CHIMMIE FADDEN

Account of a Thrilling Bowery Melodrama, "The Trust Buster's Revenge," With a Moral

By EDWARD W. TOWNSEND

(Copyright, 1904, by E. W. Townsend.)

MR. PAUL looks up from his pape one morning, and he says, "De Countess Bamboozus has got her divorce from de Count, I see."

"So soon?" says Miss Fannie. "It was very noble of de Count to give her a divorce wit only one settlement from her pa."

"It's de result of competition," says Mr. Paul. "De times being hard, American heiresses do not increase so fast as forn noblemen. In fact, de stock of eligible noblemen increases faster just when de stock of American heiresses decreases, and from de same causes—bad times. Something should be done about it. It should be planked in de next dish of national platforms."

"Does it mention who de Countess is to marry next?" asks Miss Fannie.

"Not here," says Mr. Paul. "Dat glad tidings was printed in de foist dispatch dat she was to get her divorce. No pape dat gives us de news of de brass band set would wait for de divorce to tell us who de next happy man is."

"Yes, I remember," says Miss Fannie. "De Countess is to marry Harry next. He was Number Two on her list before she got de Count, but Charles, her Number One, married since she did, but hasn't got his divorce yet. Harry foist married Grace, who is now Charley's wife, and Grace give Harry a divorce so dat she could land Charley before de Countess got her divorce. De Countess tried to hurry up and check Grace, but her pa was shy wit de settlement—his Tin Horn Trust had just failed—so de Countess has to take Harry until Grace releases Charley. She won't have to wait long, for Grace is soon to marry Jack, who was divorced last week; or she may take Dick, whose divorce is announced as a spring opening—just after Lent. Dere is a complication, dough; Grace has alimony from Harry, which is cut off if she marries oftener dan once in two years, and without her alimony she can't retain her favorite divorce lawyer. She is quite provoked about it."

"If society was run proper," says Mr. Paul, "Government would furnish divorce lawyers free. A couple may go to de City Hall and get married by Mayor McClellen, who never asks but a smile, but when divorce time comes many a desoiving woman has to wait until she can save up for lawyers' fees by wearing hats and gloves overtime. Free divorce, says I! No eight-hour demands by de judges to shut out desoiving couples who can't get around to de Court House until de evenings, because of deir odder social engagements."

"Paul, you are absurd!" says Miss Fannie.

"Woise!" says Mr. Paul. "Here am I, free, white and 21 and never a divorce to me name. It has become a nuisance at de club to have to explain to de chappies: 'I don't know when our divorce will take place. Me Missus hasn't set de day yet.'"

Listen to me; if divorce is so easy as all dat it wouldn't make such a corker of a play as me and Duchess went to on de Bowery. Say, it was a whizzer! Even de brass band set is too slow for de stage, because in dis play, "Swift and Sweet, or de Trust Buster's Revenge," dere wasn't a minute someting fierce wasn't doing. Nobody could tell, like Mr. Paul was saying, dat So-and-so would marry Such-and-such when Who t'ell got divorced. Not much! Dat's no material for a red-hot melon drama. You mustn't know too much on de Bowery what's going to happen, or de gallery will call for a song-and-dance.

Let me tell you about it. De leading lady, Eveline, was a billionaire's daughter. I used to know her off de stage when she tossed buns behind a quick-lunch counter. In de play she was all right. She loves her dad's cloik, a double-entry blond named Willie, and would married him, only just den Count Cadasus floats over on a ten-dollar steerage ticket, looking for a million or two, and he hears dat Eveline hasn't yet been discovered by de nobility. He goes to dad and he says, "How much?"

Dad says dat Counts is cheap, and he won't separate from more dan two millions, one spot cash, and one when de divorce is granted. De count goes over de situation wit his creditors, and dey admits dat day was up against a fact, not a fancy. Dad, says dey, was no farmer; Counts was cheap, all right, for fair. Dey says for him to nail de offer and depend on de anxiety of Eveline to get her divorce to make dad put up two more million instead of one. De creditors says dey would allow de Count cigarette money out of de foist million, and 10 per cent of all pocket money he touched Eveline for.

Dat was de foist act. In de second Eveline tells Willie dat he is de white-haired lad she is really strong for, but he must excuse her for a year or two, for she had a date to marry a Count, and would be absent until dad and de lawyers fixed up de terms of divorce.

