

always exact a price in cheap money that equals the value of his wares in this universal standard. Prices have not risen. The purchasing power of a debased medium has fallen. General Warner makes the same mistake as the little boy who first entered an elevator at the top story and told his mother that the house went up and he got out on the ground floor.

"I have only ten minutes, just long enough to state by illustration the principle for which I stand and to offer my friends in the divided camp of the enemy, another draught from the wisdom of Jefferson and Jackson."

"THAT'S US." It would be useless and pedantic to advocate the use of "it's me" instead of "it is I," now that the latter form has prevailed and won the universal sanction of good taste; and still the former is pure English, while its victorious rival is the English that pretends to be Latin. How did the false drive out the genuine? Easily enough; for the same reason that our children are taught Latin in school to this day instead of Anglo-Saxon and Danish; the pupils of the Nebraska City High School last week took up Cicero instead of King Alfred and the *Aeneid* instead of the *Andreas* or the *Edda*, though the former are foreign to all their inborn ideas, while the latter would hit them right where they live: that reason being that for a long time only priests could read and write, and that the pope is the bishop of Rome.

The particular expression in question is a Scandinavian form. The thought takes a little different shape in a German's mind; our Anglo-Saxon fathers said "I am it," "ic hit eom," just as a German of today says "ich bin es" or "das bin ich;" although the writer is under the impression that "dat is mi" would pass in the Low-German of Mecklenburg, which is particularly related to our language. But our Norse fathers said it just as we do yet, when we don't think; the Northmen from Norway brought "det er mig" into England, and the Normans from France followed with "c'est moi;" "det er jeg" or "c'est je" would be rank nonsense in Norse or French today. So when your boy says "it's me" don't think he is stupid; he is speaking an older English than is taught, as yet, in the schools.

A PARTISAN ASSERTION. The recent republican convention of the state of New York, which nominated our highly-valued friend, the honest and courageous Theodore Roosevelt, for governor, indulged itself in the usual amount of political mendacity.

The Munchausenism of the Saratoga platform materializes most perfectly and with the greatest incandescence when it touches the question of a protective tariff. There it reads—like a rough rider over the truth—"we have enacted a con-

servative protective tariff so wisely devised that the revenue is amply sufficient to pay the ordinary expenses of the government in time of peace."

Now let it be remembered that this wisely-constructed, conservative, protective tariff took the place of the so-called Wilson tariff which left a deficit for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1897, of eighteen millions, six hundred and twenty-three thousand dollars. The national republican platform of 1896 denounces such deficits as "injurious to the public credit and destructive to business enterprises." And hence the Dingley tariff, *i. e.* a "wisely devised protective tariff" was enacted by a republican congress and approved by President McKinley. But the deficit under the Dingley tariff on June 30, 1898, is twenty-six million four hundred and ninety-six thousand seven hundred and ninety-nine dollars more than it was the preceding twelve months under the so-called Wilson tariff.

"But it will be alleged, of course, that 'anticipatory importations' cut down normal receipts as anticipated under the wisely devised protective tariff. Not in fact until January, 1898, did its erudite author assure the public that the test of its revenue-making capacity had become fair. Let us, then, take the six months since this admission by the cautious Dingley. Between January 1 and July 1, 1897 (Wilson tariff), our customs revenue was \$108,494,711; in the same six months of 1898 (Dingley tariff) it was \$86,994,573, or nearly twenty-two millions less. A similar comparison may be made with former years. But if the Wilson tariff, by virtue of its unwisely devised schedules, was injurious to the public credit, what is to be said of a tariff which thus heavily emphasized the most disquieting features of the law? Fortunately, the question is now a mere matter of controversial history Congress at last has learned, under the stress of war, the art of raising revenue, and that way, it is needless to observe, is not the way of Dingley. The clause in the New York convention platform may be described as an obituary notice."

PREPARED FOR WAR.

A deal has been said, written and printed about how and by whom the government of the United States was prepared to make war with Spain or any other old country. Few have gone to the primary preparation. No country can safely venture upon war without a firmly established credit. War costs money.

War uses up blood and iron. It creates wasteful consumption and corpses. And war therefore is a very expensive restoration of a barbaric and savage accomplishment with modern inventions and improvements for the speedier creation of cadavers which cannot be carried on without cash and credit.

The syndicate loan made by the last Cleveland administration saved the credit of this government. Had J. Pierpont Morgan & Co. failed to fur-

nish that sixty millions of gold on time as per contract, cash, credit, and the power to carry on war would have vanished. A financial smash-up would have precipitated universal bankruptcy. Gold instead of circulating in the United States would have gone abroad or been hoarded.

The courage and wise statesmanship of Grover Cleveland and John G. Carlisle made the victories of Dewey and Sampson and Shafter and Miles possible.

The old adage
THOMAS F. BAYARD. "A man has but to die to be praised"

is again brought vividly to mind since the death of Thomas F. Bayard.

Mr. Bayard was successively United States senator, secretary of state and ambassador to Great Britain. While acting in the latter capacity he endeavored at all times to establish and maintain a condition of perfect amity between England and our own country. To this end, his matchless diplomacy and his personal popularity, his marvelous tact and his statesmanlike bearing were potent factors. And yet because of his patriotic endeavors along this line he was frequently denounced by his political opponents, and even by some members of his own party.

But Mr. Bayard is dead. And if it be true that "the evil which men do lives after them," it is also a fact, in Mr. Bayard's case, that the good he has done is not "interred with his bones." Mr. Bayard was one of those men who in public life refrain from seeking the plaudits of their own day and look to a vindication of their acts in the thoughtful history of the future.

The following extract from a republican paper printed at Chicago comes too late to afford any gratification to the dead ambassador, but it may act as an inspiration and incentive to men who, like Mr. Bayard, await the calm and sober judgment of the future for their reward of praise, rather than cater to the fickle emotions of the present:

"To James Russell Lowell and Thomas F. Bayard more than to all the other ministers and ambassadors to the British court is due the perfect amity now existing between the British and American people. Both were severely criticised at home for their eloquent efforts in behalf of Anglo-Saxon unity, but they have been magnificently vindicated."

Providence evidently favors the extension of English territory. The land around Hudson Bay is rising so rapidly that large parts of that body of water are becoming unnavigable, and it is predicted that its entire extent will one day be added to Canada's arable territory. This plan is much preferable to the method we have practised in the East, but there are limits to the extent to which it can be applied.