

Robert G. Ingersoll. In the eyes of clerical expansionists he is doubtless an infidel, but in my opinion he is a courageous, liberty-loving man, brave enough to champion the cause of humanity. Col. Ingersoll says:

"I have one sentiment for the soldiers—cheers for the living and tears for the dead. If it were meet to weep over the sacred dust of the brave who died to render our flag stainless and keep it in the sky, it is now in order to flood the graves of the boys who are falling in the Philippine islands. For they are not fighting to add luster to 'Old Glory' or to save the Union, but as mere machines at the behest of the administration, which for the time being is the government of the United States.

"War with Spain, for which the volunteer took up arms, has long since ended. Congress has not declared war against the Filipinos nor voted money to carry on a foreign war of conquest. Then why this thunder of guns, the flying thunderbolts of hell, and these new-made graves as numberless as the stars? It is a war not in behalf of liberty, but against it. Our arms are not adding glory to the flag, but instead are staining that starry emblem of freedom with the blood and tears of a people fighting for the rights of self-government. The soldier is not to blame. It has always been considered a glorious thing to die fighting for truth, liberty, and eternal right. But when one falls in the Philippine war there burns no halo of glory above his dust, but his sad, untimely, uncalled-for death causes tears to moisten the eyes of every patriot in the land. Therefore when he falls in such a war his bier should be draped in deepest mourning and drenched with the tears of his fellow countrymen.

"Take Colonel Stotzenberg as an example. No braver, truer soldier ever wore uniform or marched in the shadow of a flag. He only recently remarked that he was sick of such a war and looked forward to the near future when he and his brave volunteers would be relieved from killing men who were fighting for independence. He arrived on the battlefield fresh from the arms of his wife at Manila; at the head of his regiment, leading a charge, he fell, pierced through the heart."

WHAT GREAT PRINCIPLE DID HE DIE FOR? WILL THE ADMINISTRATION PLEASE ANSWER?

JOHN J. VALENTINE.

San Francisco, June 24, 1899.

Now here is what we get as a reward for waging war in the Philippines. A California rancher says the price of baling rope has gone up from \$1.40 to \$2, and all on account of a short hemp supply due to the war. The granger wants to know how he is benefited by expansion.—Oakland (Calif.) Enquirer.

A SINGLE MONETARY STANDARD.

In 1766 The East India Company attempted to establish bimetalism and to maintain a coinage ratio between gold and silver in India. At that time there were 994 coins of the two metals in circulation and all of different weights and fineness. These early and earnest attempts to establish bimetalism utterly failed.

Then The East India Company sought the advice of Sir James Steuart, who was regarded as the ablest economist in England, prior to the publication of Adam Smith's "Wealth of Nations" in 1776.

In 1772 Sir James Steuart prepared and published, for the benefit of The East India Company a treatise on money. In that work, in precise accordance with all preceding authorities, he proclaimed it impossible that "gold and silver can circulate together in unlimited quantities at a fixed legal ratio differing from the market value of the metals."

A master treatise on this subject was published by Lord Liverpool in 1805. It was circulated in India in 1806. The governor-general and council considered it and issued an order to subordinate governments unreservedly condemning bimetalism. The minute of the India office which preceded the general condemnation of Indian bimetalism reads as follows:

"A proportion between the gold and silver coins is fixed by law, according to the value of the metals, and it may be on the justest principles, but owing to a change of circumstances gold may become of a greater value in relation to silver than at the time the proportion was fixed; it therefore becomes profitable to exchange silver for gold; so the coin of that metal is withdrawn from circulation; and if silver should increase in its value in relation to gold, the same circumstances would tend to reduce the quantity of silver coin in circulation. As it is impossible to prevent the fluctuations in the value of the metals, so it is equally impracticable to prevent the consequences thereof in the coins made from those metals."

Further on The India Company declared the unhesitating adherence of the council to the principle that one metal only should be adopted as the standard unit, though coins of the other metal might circulate at their market value. The minute decided that silver should be the sole standard, which was perhaps natural under the circumstances. But the error was most unfortunate and having been carried out by Lord Dalhousie with the extremest severity by the total demonetization of gold has been the cause of all our present troubles.

The principles first declared by Petty, Locke, and Harris, which were fully developed by Lord Liverpool, and re-

ceived the entire adhesion of the Indian government in 1806, that one metal only should be adopted as the standard and that subsidiary coins of other metals might be issued in limited quantities and made legal tender only for very small amounts, were fully adopted by the British government in 1816.

Thus while the bimetalists of the present day allege that a fixed legal ratio between the coins can control and fix the relative value of the metals, the experience of five centuries and a chain of authorities comprising some of the most illustrious names the world ever produced, with the consequences of bimetalism before them, clearly and un-animously decided that such an idea is a delusion, and that it is the market value of the metals which regulates the relative value of the coins.

FOREST DESTRUCTION.

W. H. Mills, who has just sold 291,000 acres of

timber land for the Southern Pacific Company, remarks that the wholesale destruction of the forests in California and Oregon, by the lumbermen, threatens to ruin the Pacific coast. That is to say, as a representative of the railroad company, which is a money-making corporation, Mr. Mills is helping to hurry on the destruction, but as a citizen he regrets the course of events. This is very creditable to Mr. Mills; some railroad officials would be so happy over the making of good sales that they would forget to regret. But regrets alone never cured an evil, and as Mr. Mills knows this, he has resolved to collect data and to inquire whether it is not possible to do something to stay the devastation. Like many others, he inclines to the opinion that the time has come to repeal the duties on lumber.—Oakland (Calif.) Enquirer.

ARE THEY WORTH THEIR COST?

Probably in response to the demand for information as to the health of our troops in the Philippines, the war department has published the statistics of the period from February 4, the beginning of the insurrection, to June 6. They show that 226 men were killed in action, and 69 died of their wounds—a total of 295—while 364 died of disease. It is further stated that 1,366 men were wounded during the same time, but how many were and are still on the sick list is not stated. The figures are impressive. Are the Philippines worth their cost in human life? Apart from their cost paid in the lives of our brave soldiers the administration paid Spain \$20,000,000 in gold for the islands. But Spain did not deliver them; did not give possession of them. Yet Spain has the \$20,000,000 and the United States has a costly and, apparently, an endless war of conquest and subjugation.—Philadelphia Ledger (rep.)