But Willie sets up a scream: "Tut, tut, Eveline," says he. "It's Willie now or never! Before you can get a divorce I will have duckets to corner all de Counts coming or going. I know your dad's game, and can bust his trusts and make a million out of each of 'em. Wit a few millions to start wit, any honest trust buster ought to make a comfortable pile. Be mine," says he, "and shake Cadagus."

But Eveline was cheaty. "Do I look like a goil who would try to butt into society witout me title clear? No, sir-rah! A title and a divorce for me!"

De day was married. Only five or six free American women was crushed to deat trying to get into de Countess' carriage to steal her rings as de happy pair, accompanied by deir lawyers, drove from chuich.

"It's a frost!" sneered Willie, de cloik, seeing dat de street was blocked for only half a mile wit Jeffersonian simplex. "It's a frost! Now to do up de old man."

"BY HEAVEN, WILLIAM!" SAYS SHE. "BY HEAVEN, HOW PROVOKING!"

Dat was he end of de second act. In de naxt Willie sells information to de street of de billionaire's graft, and by dat and odder hard woik he scrapes togedder a few millions, so he can operate on his own hook. Den he makes a fat killing out of de game of busting trusts. He sends for de count and says: "How much is bid for a divorce?"

De count is in tears of rage, for he can't get a cent more dan was deposited by de old man at de time of de marriage. "True," says Willie, wit a horrid laugh. "You wouldn't get even dat if it wasn't up in your lawyer's hands, for I've got de rest. But do not despair, me dear count; oh, do not despair. I will give you two millions not to let Eveline have a divorce."

"Good heavens!" cried de count. "Dere are tings I would not do — not even for me creditors. Eveline has already smashed most of de old family china over me conk, and I fear she will toin her hands to de kitchenware. I have stood all dat etiquette requires. Can me creditors ask more?"

"Be calm," says Willie. "Your creditors can go chase deirselves; my two millions are for you. You need not live at home, and can have all de chocolate caramels and absinthe your high-born appetite demands."

"Done wit you!" says he count.

Den Willie marries his typewriter, buys six ottermobiles and a yacht, goes to all de shows at Coney Island, and even den has bales of boodle left. He was a trust buster for fair, and District Attorney Jerome couldn't find him when de grand jury wanted to find out where he got it.

In de next act Eveline comes home, and is interviewed by society reporters, and gives out de properest way to dress front hair and salad. Den she looks up Willie, and she says to him: "Willie," says she, "all I need is money to get me divorce and den I am yours."

Willie he takes de center of de stage and all de limelight, and he says, says he: "Woman!" he says. "Woman, on your way! I have married me typewriter and already she is de leader of de swiftest set of Rocky-Bluff-by-de-Sand. You would not have me when I was poor and honest; do you tink I will let you in now dat I am neider?"

"By heaven, William!" says she, ducking into de limelight and running her fingers trough her frisses. "By heaven, how provoking! If I cannot get a divorce and marry you, at least give me a look-in on wealt and press notices as your typewriter."

For a minute it looked like Willie was going to give her de job, and de gallery got ready to trun benches and tings at him. But just den Willie's wife steps from behind a screen, where she had been making goo-goo eyes at a wine agent in a stage box, and she says, "Guess again, countess." Willie hires no typewriter till I have looked her over and give me consent. I do not seem to me dat de proper lesson was taught by de drama you so well relate. We must be true to nature, or blow up trying to be. Willie, it seems to me, should have took Evelina when he became a billionaire. Den he could have went into dinner wit his wife ahead of dose lazy ladies who have neglected deir opportunities and never married even a single forn title.

"I believe in reciprocity, and how can we ciprocate de kindness of forn counts who wed our fair daughters better dan by taking dose goils, when day has solved der sentences, and place 'em at de head of de foist soicles of our foist society? Wit de glamour of divorce and nobility hanging over Eveline, and boodle and indictments hanging over Willie, what a social team dey would make! Your playwright lost a good moral point when he did not marry Eveline and Willie."

"But, sir," I says, "dey tried it dat way one performance, and de gallery tore out de benches and laid de leading man up in a hospital for a week."

"Which shows," says Mr. Paul, "dat de gallery closes its eyes to de progress of civilization; dat dey don't see dat de flag follows de marriage festivities. I would explain furder to you, Chames, but I must resume woik on me great book, which is to show how we can pay our national debt by making a nobility of our own."

"How is dat, sir?" I says, not quite copying his dude langwudge.

