

**NOT ALIKE.** The acquisition of Louisiana in 1803, by the far-seeing Jefferson, was peaceful and patriotic. The usefulness of the lands to the American people and the right to constitutionally annex them was agreed to after more than two years of discussion in and out of Congress. The greater part of the Louisiana purchase was made up of unsettled territory. It was adjacent to the seventeen states which then composed the republic. It was bought for the use and benefit of Americans who were to inhabit and improve it. Not a drop of blood was shed, not a gun fired to accomplish this magnificent addition to the domain of the United States.

The larger portion of the Louisiana purchase was unpeopled. Majestic forests and far-stretching prairies invited the enterprise and industry of our race to enter and found homes. The Jefferson purchase was of lands for Americans and their descendants unoccupied, fertile home-evolving lands.

The purchase by McKinley, at five millions of dollars more than Jefferson paid for Louisiana, of islands in the Pacific is not at all parallel. The Philippine islands contain ten millions of inhabitants. They are occupied by a brown race—a race adapted to living under a vertical sun. The Filipinos are as alien to Americans as Americans are to Turks. McKinley bought peoples, not lands. Jefferson purchased lands, not people.

The two transactions are as unlike as freedom and slavery, as far apart as liberty and bondage, as appalling in antithesis as the contrast between the statesmanship of Jefferson and that of McKinley. Not alike any more than the Rocky Mountains are like ant hills.

**THE PARIS EXPOSITION.** Congress appropriated over one million dollars for the Paris exposition. Will the people of the United States realize benefits commensurate with the investment? An ex-member of the French cabinet, who has been prominently identified with the exposition, gave the following statement to the representative of the Chicago Tribune:

"If foreigners only consider the official utterances they will believe that nothing ever compared with our present fair. President Loubet and Minister of Arts Miller can't be expected to say otherwise. Yet the exposition undoubtedly will fail to meet legitimate expectations.

"The results are now seen. We have large buildings, containing show-cases wherein may be admired things to be seen in almost any great city. We have many specialties which only interest specialists.

"Features devised specially for pleasure seeking crowds are contemptibly old and more contemptibly stupid. Director-

General Picard, who is a utilitarian, is absolutely devoid of imagination, and failed here signally. We offer visitors a poor imitation of the "Streets of Cairo," now familiar in every popular resort; a pasteboard Venice with three gondolas, a Dahomey village with ten natives, jealously fenced off in a corner, some little theatres where you may sit for twenty minutes and enjoy a variety business which you could have at one-third the price at any music hall on the boulevards.

"The sad feature of this show is that there is nothing new about it."

The Tribune says that the above statement was shown to the representatives of more than twenty nationalities, all of whom endorsed it as substantially correct.

If this report approaches truthfulness, the Paris exposition is not a success.

**Wrong in Principle.** Every dollar appropriated by this government has been recklessly squandered. Not only has our appropriation been unfortunate as an investment, but it was made without moral or constitutional right. It was not in accord with the legitimate use of public money. Money raised by taxation should be used for the benefit of all the people and not for a few. How, then, can an appropriation for an international show be justified? Of the total population of the United States, only a small fraction will be able to attend the Paris exposition. What right has the government to take money from all the people to provide entertainment for the limited leisure class?

Appropriations of this character forcibly illustrate the alarming extent to which paternalism is being carried. Originally it was confined to aiding favored interests by a protective tariff. It was later enlarged to assist private enterprise direct from the public treasury by bounties and subsidies. Protective tariffs, bounties and subsidies have so corrupted the public conscience, have so degraded public morals, that the constitutional use of public money has been completely forgotten. In addition to aiding private individuals to make money, it has now become legitimate for the government to provide people of leisure with popular forms of amusement and entertainment. There is no limit to the demands of this character that may be made upon the public treasury. Need we be surprised that taxation is becoming burdensome and oppressive? Is it not time to check this misuse of public money and confine appropriations to the purposes prescribed by the constitution?

**THE REPUBLICAN PLATFORM.**

The republican state convention met on the 2d of May, elected Nebraska's melodramatic statesman and poet, delegate to the national convention and adopted a platform. The platform reads like the

sophomoric address of a contestant in a high school talking tournament. It is conspicuous for its many crude attempts at rhetorical effect. There may have been method in the literary style. Perhaps the author purposely designed to conceal, by the charm of rhetoric, the glaring inconsistency of the argument.

McKinley, the bold and daring explorer, is grandiloquently extolled as "a president who has dealt with new and untried questions,

who has guided the ship of state with ability and security through unexplored channels and the troubled waters of agitated seas, in each hour of threatened danger, given evidence of such masterly statesmanship." There is more truth in this breezy outburst than the convention possibly suspected. The president has dealt "with new and untried questions." Imperial conquest is altogether "new and untried." He has guided "the ship of state through unexplored channels." No navigator before him had been bold enough to undertake to guide "the ship" from the safe and secure anchorage of the republic to the domain of empire. It was indeed a voyage "through channels unexplored." He did pass "through the troubled waters of agitated seas." The peril of his adventure amid the "troubled waters" of Porto Rico is not yet forgotten.

The platform "points with pride to the remodeling of our tariff laws which have increased our revenues and not

impeded our trade, which has opened the doors of mills and factories." A protective tariff law is framed purposely and intentional to prevent free trade or "to impede trade." It can aid American manufacture only by keeping out foreign goods. If foreign products are kept from American markets trade is "impeded." If they are permitted to come in manufacture is not protected. A protective tariff that would not impede trade is an incongruity. But Nebraska republicans, with remarkable facility, claim for their extraordinary tariff the advantages of protection as well as the benefits of free trade. Since protection to American manufacture means the exclusion of foreign goods, how could a protective tariff "increase our revenues?"

A prominent feature of the platform is the declaration, expressing "unalterable opposition to trusts and combinations,

having for their purpose the stifling of competition and arbitrarily controlling production and fixing prices." It is a most scathing arraignment of the logical outcome of republican policy. Every trust that now "stifles competition" is the beneficiary of republican paternalism and is the natural product of the protective system. Why deplore the "stifling of competition" when repub-