

a good government; in a republic the people secure for themselves what they believe to be a good government. The Republican party has accepted the European idea and planted itself upon the ground taken by George II, and by every ruler who distrusts the capacity of the people for self-government or denies them a voice in their own affairs.

Republicans Fear to Legislate.

The Republican platform promises that some measure of self-government is to be given to the Filipinos by law; but, even this pledge is not fulfilled. Nearly sixteen months elapsed after the ratification of the treaty before the adjournment of Congress last June, and yet no law was passed dealing with the Philippine situation. The will of the President has been the only law in the Philippine Islands wherever the American authority extends. Why does the Republican party hesitate to legislate upon the Philippine question? Because a law would disclose the radical departure from history and precedent contemplated by those who control the Republican party. The storm of protest which greeted the Porto Rican law was an indication of what may be expected when the American people are brought face to face with legislation upon this subject. If the Porto Ricans, who welcome annexation, are to be denied the guarantees of our constitution, what is the lot of the Filipinos, who resisted our annexation? If secret influences could compel a disregard of our plain duty toward friendly people, living near our shores, what treatment will be given to the millions of our fellow citizens, friendly people, 7,000 miles away? If, in this country, where the people have the right to vote, Republican leaders dare not take the side of the people against the trusts and monopolies which have grown up within the past few years, how can they be trusted to protect the Filipinos from the corporations which are waiting to despoil the islands?

Our Duty in the Philippines.

Some say that it is our duty to hold the Philippine Islands. But duty is not an argument; it is a conclusion. To ascertain what our duty is, in any emergency, we must apply well-settled and generally accepted principles. It is our duty to avoid stealing, no matter whether the thing to be stolen is of great or little value. It is our duty to avoid killing a human being, no matter whether the man being lived or to what race or class he belongs. Everyone recognizes the obligation imposed upon individuals to observe both the human and the divine law. As some deny the application of these laws to nations, it may not be out of place to quote the opinions of others. Jefferson, than whom there is no higher political authority, said: "I know of but one code of morality for men, whether acting singly or collectively. 'Franklin, whose learning, wisdom and virtue are a part of the precious legacy bequeathed to us from the Revolutionary days, expressed the same idea in even stronger language. He said: 'Justice is as strictly due between neighboring nations as between neighbor citizens. A highwayman is as much a robber when he plunders in a nation as when he robs an individual, and the moral character of an act is not determined by the number of those who join in it, but by the nature of the act, and force has never created a right. If it was true as declared in the resolutions of intervention, that the Cubans 'are and of right ought to be free and independent,' (language taken from the Declaration of Independence), it is equally true that the Filipinos 'are and of right ought to be free and independent.'"

It is argued by some that the Filipinos are incapable of self-government, and that therefore we owe it to the world to take control of them. Admiral Dewey, in an official report to the navy department, declared the Filipinos more capable of self-government than the Cubans, and said that he based his opinion upon his knowledge of both races. But I will not rest the case upon the relative advancement of the Filipinos. Henry Clay, in defending the rights of the people of South America to self-government, said: "It is the doctrine of thrones that man is too ignorant to govern himself. Their partisans assert his incapacity in reference to all nations; if they cannot command universal assent to the proposition, it is then referred to popular utility, and our pride and our presumption too often make converts of us. I contend that it is to arraign the reputation of Freedom. I contend that He has created beings incapable of governing themselves, and to be trampled upon by kings. Self-government is the natural right of man."

Some argue that American rule in the Philippine Islands will result in the better education of the Filipinos. Do not deceive us. If we expect to maintain a colonial policy, we shall not find it to our advantage to educate the people. The educated Filipinos are now in revolt against us, and the most ignorant ones have made the least resistance to our domination. If we are to govern them without their consent and give them no voice in determining the taxes which they must pay, we dare not educate them, lest they learn to read the Declaration of Independence and hastening the coming of the United States and mock us for our inconsistency.

The principal arguments, however, advanced by those who enter upon a defense of imperialism are:

Second—That our commercial interests in the Philippine Islands and in the Orient make it necessary for us to hold the islands permanently.

Third—That the spread of the Christian religion will be facilitated by a colonial policy.

Fourth—That there is no honorable retreat from the position, which the nation has taken.

The first argument is addressed to the nation's pride and the second to the nation's pocketbook. The third is intended for the church member and the fourth for the partisan.

It is a sufficient answer to the first argument to say that for more than a century this nation has been a world power. For ten centuries the British Empire has been the most potent influence in the world. Not only has it been a world power, but it has done more to affect the politics of the human race than all the other nations of the world combined. The growth of the principle of self-government, planted on American soil, has been the overshadowing political fact of the nineteenth century. It has made this nation conspicuous among the nations and given it a place in history such as no other nation has ever enjoyed.

The Commercial Argument.

