being held, accordingly, under an old registration, thereby disfranchising voters who have changed their residence since this registration was made. Most persons so disfranchised are presumed to be liberals, the liberal party being recruited chiefly from the poorer classes, who move oftener than the well-to-do. Had the tory minister postponed the elections until after the 1st of January, instead of calling them hurriedly in the fall, the liberal party would have been to that extent strengthened. As it is, the tories get this rather off-color advantage. Such a trick is so peculiarly Yankeeish that it is difficult to believe it was originated by our transatlantic cousins, even those of the tory strain. But another election trick of which the tories are guilty was unquestionably borrowed from this side. It consists in publishing for the first time, in the midst of the campaign, sensational war documents that have been stowed away in the pigeon holes of the war office for months. The tories get these public documents as public officials and ostensibly for public purposes; but as public officials they withhold them from the public until as political campaigners they can publish them to their supposed advantage for campaign purposes. That electioneering trick is borrowed from Mr. McKinley, who invented it for the present presidential campaign and has used it without shame though with indifferent effect.

No better effect in behalf of McKinleyism has been produced by the spectacular trip of Roosevelt as a rough riding spellbinder through the farther west, where it had been assumed that his swashbuckler characteristics had made him peculiarly popular. His trip appears to have been a painful failure. The hardy pioneers did not take him seriously, but looked upon him curiously as a tenderfoot giving an imitation. Then he was put at a disadvantage by orders from headquarters to lay aside his gold standard speeches. This was at the

request of the local leaders, who wired that his speeches on that subject would lose their states. So this strenuous representative of the party, whose principal candidate declares and whose manager insists that the money question is the "immediate" and burning issue, was forced to be silent on the money question in the very states which he had set out to conquer on that issue. So flat a failure did Roosevelt's rough and tumble tour in the west prove to be, that his party has made the most of a Rocky mountain mining town disturbance in which, to his professed delight, he figured vicariously as the object of the miners' wrath. The disturbance had been caused by Senator Wolcott, who is excessively unpopular in the mining districts of Colorado, but who ventured to take Roosevelt in tow. But Roosevelt, though undisturbed in his speech except by a rude question which he answered more rudely than it was asked, assumed the role of a visitor assaulted by a democratic mob and now tries to make political capital out of it.

This disturbance in Colorado calls for reflection upon the different ways in which the republican leaders and democratic leaders deal with disturbances of adversaries' meetings by their respective followers. What a mob may do is not so important as how the party leaders regard its action. It is that that gives responsible color to the event. Now, in 1896, Mr. Bryan's meetings were disturbed more than once. Republican rowdies mobbed him in Chicago, and plutocratic toughs broke up his meeting at Yale college. To these disgraceful acts the republican candidate and the republican leaders, big and little, gave their silent approval. Not one word of condemnation or protest or admonition did any of them utter to prevent repetitions of these outrages. But when the Colorado mob, last week, angered by the presence of Wolcott, had broken out riotously at Roosevelt's meeting, the democratic convention of the county

condemning "the spirit of intolerance exhibited on that occasion," and disavowing "all responsibility for the disturbance;" while Mr. Bryan himself promptly and publicly condemned the action of the mob. Parties and candidates being responsible for the lawlessness of any of their supporters only in so far as they acquiesce in it, Mr. Bryan is certainly in much better position regarding the demonstration Colorado against Roosevelt than was Mr. McKinley three years ago regarding similar riotous demonstrations against Bryan.

In his anti-trust speech at Nebraska City, Neb., Bryan characteristically and completely demolished the attempt of J. Sterling Morton to raise a local prejudice against him on the basis of legal proceedings instituted by the populist attorney general against the starch trust. A socalled nonpartisan meeting had been called to protest against these lawful proceedings on the ground that they would have the effect of closing the Argo Starch company at Nebraska City and throwing the local employes out of work. Mr. Bryan appeared upon the ground to reply to this demagogic protest. He showed from J. Sterling Morton's own paper, the Conservative, that in May, 1899, the Argo company was so prosperous. though a competitor of the National Starch trust, as to afford, in Mr. Morton's language, "irrefutable evidence of the fact that no combine or capital can crush out a well-managed private concern." Yet in September. 1899, the Argo company joined a competing trust, organized under the laws of New Jersey; and in August, 1900, the competing trust joined the original trust, thus destroying competition altogether. Consequently the populist attorney general began the proceedings in question, under a law of the state, to prevent the merging of the Argo company into the allabsorbing trust.

democratic convention of the county Upon the foregoing facts Mr. Brywhere it happened passed resolutions an, with characteristic point and



frankness, said to the people of Nebraska City:

