

ury sheet, were as follows (M standing for merchandise, G for gold, and S for silver):

	Exports.	Imports.	Balance.
M .....	\$163,093,697	\$70,618,371	\$92,475,226 exp
G .....	428,925	9,810,882	9,381,957 imp
S .....	6,063,119	2,966,356	3,126,763 exp
	\$169,615,641	\$83,395,609	\$86,220,032 exp

—The statistics of exports and imports of the United States for the fiscal year beginning July 1, 1900, to and including October 31, 1900, as given by the treasury reports, were as follows (M standing for merchandise, G for gold, and S for silver):

	Exports.	Imports.	Balance.
M .....	\$482,403,787	\$256,343,636	\$227,060,252 exp
G .....	22,569,418	21,832,862	776,556 exp
S .....	23,217,484	14,632,737	8,584,747 exp
	\$528,190,689	\$291,809,134	\$236,371,556 exp

—The statistics of exports and imports of the United States since the foundation of the government (gold, silver and merchandise), as shown by the treasury reports to October 30, 1890, were as follows:

[The upper row of figures represents merchandise to date, inclusive of gold and silver down to 1821; the second row represents gold and silver from 1821 to date.]

	Exports.	Imports.	Balance.
	\$37,655,259,671	\$33,920,014,314	\$3,735,245,357 exp
	3,645,220,028	2,174,311,632	1,470,908,396 exp
	\$41,300,479,699	\$36,094,325,946	\$5,206,153,753 exp

—The official canvass of the votes that were cast at the election November 6, 1900, in Cook county, Ill., in which the city of Chicago is located, was not completed until the 21st. Following is a summary of the result:

	Vote.	Plural-ity.
Rep. (McKinley, president).....	208,760	17,567
Republican (Yates, governor).....	109,622	.....
Democratic (Bryan, president).....	186,193	.....
Dem. (Aischuler, governor).....	198,195	7,573
Pro. (Woolley, president).....	211	.....
People's (Barber, president).....	211	.....
Social Dem. (Debs, president).....	6,752	.....
Soc. Lab. (Maloney, president).....	434	.....
United Chris. (—, president).....	124	.....
Union Reform (Ellis, pres'dnt).....	160	.....
Local:		
Rep. (Deneen, state's att'y).....	205,709	26,013
Dem. (Goldzier, state's att'y).....	179,696	.....
Pro. (Hawk, state's attorney).....	5,236	.....
People's (Becker, state's att'y).....	153	.....
Soc. Dem (Morgan, st's att'y).....	6,227	.....
Sin'e Tax (Cooling, sta's att'y).....	503	.....

Henry Labouchere, M. P., posted this notice on the bulletin board of a club of which he was a member: "The nobleman who stole my umbrella will please return it at once."

Called before the board of governors and rebuked for imputing a theft to a nobleman, "Labby" gayly pointed out the section of the constitution of the club which declared its membership consisted of "noblemen and gentlemen." "As no gentlemen would steal another gentleman's umbrella," triumphantly added "Labby," "I was compelled to decide that my umbrella had been taken by a nobleman." Defendant was acquitted.—Chicago Chronicle.

## MISCELLANY

### GOLDEN SUNSHINE.

For The Public.

"The golden sunshine of permanent prosperity fills the land."—Plutocratic Organ.

The land is filled with sunshine golden;  
A sunshine peerless, pure and bright;  
A sunshine priceless, and beholden  
To God alone for life and light.

'Tis likewise filled with sunshine gold-en,  
A sunshine dearly bought and sold;  
A sunshine "cornered," and beholden  
For all its worth to greed and gold.

A sunshine gold-en born of tears;  
A sunshine sad souls shiver under;  
A sunshine booked for four more years,  
And then—what then? The helpless wonder.

J. S. T.

### A PANORAMIC HISTORY OF THE GREAT AMERICAN WABBLER.

For The Public.

	PRESEN- T.	FUTURE.
IN REGARD TO PAST, ENT, TURE.		
Silver	For	Against ?
War with Spain	Against	For ?
Civil Service Reform	For	Against ?
Forceful Annexation	Against	For ?
Puerto Rico "Plain Duty."	For	Against ?
HANNA	FOR	FOR, FOR G. T. E.