"Easy," says Mr. Paul. "Congress creates as many counts and dukes as dere is new fortunes made, and auctions off de new nobility to de highest bidders. De funds so acquired will not only, as my book will show, pay de national debt, but reduce de tariff so much dat a free American can buy his trousers abroad without being fined or sent to jail by de customs officers."

"I object!" says Whiskers, who heard Mr. Paul say dat. "Protection is sacred."

"Sure!" says Mr. Paul. "My plan protects de buyer instead of he sellers."

"Fudge!" says Whiskers.

"DONE WIT' YOU," SAYS THE COUNT.

STORIES OF SENATOR HOAR.

From the National Magazine.

The incident happened as I was being driven to the station, and it arose from my admiration of the public library Senator Hoar had pointed out to me.

"The only time I was ever guilty of wire pulling," my host then remarked, "was when I so used my influence that Thucydides instead of Herodotus received honorable mention on that facade as the representative Greek historian. Why did I want to carry that point? Oh, only because I've always had an especial fondness for Thucydides."

Was not that deliciously characteristic? Is there another man in American public life today who would pull wires for Thucydides?

Astounding Information.

From the Boston Record.

Senator Hoar used to relate with much glee the conversation that recently took place between two southerners, the first of whom had but lately returned from a trip through New England. Said the first man from Dixie to his friend:

"You know those little, white, round beans?"

"Yes," replied the friend, "the kind we feed to our horses?"

"The very same. Well, do you know, sir, that in Boston the enlightened citizens take those little white, round beans, boil them for three hours, mix them with molasses and I know not what other ingredients, and bake them, and then—what do you suppose they then do with the beans?"

"They——"

"They eat 'em, sir!" interrupted the first southerner, impressively. "Bless me, sir, they eat 'em!"

A Curiosity.

From the Houston Chronicle.

Visitor to Museum (in 2404)—What's that?

Attendant—It's a piece of beef, sir. One of the bits now in existence. It used to be quite plentiful, however. In fact, it was used as a food up to the Twentieth century.

Hard Pressed for Funds.

"Oh, Henry," exclaimed his wife, as she threw her arms rapturously about his neck, "I do love you so! Don't forget to leave me $10 when you go to town this morning, will you dear?"

"And this," muttered Henry, softly disengaging himself from her fond embrace, "this is what you might call being hard pressed for money."

Edward M. Shepard on Issues of the Campaign

IS it true that our increase in wealth and prosperity since the rise of the Republican party has been its work, its glory? Was it an appeal to truth for Mr. Hay to treat as a result of "Fifty Years of the Republican Party" our increase in population between 1850 and 1900, our four-fold increase in farming acreage, our five-fold increase in corn crop and six-fold increase in wheat crop, our increase in manufacturing capital from $500,000,000 to $10,000,000,000? Does any argument deserve less respect from one who has mastered that first rule of reasoning which bids him not infer that event A is the effective and sole cause of event B merely because in order of time event B comes with or after event A? Were there not in the United States fertile soil and moderate suns and rains, the brains and hands and inventive genius of American men and women, liberty, law and order—all these before there was a Republican party; and were not they the prime cause of our prosperity? The growth of American population and wealth between the peace of 1783 and the inauguration of John Adams in 1797 was but a small fraction of the like growth under McKinley and Roosevelt. And in those 14 years—the years when Franklin and Jefferson and Hamilton and Madison, under the auspices of the noble, unboastful character of the Father of His country, established our republic—our material growth in absolute figures was small indeed, our railroad mileage naught. Were those earlier statesmen dwarfs, therefore, in comparison with the latter-day Titans, who have dwelt in the White House since March, 1897? What years, O American men and women, have done more, material and moral, than those early ones for their own generation—what years more for this very twentieth century prosperity of ours? Is it the Lincoln doctrine, or was it ever, that the merit of moral and political causes is measurable by the wealth and luxury accumulated at the very time of their operation? Is it not the doctrine of apostles and prophets and the lesson of all practical history that self-denial, simplicity, economy, righteousness, sobriety, lead on—not instantly, but after patient years—to power and wealth? Would not Republican orators give better promise for future fruits of present-day Republican administration if they could rather and truly claim for their party under President Roosevelt an enforcement of equal rights, a rigorous economy, a punctilious regard for law?