If the people of Nebraska City defend the starch trust they must be prepared to defend all the other trusts, for it is impossible for them to destroy a trust located elsewhere and defend a trust located in their own city. Are the people of Nebraska City willing to subject themselves and their countrymen to the extortion practiced by all the trusts in order to maintain one trust which has one factory in their city?  $\mathbf{As}$ matter of fact, the people of Nebraska City are more interested in the dissolution of the starch trust than the people of other parts of the state. When the Argo was an independent company it was controlled by the citizens of Nebraska City, and Nebraska City interests could be considered by its management. But if the National Starch company, with headquarters in New York, is allowed to absorb this industry the control will be removed from Nebraska City to New York, and the wishes and interests of the people of Nebraska City will have little consideration. What is to prevent the Argo company from being closed down by the starch trust? When all the factories belong to one corporation, the closing down of one factory does not bring loss to the corporation, because the work can be carried on somewhere else; but the Argo company as an independent company could not close down without serious loss; therefore, the chances are greater in favor of the local factory being closed down under a trust than under independent management. The attorney general is seeking to enforce a statute of Nebraska. The law is a good law and ought to be enforced, and the people of Nebraska City ought to hold a mass meeting to commend him rather than condemn

It is quite in keeping with the spirit of McKinley republicanism that, while professing to be the party of law and order, it should thus condemn public officials for endeavoring to enforce the law against rich and powerful trust magnates, appealing for support to the selfishness of small local interests. And it is entirely in keeping with Bryan's character to meet that sort of thing boldly, upon the basis of general fair dealing, instead of bending his knee to popular clamor. He gave evidence of this quality when a candidate for congress from Nebraska. Asked while on the stump if he would vote for a tariff for the protection of the Nebraska beet industry, he unhesitatingly replied: "If elected to congress I will not vote to take money out of your pockets to enrich others, nor will I vote to take money out of others' pockets to enrich you."

So badly off for converts is the Mc-Kinley party that its papers joyfully exploit the letter of William M. Ivins, of New York, as that of a democrat who intends to vote for McKinley. Having for years been a business confederate of the republican boss, Tom Platt, Mr. Ivins would not be likely to have enough democracy about his political conscience to interfere with his plans for personal emolument. With his associations and ambitions he is precisely the kind of democrat who would support McKinley in a campaign like this. He could not be expected to place confidence in Bryan, whom he describes as a "man without practical experience, either in business or in government." But that is to Bryan's credit. If his practical experience either in business or government were down to the Ivins standard, he would be the worst possible man for president. It is a favorable sign when titular democrats like Ivins and Carlisle and Stetson take refuge in McKinleyism. There is a millennial suggestion about it. It implies that the goats are beginning to separate themselves from the sheep.

At a labor meeting in New York, Oscar F. Williams, formerly American consul general at Manila, made a bitter attack upon Bryan in a speech in behalf of McKinley. There is no mistaking Mr. Williams's motives. He wants a full dinner pail for himself, and looks to McKinley to furnish it. This much he has written down himself. While consul at Manila, but on board an American manof-war in the bay, he took time by the forelock, and in a letter to Mr. Day, then secretary of state, applied as early as August 5, 1898, for a lucrative job in our Asiatic crown colony. His letter may be found at |

page 332 of the famous senate "document 62." We quote:

Presumably when Manila falls and the Philippine islands become by conquest a part of our national domain, my duties will end. In view of such probabilities I seek your appointive favor, and with pride recall to your mind the report of the then Commodore Dewey, made to Secretary Long and by him transmitted to you-this under date of April 18-says of me: "His assistance has been invaluable." This report was made before I ever saw the admiral, and made without my knowledge, and I know that my services to our navy, army, citizens and nation have since been much greater than before. Your commendations of my service have been most gratifying to me, and because of narrow resources I hope to have honorable and profitable station here or elsewhere in the United States public service. Could I be appointed general commissioner of customs of the Philippine islands, lighthouse inspector or general commissioner of agriculture, I should be honored and pleased.

Mr. Wililams's application for a job throws a more brilliant light upon the objects of McKinley "expansion" than do any of his campaign arguments for what he did not then hesitate to call "conquest." It also explains his attack upon Bryan. With McKinley reelected he would have hopes of one of those Philippine commissionerships or inspectorships, which Bryan's election would shatter.

While the McKinley organs are explaining that the shutting down of mills, the reductions of wages and the general tendency to depression in trade which it has been impossible to conceal during the past six or eight months, are due to fears of McKinley's defeat, they might enlighten a bewildered public by explaining how it happens that fears of McKinley's defeat produce the same effects in Europe. "The wave of industrial prosperity in Europe," says a cable dispatch, "has taken a turn and begun to recede; all signs at present point to a crisis in industrial and financial lines, which may occur before two years have passed." Is Bryan responsible for that? Would his election promote that tendency? Would Mc-Kinley's stop it? The plain truth is, as we have in these columns re-