

**QUAKER
DEMOCRATS.**

Even Pennsylvania democracy is nauseated and threatens to throw up the money fallacies, together with the referendum and initiative. Therefore, its organ, the Philadelphia Record, rises and affirms that:

"By his populist platform and his speech menacing the people with a new greenback agitation just when the spectre of free silver has been laid Mr. Bryan has shown even to his most zealous adherents in the past that he is not the man for the hour. No matter how sound may be his views upon the great issue which a republican administration and a republican congress are forcing upon the nation, his identification with the worst monetary heresies and humbugs, including greenbackery, has inspired a distrust of him which cannot be overcome in the pivotal states that will decide the contest."

In case such inexcusable truth-telling should prevent Colonel Bryan's nomination, why not name Constantine J. Smyth or W. H. Thompson in his stead? One of their statesmen is as good as any other one of their statesmen—a dollar is a dollar.

**MAKING
PRECEDENTS.**

Three reasons are advanced for the passage of the Porto Rican tariff bill. First: The necessity of relieving the impoverished condition of the people. The passage of the relief appropriation of \$2,000,000 removes the necessity of the measure on this ground. Second: To defray the expense of the government of the island. If the people are without money to buy food, how will they be able to pay taxes? Third: The pretext of a precedent for the Philippines. If this be true and if the administration is going to consistently follow it, will it not mean for the Philippines a duplication of the proposed act for Porto Rico, a tariff for two years only or until the local government of the island is able to raise the required revenue? If the proposed policy of self-government and ultimate independence for Cuba prevails, will not this be a precedent for similar declarations relative to the Philippines? Congress is also establishing another sort of precedent, not so worthy of emulation. The denial of free trade with Porto Rico is a breach of faith. Is this to be a precedent for our policy in the Philippines?

JENSEN GRIEVES. The Hon. Peter Jensen of Jefferson county is inconsolable in his grief because of a few words of mild and gentle reproof administered by THE CONSERVATIVE to Mr. Hanna's president. That Mr. Jensen may not be too severe in his judgment, THE CONSERVATIVE publishes this week an historical reference suggested by the Hon. Thomas B. Reed, the former republican czar of

the house, and appends an excerpt from Mr. Kohlsaas, of the Times-Herald, which lend color to the growing suspicion of perfidy on the part of McKinley and a disregard by him of constitutional authority. It is to be hoped that these expressions of sympathetic approval, from men so eminent in the councils of the republican party, will condone, in part at least, the crime of the "unreasonable and unjust attack" upon Saint McKinley, of which Mr. Jensen deems THE CONSERVATIVE guilty.

Mr. Kohlsaas, in the Times Herald, says: "The common sense and conscience of the American people cannot be deluded into viewing the 'plain duty' of the nation through the cross-eyed spectacles of the republican 'leaders' in Washington. The people take no stock in the constitutional subtleties which have been invoked. They know that justice can be done under the constitution, even if the tariff injustice and bad faith is not absolutely forbidden by the constitution. They demand that their representatives in congress follow the plain, straight and narrow path of duty which gives Porto Rico free intercourse with the United States and makes it master of its own internal taxation for local purposes."

"Let Porto Rico have the Dingley tariff protection against the outside world just the same as other parts of the United States, but absolute free and unrestricted trade with its sister states and territories and we will hear no more of Porto Rican distress and relief funds."

**MCKINLEY AND
CLEVELAND.**

The contrast between Cleveland and McKinley is thus strikingly brought out by the Indianapolis News:

"In considering the attitude of Mr. McKinley, one cannot but revert to the way in which Mr. McKinley's predecessor met such emergencies. The country owes the repeal of the purchasing clause of the Sherman act to the persistence, the independence, and the unshakable courage of President Cleveland. Day after day and night after night he stood solidly for sound finance, and finally forced congress to act for the welfare of the country. He did not 'change his mind.' He did not think that the good of the people should be sacrificed 'to the interest of party harmony and discipline.' He split his party in two, rather than yield one jot of his convictions on the financial question. Again, when the Gormanized Wilson tariff bill was sent to him, he returned it without his signature—having done his utmost to sustain the house in its fight with the senate—but with a letter to Representative Catchings in which he said:

"I take my place with the rank and file of the democratic party, who believe in tariff reform, and who know what it is; who refuse to accept the result embodied in this bill as the close

of the war; who are not blinded to the fact that the livery of democratic reform has been stolen and worn in the service of republican protection, and who have marked the places where the deadly blight of treason has blasted the counsels of the brave in their hour of might. The trusts and combinations, the communism of pelf, whose machinations have prevented us from reaching the success we deserved, should not be forgotten nor forgiven."

"The contrast is startling, and extremely unflattering to President McKinley. If Mr. McKinley had a tithe of the courage of Grover Cleveland, the Porto Rican tariff bill would have been overwhelmed in the house of representatives."

**HISTORY RE-
PEATS ITSELF.**

Thomas B. Reed said to Senator Beveridge, after his recent speech on the Philippine question, in which he opposed the extension of all constitutional guarantees to the Filipinos:

"You have turned back the hand of time. You should refresh your memory by reading the proceedings of the British parliament for the thirteen years preceding the declaration of independence. You will there find a resolution adopted that is identical in its purpose with your action today. And you will also find Benjamin Franklin making the identical plea to the British house of commons that Azel Ames, the federal delegate of Porto Rico, is making in this country today."

The stamp act, taxing the American colonies without representation, was passed by parliament in 1763. It aroused the most bitter feeling in America and the colonists declined to comply with it. Benjamin Franklin was sent to England to protest and to notify Great Britain that the colonies would gladly raise any revenue required by the crown, but maintained the right to levy their own taxes. Franklin remained in England over a year, urging the claims of the colonies and protesting against the principle of taxation involved in the stamp act. He finally succeeded in arousing public interest in his cause and was given an audience before the house of commons.

The following, from the report of the examination, is strikingly like the sentiment expressed by

**Revenue Spent
in America.**

Beveridge and fully justifies Reed's significant remark:

"Don't you know that the money arising from the stamps was all to be laid out in America?" Franklin was asked.

"I know it is appropriated by the act to the American service."

"Do you think it right that America should be protected by this country and pay no part of the expenses?"

"That is not the case. The colonies raised, clothed and paid, during the last war, near 25,000 men, and spent many millions."

"Do you think the people of America