The permanent chairman of the last Republican national convention presented the pecuniary argument in all its baldness, when he said: "We make no hypocritical pretense of being interested in the Philippines solely on account of others. While we regard the welfare of the people as a sacred trust, we see our duty to ourselves as well as to others. We believe in trade expansion. By every legitimate means given to the province of government, we intend to mean to stimulate the expansion of our trade and open new markets."

This is the commercial argument. It is based on the theory that war can be rightly waged for pecuniary advantage, and that it is profitable to purchase trade by force and violence. The Democratic party is in favor of the expansion of trade, but it would extend our trade by every legitimate and peaceful means; but it is not willing to trade instead of the human race, and a war of conquest is as unwise as it is unrighteous. A harbor and coaling station in the Philippines would answer every trade necessity, and such a concession could have been secured at any time without difficulty.

The pecuniary argument, though more effective in certain classes, is not likely to be used so often or presented with so much emphasis as the religious argument. The religious argument is the "gospel-gospel" were urged against the Filipinos only it would be a sufficient answer to say that a majority of the Filipinos are now Christians. The religious argument is one of much wider application and challenges every other argument. The religious argument varies in positiveness from a passive belief that Providence delivered the Filipinos into our hands, for their good and our glory, to the exultation of the minister who said that we ought to "thrust the natives (Filipinos) until they understand who we are," and that "every bullet that is fired is a word of God, and every bayonet thrust is a word of God, and every wave means righteousness."

We cannot approve of this doctrine in one particular. We are willing to apply it everywhere. Love, not force, was the weapon of the Nazarene; sacrifice for others, not the exploitation of them, was His method of saving the human race. Let it be known that our missionaries are seeking souls instead of sovereignty; let it be known that instead of the advance guard of conquering armies, they are going forth to help and to uplift, having their lights lit with good truth and their feet shod with the sandals of peace, and that they are carrying the breastplate of righteousness, and carrying the sword of the Spirit; let it be known that they are the citizens of a nation, and that they are the citizens of other nations as carefully as it protects the rights of its own citizens, and the welcome given to our missionaries will be more cordial than the welcome extended to the missionaries of any other nation.

The argument, made by some, that it was our duty for the nation that it had anything to do with the Philippine Islands, but that the naval victory at Manila made the permanent acquisition of those islands necessary, is also unwise. We won a naval victory at Santiago, but that did not compel us to hold Cuba. The shedding of American blood in the Philippine Islands does not make it imperative that we should retain possession forever; American blood was shed at San Juan Hill and El Coney, and yet the Philippines were not ours. Let it be known that the American flag floats over Manila does not compel us to hold the Philippines. Let it be known that the American flag waves over Havana today, but the President has promised to haul it down when the flag of the Cuban republic is raised in its place. Better a thousand times that our flag in the Orient give way to a flag representing the idea of self-government than that the flag of this republic should become the flag of an empire.

Solution of the Question.

There is an easy, honest, honorable solution of the Philippine question. It is set forth in the Democratic platform and it is submitted with confidence to the American people. This plan I unreservedly endorse. If elected, I shall convene Congress in extraordinary session as soon as I am inaugurated, and recommend an immediate declaration of the nation's purpose: first, to establish a stable form of government in the Philippine Islands, just as we are now establishing a stable form of government in the United States; second, to give independence to the Filipinos; just as we have promised to give independence to the Cubans; third, to protect the Filipinos from outside wrongs, while they work out their destiny, just as we have protected the republics of Central and South America, and are, by the terms of the treaty, pledged to protect Cuba. An European protectorate often results in the exploitation of the ward by the guardian. An American protectorate gives to the ward the right to develop its own strength, without making it the victim of our greed.

Mr. Chairman and Gentlemen of the Committee on the Philippine question, I discharge my debt of gratitude which I owe to my countrymen for the honors which they have so generously bestowed upon me; but, Sirs, I beg my lot to occupy the position of office for which the convention has named me, or to spend the remainder of my days in private life. I shall be my constant endeavor to be the first to give up the office for which the convention has named me, and to spend the remainder of my days in private life. I shall be my constant endeavor to be the first to give up the office for which the convention has named me, and to spend the remainder of my days in private life. I shall be my constant endeavor to be the first to give up the office for which the convention has named me, and to spend the remainder of my days in private life.

SPEECH OF MR. STEVENSON

Accepting the Democratic Nomination for Vice President.

Hon. Adlai E. Stevenson, in his speech at Indianapolis accepting the Democratic nomination for Vice President, said in part:

I am profoundly grateful for the honor conferred upon me by my selection by the national Democratic convention as its candidate for the high office of Vice President of the United States. For an honor of this kind I have never before been officially made known to me I express to you, Mr. Chairman, and to your honored associates of the committee, my sincere thanks. Deeply impressed with a sense of the responsibility assumed by such candidacy, I accept the nomination so generously tendered me. Should the action of the convention meet the approval of the people in November, it will be my earnest endeavor to discharge with fidelity the duties of the great office.