### LOVE IN AN INDLAN HOME.

A boy of six who had made his little mark in a reservation school, was asked by his teacher: "Will you come with me to my home and go to school where the white boys go? There are engines and big houses, and you shall see the ocean with the ships. There are grapes and apples and all kinds of fruits to eat. You will be a smart man when you are big, and you will get money when you work."

"I like to go to see the engines and the ships on the ocean," he answered, thoughtfully, "but my papa will be very sorry. When I come to this school, not far away, my papa just cry and put his hand on my head and put me up on his arm and will not let me go. I like my papa. Just catch fish for me and put it on fire with salt and we have a good time to eat. No, I not go far away from my papa. And my mamma got nice baby. Just cry and laugh and like to play with me too, that baby!"—Bertha S. Wilkins, in the Land of Sunshine.

### ROMAN AND AMERICAN IMPERIALISM.

We are told that the people of this country would never permit this republic to be changed to an empire. So thought the Romans upon whose republic the sun rose and set for 550 years and who lost their liberty through influences very similar to those now in operation in this coun-

try. After conquering Gaul, Caesar returned with his victorious legions and trampled upon the liberties of his country. But war and conquest had already centralized the government and corrupted and enervated the people and Rome was virtually an empire years before she began that long line of emperors, among whom were some of the vilest human monsters that ever lived. That proud and mighty empire endured nearly 500 years. It extended from the frozen wastes of the north to the burning sands of the south and it thought itself invincible and eternal. But the spirit of conquest and militarism, decay of the spirit of liberty, the amassing of great fortunes by a small class while the poverty of the people increased—these were among the conditions that preceded the decline and fall of the Roman empire.

The danger from imperialism is not in the usurpation of an emperor in our day, but in centralization, in the growth of a plutocracy, in class legislation, class distinctions, growth of the military spirit, conquest, and the spoliation of the people by the trusts for the enrichment of the few who come to control legislation and corrupt, in the interests of their class, the judiciary.—B. F. Underwood, at Quincy, Ill., Oct. 29, as reported in the Quincy Daily Journal.

### THE FUTURE OF THE DEMOCRATIC PARTY.

What will the party do now? There is a very general feeling among old-line democrats that something should be done to unify the discordant elements and perhaps try to get back to the old conservatism of that party. But those who have made a study of social conditions, both in Europe and America, contend that this never can be—that there is to be a new alignment of parties and that the evolution of man and the world of affairs has brought to the surface economic and social questions as far in advance of the problems of the past as the complex character of present social conditions is greater now than when the pilgrim fathers landed on Plymouth rock.

Principal among these questions as they relate to political life is that of special privilege and monopoly, and that this is to play a large part in the political life of the future is shown by the tendency in our cities to municipal ownership and control of public utilities; the ownership and control in Switzerland of the transportation systems of that country;

the ownership of the street railway system of Glasgow, and other movements of the kind all the world over. Such questions as these are now before the public and promise to occupy leading place in the consideration of our home affairs.

The question is whether the democracy shall take the advance step and seek to deal with these new issues in the spirit of the declaration of independence or try to retrace its steps. To-day these questions in definite form cannot be said to be partisan issues—that is members of both leading parties are found on either side; it is to be hoped that they never may become partisan in a narrow sense. But that there shall be a political division along these lines cannot be doubted when we consider that special privilege does exist and its beneficiaries will seek to perpetuate it, while those who see its evils and experience its injustice will try to crush it out.—The Farmers' Voice of Nov. 10.

#### SIXTO LOPEZ TO GEN. WHEELER.

Extract from letter dated 41 Woburn place, London, W. C., June 30, 1900. We reprint from City and State.

Our contention is this: The Philippines were and are our country. "Forcible annexation," as your president has admirably expressed it, "would be criminal aggression." No legal quibble about "the right of conquest and purchase" will obscure the moral question or even serve as a lubricant to conscience. No profession of "philanthropy" or "benevolent assassination or assimilation"—we will not quarrel about the word, the meaning is practically the same—will serve to shield your president from the charge which he has made against his own policy.

