

his evident intention to apply those remarks to a time when a dollar will buy at the same time more of most products of labor and less of most kinds of labor, tempt us to linger. It appears to Mr. Phelps a necessary truth that if goods fall in price the compensation of labor must fall with them; but that is because Mr. Phelps has not thought the matter out. With recent industrial progress the returns of labor have been relatively increasing and those of capital relatively decreasing; also the application of the same labor has resulted in a larger and larger quantity of product; for both of which reasons an increased command of money over product does not necessarily mean any increased command over labor.

We have no objection to urge against a point on which Mr. Phelps lays considerable stress, that non-producers of wheat (or anything else) have an interest in reducing its price; that if this is done it tends to "raise the condition of the consumer and depress the condition of the producer," and that it is no proper function of government "to widen social differences." THE CONSERVATIVE and its readers are a unit on that point. But when our friend from Joliet intimates that the wheat-grower in the United States has actually suffered in any such way, it becomes necessary to remind him that even if we granted (as we do not) that no more wheat was to be produced, at the same sacrifice of toil and capital, now than in 1873, and that if we further granted (as we do not) that the lower gold price now to be had for a bushel of wheat is a result of legislation in any way whatever, yet the "social condition" of the wheat-grower does not depend upon what his wheat brings him in gold, but in all the items that go to make up his material well-being. Does his bushel of wheat command more or less sugar than then? More or less kerosene? More or less calico, prints, hosiery and shoes? More or less ironware and farm implements? If more, the tears of Mr. Phelps are wasted, for the condition of the farmer has not deteriorated, whatever may have happened to gold prices.

It would give us pleasure to discuss with Mr. Phelps that profound problem in wheat, silver and gold, and their relative prices in this country, India, Russia, Egypt and London, which he is good enough to lay before us; but our readers will not stand much recondite arithmetic in hot weather. Nor is it in the least necessary to induce them to stand it, for no figures based on the assumption that the same quantity of gold will freely buy different quantities of silver in different countries can really interest them. In fact, Mr. Phelps is here floundering in a helpless mix-up of the rate at which wheat producers and other private citizens can buy silver and the rate at which governments issue it as coin. He is trying to show "that the

nation that is able to furnish a fair proportion of the requirements for commodities, and to use the silver or gold in its domestic affairs to the greatest advantage will make the price for commodities which all other nations must sell by." If this is to be taken as only a clumsy way of saying that the country which produces a commodity at the best economic advantage fixes its price, we admit it; but that country, in the case of wheat, is not Russia, or India, or any other than our own. The proof of that is in the actual records of sales; in all the years when rival countries have been said to be encroaching on our wheat markets, our possession of those markets has been strengthening—relatively as well as absolutely. The price has been fixed by the United States, and silver advocates are advised not to forget it.

We close, not because we have exhausted Mr. Phelps, or believe this enough to convince him. We expect, through any "wreck of matter and crush of worlds," to hear that that gentleman is still faithful to 16 to 1—still calls the silver standard "double," and bewails the farmer's losses from perfidious gold.

M'KINLEYISM.

"McKinley" is platform enough for the republican party in 1900. The party need pledge to the laboring man nothing else. The record of the administration to date is sufficient argument. When the campaign finally opens and the statistics gathered by the commercial agencies are laid before the people, the story of the result of the campaign will have been told and the only thing to be waited for will be to learn the size of President McKinley's majority.

Thus speaks one of the most hide-bound of the republican organs.

The question is, what does McKinley stand for?

Does he not stand for the highest possible protective tariff, which is taxation of the mass of the people for the benefit of a class—taxation of the consumer for the benefit of certain manufacturing producers?

Does he not stand for the taxation of Americans for purely aggressive war?

Does he not stand for the sacrifice of American lives when in no sense of the word is the integrity or welfare of the country threatened?

Does he not stand for slavery; for purchasing the right to control the lives and property of a people from the government of another nation?

Does not McKinleyism stand for defiance of the declaration of independence, usurpation of the constitutional rights of the people, and treason to the fundamental principles of the government of the United States?

What have we to put against it? Nothing but anarchy and heterogeneous demoralization! The American people, being dead to their welfare; dead to the

spirit of freedom; dead to constitutionalism; powerless to organize themselves into any self-protective body; dead to patriotism in any intelligent sense; dead to honor; dead to justice, is it not evident that it is impossible for them to find representation? Democracy is dead in the United States. The time has come for an awakening of the people. A political John the Baptist is needed, crying in this wilderness of corruption "make straight the path" leading to constitutionalism. The only work before THE CONSERVATIVE is patriotic constitutionalism. Conservatism and constitutionalism are one. The people must rise and

"Strike for their altars and their fires,
Strike for the glory of their sires,
Freedom, and their native land."

FRANK S. BILLINGS.

Grafton, Mass.

GENUINE HAND-MADE.

If Nebraska City has always been a liberal patron of outside poets, it has not been because she had none of her own; she has always been able to supply the local demand for poetry with home product. The following lines, published in The News of August 2, 1862, are we think equal to anything ever offered in any market. The occasion was the death of the child of one Tompkins:

ON THE DEATH OF A BURNT CHILD.

Come all, my friends, both old and young,
O, hark, and you shall hear,
How death did quickly snatch the child
The parents loved most dear.

The last and least of their little flock
Was caught by a stove, by its little frock
In falling o'er one Sabbath day
While the parents dear were not away.

And to see and hear, but not to save
Their little boy from an early grave
Which puts them in mind, of one of yore
Who died by a scald, while creeping on the
[floor.

Strange! they both were burned on a Sab-
[bath day.

And placed in the ground on Tuesday eve,
A family living in an adjoining room
Hastened to the spot of grief and gloom.

Eighteen months Lucius spent with them
And cheered them with his smile.
But soon they mourned in weeds of woe
For their dear scalded child.

But O! What sorrows fill their heart
'Tis more than tongue can tell
To think how soon the time did come
To take their last farewell.

And now the little boy has gone
To that bright world above,
The other four please come this way
And sing redeeming love.

Then Tompkins now a warning take
Prepare to meet your God,
That you may meet your happy flock
In yonder blest abode.

There you may meet around the throne
Parents and children on that shore
Where farewell tears are never shed
And scaldings are no more.

No man loves aught for itself, but invariably for himself.