It is wisely provided in the constitution that at stated times political power shall return to the hands of the people. The struggle for political supremacy, upon which we are now entering, is one of deep moment to the American people. Its up-



HON. ADLAI E. STEVENSON.

premise importance to all conditions of our countrymen cannot be measured by words. The ills resulting from unjust legislation and from an unwise administration of the government must find their remedy in the all-potent ballot. To it we now make our solemn appeal.

The chief purpose of the great convention whose representatives are before me, we redress for existing wrongs and secure against perils yet greater which menace popular government. Your convention, in language clear and unmistakable, has presented the vital issues upon which the pending contest is to be determined. To its platform I give my earnest assent.

After referring to the platform declarations on trusts, tariffs, Congressional extravagance, etc., Mr. Stevenson says: A question is yet to be discussed, to which all of these are of secondary importance. The chief purpose of the great convention whose representatives are before me, we redress for existing wrongs and secure against perils yet greater which menace popular government. Your convention, in language clear and unmistakable, has presented the vital issues upon which the pending contest is to be determined. To its platform I give my earnest assent.

After referring to the platform declarations on trusts, tariffs, Congressional extravagance, etc., Mr. Stevenson says: A question is yet to be discussed, to which all of these are of secondary importance. The chief purpose of the great convention whose representatives are before me, we redress for existing wrongs and secure against perils yet greater which menace popular government. Your convention, in language clear and unmistakable, has presented the vital issues upon which the pending contest is to be determined. To its platform I give my earnest assent.

Upon every phase of our foreign policy, the language of the Democratic platform is too clear to admit of misconception. It favors trade expansion by all peaceful and honorable means, and it is in conflict with that provision of the Constitution which declares that "Duties, imports and excises shall be uniform throughout the United States."

Deplores Spirit of Empire.

The Democratic platform condemns the policy pursued by the present administration toward the Philippine Islands. This policy—inspired by the greedy spirit of commercialism—has entailed our government in an unnecessary war, sacrificed lives, and placed the American people in deadly antagonism to our former allies in the balance of power. It is a flagrant breach of good faith toward a dependent people. It is imposing government without the consent of the governed, in conflict with that provision of the Constitution which declares that "Duties, imports and excises shall be uniform throughout the United States."

The Democratic party has ever been the advocate of wise territorial acquisition. It was in control of the government during forty years of the first half of the present century. During that period new States were admitted into the Federal Union, our Western border extended beyond the Mississippi. Out of the Louisiana country—acquired under the first Democratic administration—have been carved fourteen magnificent States. Under a later Democratic administration—and as the result of the treaty which terminated our war with Mexico—we acquired California and neighboring States and Territories, thus bringing under our flag, to remain forever, the vast expanse stretching to the Pacific.

The policy of aggressive expansion—of subjugation of distant islands—pursued by the present administration, finds no precedent in the peaceful cession of Cuba to our country by Napoleon, that of Florida by Spain, nor that later, of the vast Westward by Mexico. The territory acquired under Democratic administrations was, with favorable climatic conditions, the fit abode for men of our own race. At the time of annexation it passed under the rule of Anglo-Saxons, who carried with him our language and our laws. It was territory contiguous to our own, and acquired with the declared intention—when conditions and population would justify—of carving it into States. The result: Millions of American homes, our national wealth increased beyond the dream of avarice, and the United States chief among the nations of the earth. Can it be that the new policy of forcible annexation of distant islands, which has what in the historic events I have mentioned? The answer is found in the bare statement of facts. The territory acquired under Democratic administration is contiguous to the Philippine Islands 8,000 miles distant. The acquisition of territory upon our own continent added little to the national expanse; to maintain permanent sovereignty over the distant islands necessitates immense expenditures upon our army and navy. More than that, it contemplates a method of administration that pertains, not to the republic, but to the empire. Can it be doubted that the attempt to stifle the spirit of liberty abroad will imperil popular government at home?

We stand 100 years from the hour when the political forces were gathered together to meet in the election of the first Democratic President. The anniversary of the masterful day in our history was wisely chosen for the assembling in convention of the representatives of the historic party whose founder was Jefferson—and whose platform is the Declaration of Independence. In the great struggle now upon us we invoke the co-operation of all who revere the memory of our fathers, and to whom this declaration is not unmeaning parchment—but the enduring chart of our liberties. Upon the supreme issue now in the forefront—and to the end of that republican government be perpetuated—we appeal to the sober judgment and patriotism of the American people.

After the Combat.

"While I was abroad I witnessed a duel in France."

"Anybody hurt?"

"Yes; one of the principals had a rib broken embracing the other after combat was over."