But if this doctrine of "present wealth, therefore present virtue, in present ruling politics," be not a shallow sophistry, still see with what absurd fairness it is applied. Do Republican apologists say—dare they say—what alone would be relevant to the political problem, that during the 44 years since their party came into power, the progress of our country has been as great, from year to year, as during the 60 years of general Democratic supremacy before the civil war? If the Republican party may justly ask another lease of power because from 1860 to 1900 our population increased from 31,000,000 to 76,000,000, or 35 per cent per decade, why may not the Democrats with greater justice ask their return to power because from 1800 to 1860 the increase was from 5,300,000 to 31,443,000, or 83 per cent in each decade? Was not the increase in the decade 1850-1860—and in spite of slavery—from 23,000,000 to 31,000,000, or at the same rate as in the decades 1860-1900? If the increase in total wealth between 1860 and 1900 was from $16,000,000,000 to $90,000,000,000, or 116 per cent per decade, and in wealth per capita of population from $513.92 to $1,235.86, or 35 per cent per decade—was not the Democratic increase in total wealth between 1850 and 1860 from $7,000,000,000 to $16,000,000,000, or 128 per cent for the decade, being still larger than the Republican, and in wealth per capita from $307.69 to $513.92, or at the rate of 67 per cent for the decade—nearly double the Republican rate? Although the value of farms and farm property increased from $7,980,000,000 in 1860 to $20,514,000,000 in 1900, or at the rate of 39 per cent in each decade, was not the increase from $3,967,000,000 in 1850 to $7,980,000,000 in 1860, or at the rate of 100 per cent per decade; and were not therefore Democratic auspices far more favorable to prosperity than Republican? Although the corn crop increased from 838,000,000 bushels in 1860 to 2,105,000,000 in 1900, or at the rate of 37 per cent in each decade, was not the increase from 377,000,000 in 1840 to 838,000,000 in 1860, or at the rate of 61 per cent in each decade; and if, therefore, we wish large increase in the next four years, ought we not to prefer a Democratic president? Even if the wheat crop increased from 173,000,000 bushels in 1860 to 552,000,000 in 1900, or at the rate of 50 per cent in each decade, did it not increase from 84,000,000 in 1840 to 173,000,000 in 1860, or at the larger rate of 53 per cent per decade? If this kind of argument be fit, what shall be said of the increases in wealth under Democratic auspices from $7,000,000,000 to $16,000,000,000 in 1850-1860, or at the decade rate of 128 per cent, as against the increase under Republican auspices during the decade 1890-1900 from $65,000,000,000 to $94,000,000,000, or at the rate of only 44.6 per cent? Or what shall be said of the increases in wealth per person throughout the United States in the decade 1850-1860 from $307.69 to $513.92, or at the decade rate of 67 per cent, as against the corresponding increase under Republican auspices in 1890-1900 from $1,038.57 to $1,235.86, or at the decade rate of only 19 per cent? Or what shall be said of the increase in export of American manufactures of iron and steel from $52,144 in 1800 to $5,870,114 in 1860, or an average rate of 1359 per cent per decade, as against the Republican increase from $5,870,114 in 1860 to $121,913,648 (at the abnormally high figures of 1900), or an average increase per decade of only 494 per cent? Or what shall be said, and perhaps more reasonably, of the increase under Democratic rule in our export of agricultural products from $25,000,000 in 1800 to $356,000,000 in 1860, an average of 150 per cent per decade, as against the increase under Republican rule from $356,000,000 in 1860 to $885,000,000 in 1900, an average of only 56 per cent per decade? What shall be said of the Democratic increase in our total domestic merchandise exported from $31,000,000 in 1800 to $316,000,000 in 1860, or an average Democratic increase of 158 per cent per decade, as against the Republican increase from $316,000,000 in 1860 to $1,370,000,000 in 1900, an increase of only 83.5 per cent per decade? Or what shall be said of the Democratic increase in American tonnage engaged in foreign trade from 669,921 in 1800 to 2,546,237 in 1860, a Democratic increase per decade of 46 per cent, as against the decrease from 2,546,237 in 1860 to 826,694 in 1900, a Republican decrease of 16 per cent per decade? Or what shall be said of the Democratic increase of tonnage engaged in domestic trade from 801,919 in 1800, to 2,807,631 in 1860, a Democratic increase of 188 per cent per decade, as against the Republican increase from 2,807,631 in 1860 to 4,328,145 in 1900, or only 13 per cent per decade? If this increase in railroad mileage be so significant a Republican glory, is it not fit to point out that under Democratic auspices the mileage increased from 33 miles in 1830 to 30,626 in 1860; or, if this be a crowding of the argument, then that the increase under Democratic auspices in 1850-1860 was from 9,021 to 30,626, a decade increase of 236 per cent, as against the increase from 191,276 in 1890 to 194,324 in 1900, or at the decade rate of only 20.5 per cent?

