

OUR MISSIONARIES. The musketeer missionaries of the United States are doing blessed work for civilization, humanity and Christianity among the stiff-necked barbarians and heathen of the Philippine Islands.

N. A. J. McDonnell, of Salt Lake City, serving in the Utah battery, which is throwing shells full of piety, and shot full of benevolent assimilation into the camps of the savages, writing on the 22d of February remarks with all the fervor of a methodist exhorter: "the good work still goes on, and the Filipinos are regularly meeting with defeat." He thus describes the courage of the natives and the way in which they sacrificed their lives:

"The enemy numbered thousands and had courage, but could not shoot straight. People can never tell me anything about the Rough Riders charging San Juan; if these natives could shoot as accurately as the Spanish, they would have exterminated us. Fighting goes on all along the lines, many natives are killed, but we capture very few rifles, as they seem to have men to take them. Official reports say over 4,200 natives have been buried by American troops. How many they have buried themselves and how many more are dead in the brush no one knows."

But Frank M. Erb, of Allegheny, who belongs to a Pennsylvania regiment, writes on February 27 from the trenches near Manila, and with all the zealotry of a genuine McKinley Christian, tells how the "nigger-killing" progresses, thus:

"We have been in this nigger-fighting business now for twenty-three days, and have been under fire for the greater part of that time. The niggers shoot over one another's heads or any old way. Even while I am writing this the black boys are banging away at our outposts, but they very seldom hit anybody. The morning of the 6th a burying detail from our regiment buried forty-nine nigger enlisted men and two nigger officers, and when we stopped chasing them the night before, we could see 'em carrying a great many with them. We are supposed to have killed about 800. Take my advice, and don't enlist in the regulars, for you are good for three years. I am not sorry I enlisted, but you see we have had some excitement and we only have about fourteen months' time to serve, if they keep us our full time, which is not likely. We will no doubt start home as soon as we get these niggers rounded up."

But Leonard F. Adams, of Ozark, Missouri, depicts "benevolent assimilation" with an electric touch and leaves nothing wanting to illuminate the march of piety in the Philippines. In his letter of February 4, Adams gives this peaceful picture of Christian efforts and their results:

"The next day after the battle we went over the battlefield in squads burying the dead niggers. I saw seventy-

four buried in one hole. We would rake them up in a pile, dig a hole, and dump them in, throw a little dirt over them, and go ahead. In the path of the Washington regiment and Battery D of the Sixth artillery there were 1,008 dead niggers, and a great many wounded. We burned all their houses. *I don't know how many men, women and children the Tennessee boys did kill. They would not take any prisoners.* One company of the Tennessee boys was sent into headquarters with thirty prisoners, and got there with about a hundred chickens and no prisoners."

CONSERVATIVE SUGGESTIONS.

Whenever you wish information relative to money and its functions proceed to interview all the paupers in the poor-house.

The real genuine philosopher who ponders profoundly upon pecuniary matters and never arrives at an illogical conclusion concerning currency problems is a gentleman who never chews his own tobacco, never pays debts, never studied political economy, constantly uses the word "plutocracy," without knowing what it means, and is everlastingly denouncing the banks, railroads and manufactories as "trusts."

Frequently this breed of aerial economists is represented in congress where they indicate that speech-making is the sole end of statesmanship, outside of getting appropriations for unneeded public buildings, unnavigable rivers and harbors and jobs for indigent and inefficient constituents.

De Armond, of Missouri.

Among the most incandescent inanity evolved on trusts no other sample can compare with that furnished by the full-worded and meagre-minded De Armond of Missouri. This brass-mounted, silver-plated and perpetual oration-hatcher has achieved conspicuousness for being able to talk longer and say nothing than any one of his competitors in resonant and thoughtless verbosity. Here is a specimen of the dethoughtized slush of Congressman De Armond:

"The trusts have been and are stifling individual enterprise, fostering and perpetuating monopolies, depriving the people of public functions, which they convert into agencies for the advancement of corporate interests, corrupting legislators, debauching the judiciary, controlling elections, aggrandizing wealth, oppressing the poor, promoting extravagance in public expenditures, extending the immunity of the classes from just taxation while adding to the burdens of the masses, undermining the republic and building up an aristocracy of wealth, exalting the millionaire and oppressing the millions."

How are trusts formed except out of "individual enterprise?"

How can they "foster and perpetuate" monopolies without "individual enter-

prise;" and when they have fostered trusts how can trusts "deprive the people of public functions?"

How are "public functions" converted into agencies for the advancement of corporate interests? When and where has Demagogue De Armond witnessed such conversion and use of "public functions?"

De Armond is a legislator. Does he speak of corruption of legislators from introspection, retrospection, observation or experience?

Where has the "judiciary" been debauched?

Where have the elections been controlled by trusts?

What does De Armond mean by "aggrandizing wealth" and how is that feat performed by trusts?

Where is the "oppression of the poor" by trusts, and whence do the advantage and profits of trusts for "oppressing the poor" come?

Trusts promote "extravagance in public expenditures," saith the oral De Armond; and was the last congress of which he was an active spokesman a trust? In extravagance it has no equal.

Who "extends immunity" from "just taxation" to the classes and adds to the "burden of the masses," except just such statesmen as De Armond who are the idols of the masses—all except the m—whom they delude with wind and words.

Who is "undermining the republic" more than the De Armonds who deride decisions of the federal courts, whether uttered by a district, a circuit, or the supreme of the United States?

Who "builds up an aristocracy of wealth" more certainly and securely than the man who inveighs against thrifty frugality, obedience to the laws as expounded by the courts, temperate life and constant industry upon the part of American laborers, in a country where the laborers of today may be and are the millionaires of tomorrow?

There is not now and there can not be in the United States a permanent aristocracy, founded upon wealth. No vast entailed estates, no hereditary titles and no gauge for manhood, character and personal worth except in the living citizen, forbid such a leisure class in perpetuity.

"Exalting the millionaires?" How and what for, Mr. De Armond?

And "oppressing the millions?" and how and at what profit, what pleasure and for what purpose? To make the millions less useful to the wealthy and incapable of getting wealth for themselves?

Senator Quay of Pennsylvania is the representative conscience of the Keystone state and a fair exponent of its commercial and political morals.