

Yet he could not be sentenced for a shorter term. It was a Gordian knot, and the judge cut it. Turning to the mortality tables of the life insurance companies, where he ascertained that upon the law of probabilities the prisoner might be expected to live 38 years, he sentenced him to imprisonment for half that period, or 19 years. The case has been appealed and the sentence will very likely be reversed. But what else could the judge have done?

THE FULL DINNER-PAIL.

The indirect insult conveyed in the argument of the full dinner-pail ought to arouse the indignation of every citizen who takes the trouble to think seriously of it.

The full dinner-pail, said Mr. Hanna at Youngstown, is the issue.

What does Mr. Hanna know of the dinner-pail? Does he convey his diamond-back terrapin and extra-dry champagne to his banquet-table in a dinner-pail? Did he ever know what it was to carry a dinner-pail? Would he know whether to use a cork-screw or a can-opener to get at the fullness of the dinner-pail?

These questions may be thought frivolous. Yet if they are examined aright, they are not irrelevant.

The orators and editors who are prating of the dinner-pail, but who have never carried one, are sadly out of touch with the spirit of the American "workingman." Reduced to its final terms, what does the full dinner-pail argument mean? It means "We give you enough to eat. In return, let us do in all other things as we please."

"The full dinner-pail!"

Could any absolute tyrant offer a more inadequate, more degrading argument? It is the argument the slaveholder could have offered to his bondmen in the worst days of slavery this country ever saw. Many a negro of the south will tell you to-day that he has poorer fare and fewer clothes than in the days when he was a chattel. Does that make slavery any the less revolting?

"The full dinner-pail!"

Why there are many years when

even the tsar of Russia can triumphantly point to the fact that his subjects are not starving. Does that argue for the divine right of kings?

"The full dinner-pail!"

Let us blush that any American citizen should consider such an argument fit to submit to fellow Americans. Are we then fallen so low that the only appeal is to the stomach, none to the heart and the head?

O, Hannas, Forakers and Depews! Ye who run no risk of half-full dinner pails, no matter what governmental policy, what failure of crops, what shut-down of factories, what cataclysm overtakes us; verily, ye have your reward! But little can your capon-lined sensibilities know of the metal of men who are acquainted with both the full dinner-pail and the empty. Your pigmy souls cannot comprehend that they would be willing to risk (if risk it were) a scantiness of rations with all the heroism of the men of Valley Forge rather than representative government should perish from the face of the earth, rather than oppression instead of freedom should become the thing which the flag symbols.

"The full dinner-pail!"

Look at the condescending, oligarchical spirit of it. "The masters grant us rations! Support the masters!"

The masters are looking out for us! Are they? Give us a fair field and no favors and we can look out for ourselves.

"Hanna and God have given us prosperity! Vote for Hanna's man, resting assured that he is God's man!" It is impious, of course, to question that Mr. Hanna, his man and the republican party are responsible for the full dinner-pail. It is worse than impious to suppose that, by any possibility, the dinner-pail could be full under another's administration. But even allowing these at least questionable premises, what sort of argument is it which makes its highest appeal to the American workingman merely as a beast of burden who is to be rewarded with a full measure of meal (if he can get it), but who is so devoid of conscience, love of liberty and justice for the oppressed that any men-

tion of them is considered sheer waste of breath?

Should we then have a new flag?

Forty-five dinner-pails in a field of brass as an emblem of our revered rulers and their most salient quality?

Thirteen stripes (well-laid on) to indicate what we deserve if we dare to disagree with the argument of the full dinner-pail?

EDMUND VANCE COOKE.
Cleveland.

NEWS

The anthracite coal strike in Pennsylvania is on in full earnest. Last week we reported the causes and development of this gigantic labor conflict, and told of the official call issued on the 12th and fixing Monday the 17th as the date upon which the strike should begin. Between these dates doubts were expressed as to the probabilities of a general observance of the call. The operators predicted that less than 20 per cent. of the men would go out. But when the day for striking arrived these predictions came to nothing and all doubts vanished. Out of 142,000 miners employed in the anthracite region fully 100,000 responded promptly to the call. President Mitchell, of the United Mine Workers of America, has reported that the number who had responded at the date of this writing (September 20) amounts to 126,000.

There are four great territorial divisions in the anthracite coal region, known as the Lackawanna, the Wyoming, the Lehigh and the Schuylkill. In the Lackawanna and the Wyoming region, where 90,000 men were employed, the tie-up is so complete that only one mine, and that a small one, is in operation. In the Lehigh region about 8,000, being half the men employed, have struck. Only in the Schuylkill region, where the employes number some 35,000, did the strike call meet with an unsatisfactory response. But that was only on the first day. Since then several thousand have joined the strikers.

The operators continue to ignore the overtures of the men for friendly arbitration, relying, as some of them unblushingly write to the newspapers, upon the superior power of their wealth. The president of the Dela-

ware & Hudson Coal company, for instance, says that the strike fund is only about \$71,000, which will not support a great strike long; while a director of the Pennsylvania Coal company predicts an early victory for the operators because the strikers lack the resources to carry on a protracted strike, whereas the operators can hold out for at least six months. One of these magnates glosses over his appeal to mere wealth power by assuring the public that "the miners have no grievances." This in the face of a detailed statement of the operators themselves which shows that all the wages of the region average only \$20 a month!