Or shall we take the increase in total manufactures, which is the glory of the protectionists? We have not the official figures before 1850 which would, no doubt, show enormous proportional increases. Let us, as we must, begin with 1850. The Democratic increase for 1850-1860 was from $1,019,000 to $1,885,000,000, or at the decade rate of 84 per cent. But in 1890-1900 the Republican and "protected" increase (allowing the abnormally high prices of 1900) was from $9,372,000,000 to $13,039,000,000, or at the decade rate of only 30.2 per cent. Is it not significant that, while the total manufacturing product increased in 1890-1900 by 30 per cent, the increase in wages and salaries paid employes was from only $2,283,000,000 to $2,785,000,000, or at the decade rate of 19.8 per cent, being only one-half the ratable increase in the manufacturing output? So it is to be noticed that, while population increased in 1850-1860 by 36 per cent, the increase in manufacturing output was 84 per cent, or 36 times the rate of population increase; but that the population increase from 1890-1900 was 21.8 per cent, while the increase in wealth was 39.2 per cent, or only 1.81 times the population increase. Indeed, in whatever just way the figures of even manufacturing growth are treated, they tell for the period of Democratic rule and greater economic liberty.

The Republican orators and campaign book refer to the recent great increase in exports of domestic products as a crushing proof that, even if foreign trade be considered, Republican administration and high protective tariff are best. Did not—so they say—exports increase from $216,000,000 in 1860 to $1,370,000,000 in 1900, a per decade increase of 83 per cent upon the amount of 1860? But here again it is easy to explode their argument. For the increase in 1850-1860 was from $134,900,000 to $216,000,000, or at the decade rate of 134 per cent—a Democratic rate of increase under a revenue tariff half as large again as the Republican and "protected" rate of increase. From 1890 to 1903 the increase was from $845,000,000 to $1,382,000,000, or at an annual rate of 4.9 per cent, being less than half the Democratic rate of 13.4 per cent in 1850-1860.

Mr. Hay ventured to include the decade 1850-1860 in his figures of Republican glory. Yet those were years of Democratic power; and the Walker tariff, enacted by Democrats in 1846 for revenue only, was then in effect. Is there anything so truth telling in the vast masses of figures in the Republican campaign book as the fact it would conceal, that those were years of greater ratable growth in material things than any our country has since known?

I cannot leave this mass of figures, made necessary by the almost overwhelming dependence of the Republicans upon the "prosperity" argument, without asking you to think of another point. Does it not illustrate the debasing effect upon the latter-day morals of the Republican party produced by its change of dominant purpose from the restraint of human slavery to the maintenance and tightening of the shackles of a "protective" tariff, that Messrs. Hay and Root and the authors of the Republican campaign book have made no allowance for the regenerative and stimulating effect of the abolition of slave labor? If other things were equal, the rates of industrial increase from 1860, when in nearly half the country the labor was chiefly the crude, wasteful, hopeless labor of slavery, to 1900, when all labor was free, ought to have exceeded those of the preceding decade, instead of to have fallen far below them.

Messrs. Hay and Root, and even the sordid pages of the Republican campaign book, affirm a moral kinship between Abraham Lincoln and the statesmen who control their politics in 1904, between the men and women who gave the all necessary religious and humanitarian uplift to the anti-slavery struggle and the war for the union, and, on the other hand, the vast corporate and business influences, which, by and for their own profit, dominate the Republican party. To these influences even its gallant and strenuous candidate has—after his much protesting eloquence to the contrary in 1902 and 1903—been compelled to completely submit with promises not again to "run amuck," and not again to treat the tariff question as open, even to the extent to which President McKinley at the last held that the welfare of the country required it to be open. Surely the claim to this kinship needs only to be stated to refute itself. What part, indeed, did a protective tariff play in the national uprising of 1861? How much was it discussed in the Lincoln-Douglass debates in 1858, or Lincoln's Cooper Union speech in 1859, or the important speeches, Republican or Democratic, of 1860 or 1864? It was not mentioned. The Republican platform of 1856 said not one word in behalf of protection nor did it mention the tariff, although the Walker tariff—a tariff for revenue, and not for protection—had been in operation 10 years. The Republican platform of 1860 did not refer to protection or a protective tariff. In one of the later and subordinate clauses of the platform it did declare that, "while providing revenue * * * by duties upon imports, sound policy requires such an adjustment of these impositions as to encourage the development of the industrial interest of the whole country." But even this vague suggestion, which might mean high or low protective duties, or no protective duties whatever, made no part of the campaign. Lincoln did not refer to it in his letter of acceptance or in his inaugural. In 1864 the Republican platform made not a single reference to protection or the tariff; nor did Lincoln in his acceptance or inaugural.