Nor will it avail to offer insult to one's moral sense by claiming a legal title to sovereignty due to "cession" and "purchase" from Spain. Spain never had a moral right to our country. Her alleged ownership rested solely on might and not on right. She never possessed even the tentative right which comes to the provider of beneficent rule. This was recognized by the United States when it went to war on behalf of Spain's colonial possessions, and demanded that Spanish sovereignty should cease.

In addition to this Spain did not possess sovereignty at the time of the so-called "cession." Her territories were in the hands of the Filipinos (with the exception of one city) who had established an independent government, *de facto* and *de jure*.

If Spain, then, had no moral and no

legal ownership to the Philippines, who had?

There is but one answer: the owners were and are the inhabitants, the Filipinos.

Who, then, is the aggressor in this war? Who is it that is endeavoring to seize and annex the Philippines over the heads of the natural owners, the inhabitants, and to purchase a legal title in absence of a moral one? Who was it that fired the first shot and took the first life? Who is it that declares that "all just powers of government are derived from the consent of the governed?" Who is it that now seeks to deny the application of that principle of human rights to the Filipinos? Who was it that sought and accepted our aid in the conflict with Spain and now denies that we have any right whatsoever to a voice in determining the fate of the Philippines?

Whoever is chargeable with these acts, on him and on them must be laid the responsibility of the war and bloodshed.

If the United States administration had promised that the principle enunciated in the declaration of independence and quoted above would be made applicable to the Filipinos, there would never have been a shot fired, and if that promise were now made there would be no more war. That promise could have been made and can now be made.

#### MR. BRYAN AS A CANDIDATE.

In our opinion no higher type of man has ever been nominated by any political party for the presidency of the United States than William Jennings Bryan. No public man in our history was ever inspired by higher motives or loftier ideals of right and duty. Mr. Bryan is above all a manly man; frank, courageous, brave, clean of life, large of brain, great of heart. He possesses and fully deserves the admiration, the confidence, and indeed the love of several millions of his countrymen. He is one of the most picturesque and attractive figures that ever appeared on the stage of American politics. In spite of his two defeats for the presidency and of the disasters which have overtaken the democratic party under his leadership, it is entirely too early to assume that his public career is closed. He is yet comparatively a young man, and it is by no means improbable that conditions may yet arise which will impel the country to summon him to the highest public service.

No party leader in our history—not even excepting Henry Clay or James G. Blaine—has possessed a larger measure of personal magnetism or

inspired in a higher degree the enthusiasm and devotion of his following. But neither Henry Clay nor James G. Blaine became president. It seems that the American people—in tensely practical and utilitarian as they are—are disinclined to call men of this type to the executive office.

Mr. Bryan is perhaps too much of an idealist—too warm in his sympathies, too emotional in his temperament, and a trifle too radical in his methods for the cold American nature. Although more ardent and impulsive than either Thomas Jefferson or Abraham Lincoln, there is much of both of these great characters in Mr. Bryan's composition. Both were essentially radicals, and each was, like Mr. Bryan, a bit of a dreamer and more of a philosopher than man of affairs. Yet they rank as perhaps our greatest two presidents. Each proved a success as an administrator, as Mr. Bryan doubtless would if given the opportunity, and each wrote grand pages in our national history. But they lived in different times. It is safe to say that in the present temper and with the present tendencies of the American people, neither Thomas Jefferson nor Abraham Lincoln, if alive, would stand a ghost of a chance to be elected president.—Indianapolis Sentinel of Nov. 8.

#### MUST WE GIVE UP "THE STAR SPANGLED BANNER?"

For The Public.

As I write these lines a party of apparently highly intelligent men and women, a party of fathers and mothers almost exclusively, are singing "The Star Spangled Banner."

Ah, they have stopped at the end of the first verse and chorus!

Can it be that the same thought and feeling came to each one during that first verse? Else why did they stop so suddenly?

That was their first song of the evening! They are singing no other songs now, they have broken the circle and some are leaving the parlors. They stopped abruptly, like a piece of machinery, and, without apologies or excuses, instantly separated.

Now, why have they acted thus? They came together by prearrangement for an evening of song here in our hotel parlors. Instantly, and without previous warning, without discussion they break up their party, their circle, and separate.

Can the same feeling which took possession of my heart, instantly I heard the first strains of that heretofore inspiring music, have also swept across their heart strings?