

ALVIN SAUNDERS DEAD.

War Governor of Nebraska and Ex-Senator Passes Away.

Ex-Governor Alvin Saunders died Nov. 1st at his home on Sherman Avenue, Omaha, at the age of 85 years. His death was easy and quiet and it seemed to those gathered about his bed that he had merely gone to sleep.

Governor Saunders' death removes one more of the few survivors whose lives connect with the early history of the middle West. He supported Abraham Lincoln at the time of his nomination for president and was largely instrumental in bringing it about. As a reward, Lincoln appointed him governor of the territory of Nebraska. The last signature ever written by Lincoln was obtained by Governor Saunders, and it is the most highly prized souvenir in the possession of the Saunders family. The signature was obtained late in the afternoon of the day of the assassination, when Mr. Saunders called upon the president to get his governor's commission renewed for the second term.

Governor Saunders leaves a wife, a son and a daughter, the latter being Mrs. Russell Harrison.—Ex.

ENGLISH LIBERTY. A daily study of current events in Great Britain may be useful to Americans. Our domestic imperialists have for more than a year urged Americans to consider the glory of British arms, the richness of British conquests, the wide scope of British trade and the merits of British policy in the crown colonies. This has been done to lead us into copying the imperial policy of that country, regardless of the fact that while it conforms to the British constitution it is repugnant to ours. The institutions of a constitutional empire can be extended by force. The free institutions of a constitutional republic cannot be extended by force.

American anti-imperialists have now the right to call the attention of their countrymen to the tolerance of opposition in Great Britain. While the Chicago Tribune is calling for the arrest and execution of Carl Schurz, J. Sterling Morton, George H. Boutwell and Bishop Potter as traitors because they declare that self-government ceases to be self-government when it is forced upon an unwilling people, in Great Britain subjects of great eminence, members of parliament in the lords and commons, are not checked or rebuked for their expressions of dissent from the policy that has forced the war on the two South African republics. It is a strange situation. While American imperialist newspapers are telling our citizens that it is unpatriotic in them to express sympathy for the Boers, Englishmen in all walks of life are showing sympathy and freely expressing it.

In this we do not refer to the Irish members of the house of commons, who

habitually go to the extremes in criticism of England that seem to be warranted by seven centuries of oppression to their country. They stand apart from the Englishmen who arraign the policy of Chamberlain and Cecil Rhodes. Mr. Stanhope, Mr. Evans and Sir William Vernon Harcourt, in the commons, have announced that while they will support the government in the prosecution of "this unhappy war," they regard it as unjustified and wrong.

Harcourt said: "The British nation has a right to know what the proposals of the government are. The government has no right to involve the nation in a war in the dark. I disassociate myself altogether from responsibility of any kind for the measures which have led to this war, though I am prepared to support the government in the unhappy conflict in which we are engaged." Mr. Stanhope, of one of the most distinguished families of England, which has furnished soldiers and sailors and scholars to build up the glory of Great Britain, said: "The British high commissioner in South Africa, Sir Alfred Milner, is lacking in the qualities necessary to a diplomat in his position. I am convinced that the secretary of state for the colonies and the British high commissioner have for the last two years been fully determined that war and war only should end this crisis, and that they have worked for this consummation during the last year."

In this position there is a lot of hard-headed English sense and that kind of sturdy patriotism which may have to interfere to save the empire from itself. These Englishmen are not misled by specious talk about destiny and the Providence of God. They propose to drag into daylight the machinations which have involved the country in war.

They are patriots of the style of Charles James Fox, who during the American revolution said in the commons: "The noble lord who moved the amendment said that we were in the dilemma of conquering or abandoning America. If we are reduced to that I am for abandoning America. I cannot conscientiously agree to grant any money for so destructive, so ignoble a purpose as the carrying on of a war commenced unjustly and supported with no other view than to the extirpation of freedom."

They have the spirit of Edmund Burke, who in parliament said: "You simply tell the American colonists to lay down their arms, and then you will do just as you please. Could the most cruel conqueror say less? Had you conquered the devil himself in hell could you be less liberal?"

They are Englishmen like Chatham, whose son resigned his commission in the army rather than fight against self-government in America, and who said in the house of lords in the second year

of our revolution: "We have tried for unconditional surrender; try what can be gained by unconditional redress. This country has been the aggressor. You have made descents upon their coasts; you have burned their towns, plundered their country, made war upon the inhabitants, confiscated their property, proscribed and imprisoned their persons. I do therefore affirm that, instead of exacting unconditional surrender from the colonies, we should grant them unconditional redress. I would sell the shirt off my back to assist in proper measures, properly and wisely conducted; but I would not part with a single shilling to the present ministers. Their plans are founded in destruction and disgrace. It is, my lords, a ruinous and destructive war; it is full of dangers; it teems with disgrace and must end in ruin. If I were an American as I am an Englishman while a foreign troop was landed in my country I would never lay down my arms! Never! never! never!"

A session of the American congress is approaching. Let us hope that it will vindicate the belief that American liberty of expression is no less than that liberty was in England a century and a quarter ago, and no less than it is now.—San Francisco Call.

BROWN AND BRYAN.

Bryan has subjected himself to the most stinging rebuke administered to a party leader for years. When John Young Brown, who represents in this state contest whatever there is left of honesty and good faith in bluegrass democracy, demanded of Bryan why he advocated free government for the people of the Philippines if he denied it to the people of Kentucky by indorsing the infamous Goebel election law, Colonel Bryan could only turn pale and crawl. The very question was an insult, deadly because of the truth of the implication. The failure to answer to answer it satisfactorily was absolute conviction on moral grounds, and, what perhaps hurts Bryan vanity quite as much, lasting discredit in the eyes of those who judge politicians solely by the measure of their dialectical adroitness.

So Bryan leaves Kentucky poorer in reputation, poorer in friends, richer in enemies and ill-wishers, than when he entered that state. And as he departs he is pursued by the impudent boast of the political scoundren for whose benefit he has sacrificed so much, that if he, Goebel, is elected in 1899 the Goebel election law will be used unflinchingly in 1900 to count the electoral vote of Kentucky for Bryan!

Will it be surprising if this colossal error of judgment marks the turning point in Colonel Bryan's political fortunes? If so, it should prove, Colonel Bryan has no one but himself to blame,