After issuing the strike call, but before the day fixed for striking, the United Mine Workers of America published a general statement of the miners' grievances, which makes some very interesting and important revelations. It states that the average wages of anthracite coal miners has for many years fallen below \$250 annually, while the cost of necessities of life has risen during the same period more than 20 per cent.—thereby in effect reducing wages. Referring to a law of Pennsylvania making 2,400 pounds of coal a miners' ton, it charges that the miners are required nevertheless to produce 2,700 to 4,000 pounds for a ton, and in addition are docked exorbitant sums for impurities. When paid by the car, they are required to furnish much more than a rounded car load. For blasting powder of a grade that can be purchased in the open market for \$1.50 a keg retail and one dollar wholesale, they have \$2.75 per keg deducted from their wages. Unless they deal at the "pluck-me" corporation stores, many of the companies discharge them. They are assessed one dollar a month for a doctor whom the company employs without consulting them, and are required to make this payment whether they need a doctor or not. The hard life resulting from these oppressive conditions compels them to take their young children from school and put them at work in the breakers. And they have been unable to get redress. When they have complained individually, they have been told that they are free to quit work. When they have organized and sent committees, the committees have either been informed that competition makes redress impossible or have been discharged as "agitators." When they

have asked for a general conference and adjustment between all, operators and miners of the region, their request has been completely ignored. And when they have telegraphed the presidents of the great railroad companies who control the anthracite coal fields, proposing arbitration, their messages have been treated with silent contempt. Such are the reasons the strikers give in justification of their strike.

Coincident with the beginning of this strike, Mr. Roosevelt gave out for publication his letter of acceptance as the republican vice presidential candidate. It puts forward prosperity as the great issue of the campaign, declaring in that connection that "under the administration of President McKinley this country has been blessed with a degree of prosperity absolutely unparalleled, even in its previous prosperous history." A discussion of the money question occupies much space in the letter, and some of it is devoted to the question of trusts; but, as with Mr. McKinley's letter, most of it is taken up with a presentation of the Philippine question.

In Colorado the republicans have nominated Frank C. Goudy for governor.

Mr. Bryan's formal letter of acceptance appeared on the 18th. Having dealt fully and exclusively with the Philippine question in his speech at Indianapolis, he makes in his letter but brief reference to that subject, devoting the letter almost wholly to the other questions raised by the platform. But upon each of these he expresses himself directly, though briefly, his entire letter being hardly half as long as Mr. McKinley's. He begins with an emphatic renewal of his pledge, made four years ago, that if elected, in order that he may not be tempted to use the patronage of his office to advance any personal ambitions, he will under no circumstances be a candidate for reelection. His letter then proceeds to discuss in their order trusts, tariffs, corporations in politics, the money question, the election of senators by the people, direct legislation, government by injunction, the blacklist, labor arbitration, the proposed labor cabinet officer, Chinese exclusion, pensions, the Nicaraguan canal, territories, the Cuban question, the reclamation of arid lands, foreign alliances, the

Monroe doctrine, excessive taxation, and the income tax.

In his discussion of the Monroe doctrine, applied as he had in his speech proposed to apply it to the Philippines, Mr. Bryan answers the objection made in Mr. McKinley's letter of acceptance by saying:

The position taken by the republican leaders, and more recently set forth by the republican candidate for the presidency—namely, that we cannot protect a nation from outside interference without exercising sovereignty over its people—is an assault upon the Monroe doctrine, for while this argument is at this time directed against the proposition to give to the Filipinos both independence and protection, it is equally applicable to the republics of Central and South America. If this government cannot lend its strength to another republic without making subjects of its people, then we must either withdraw our protection from the republics to the south of us or absorb them. Under the same plea, that the guardian nation must exert an authority equal to its responsibility, European nations have for centuries exploited their wards, and it is a significant fact that the republican party should accept the European idea of a protectorate at the same time that it adopts a European colonial policy. There is no excuse for the abandonment of the American idea. We have maintained the Monroe doctrine for three-quarters of a century. The expense to us has been practically nothing, but the protection has been beyond value to our sister republics. If a Filipino republic is erected upon the ruins of Spanish tyranny its protection by us will be neither difficult nor expensive. No European nation would be willing for any other European nation to have the islands, neither would any European nation be willing to provoke a war with us in order to obtain possession of the islands. If we assert sovereignty over the Filipinos we will have to defend that sovereignty by force, and the Filipinos will be our enemies; if we protect them from outside interference they will defend themselves and will be our friends. If they show as much determination in opposing the sovereignty of other nations as they have shown in opposing our sovereignty, they will not require much assistance from us.

Mr. Bryan closes his letter of acceptance with a reminder to the people that the various subjects treated in it, "important as each may seem in itself, do not press so imperatively for solution as the question which the platform declares to be the paramount issue in this campaign,"