Something from Abraham Lincoln in behalf of a high protective tariff would be precious indeed, to the Republicans of today. But they can find nothing. For even their campaign book the best they can do is to pick out a few sentences from speeches of Mr. Lincoln in 1843 and 1847, a dozen and more years before he was president, and even before he was in congress, in which he declared that the justification of a protective duty would be its result in establishing some new industry in our country, so as to secure the goods to the consumer at a cheaper rate than he could bring them from abroad. The modern Republican idea that the use of a protective tariff is to keep prices high to the American consumer in order that the profits of other Americans engaged in gigantic and long established industries shall be increased, would have been as abhorrent to Abraham Lincoln as it is to Judge Parker.

Even in 1888, when, the war being three years ended, business questions began to be thought of, the Republican party said not a word in behalf of a protective tariff, but, rather to the contrary, declared that "it is due to the labor of the nation that taxation should be equalized and reduced as rapidly as the national faith will permit"; and General Grant in his letter of acceptance was equally silent on this question. Could there have then been Republican success in 1860 or 1864 or even 1868 unless Walker tariff men and even free traders whose economic views remained unchanged, had not left the Democratic party for the Anti-Slavery party? Would not that success have been defeat if Chase, Summer, Blair, Bates, John M. Palmer, Trumbull and a host of other former Democrats and believers in low duties had not—and because the tariff was not in question—joined the Republican party? Are you not, Mr. Hay, forgetful, very forgetful, when you say that—

Only those who believe in human rights and * * * who believe in the American system of protection * * * have any title to name themselves by the name of Lincoln, or to claim a moral kinship with that august and venerated spirit.

And what part did colonial exploitation of inferior races or weaker countries, or the policy of "big stick" suzerainty over the republics to the south of us, or the policy of the "strong man armed" in the trade and territorial disputes of foreign countries, play in the politics conceived or directed by Lincoln or his party? If, in 1864, the Democratic party boasted the Olmstead manifesto in behalf of a conquest of Cuba, did it not result in Democratic shame and disaster? If Seward, at the head of a Republican cabinet, a month after Lincoln's inauguration, secretly urged his chief to avoid domestic difficulties by plunging us into an European war, did not Mr. Hay's own disclosure in his Lincoln's biography of the secret well nigh blast Seward's reputation for statesmanship? Quote, Mr. Root and Mr. Hay, if you can, any remembered and honored utterances of honored Republican statesmen before McKinley's presidency, in behalf of your foreign and colonial policy. Quote, if you dare, the Republican platform assertion in 1856, that the maintenance of the principles promulgated in the Declaration of Independence is essential to the preservation of our Republican institutions, that the "highwayman's appeal" that "might makes right" would "bring shame and dishonor upon any government or people." Or quote the Republican declaration of 1860 that the doctrine that governments derive "their just powers from the consent of the governed," is "essential to the preservation of our republican institutions." Or quote the platform declaration by the Republican party in 1868 of its "sympathy with all oppressed peoples struggling for their rights," and of its solemn recognition of "the great principles laid down in the immortal Declaration of Independence as the true foundation of democratic government." If to these challenges you must remain dumb, are you not, truly, in Mr. Hay's eloquent words, guilty of "sacrilege to try to trade upon that benignant renown" of the humanitarian Lincoln "whose light 'folds in this orb o' the earth'"?

The limits of even this long speech prohibit discussion of the great issue which Democrats wisely and courageously raise by their assertion that the system called "protection"—that is to say, the support of specially favored interests by duties, payment of which is enforced upon the whole people—is a "robbery," and by the Republican vindication of it as a "cardinal policy" to be followed. I point out, however, that, notwithstanding the former urgency of both Mr. McKinley and Mr. Roosevelt for revision of tariff schedules in the interest of larger export trade, the Republican party is now pledged, not only against revision, but against any discussion whatever of the question. The citizen who would undo any injustice in the tariff or let down any of its obstructions by partial repeals or reciprocity treaties, or who would have light shed upon the operation in detail of its multifariously complicated system constructed by "give and take" between the attorneys of special interests before ways and means and finance committees, is peremptorily refused any relief if Mr. Roosevelt be elected. The policy of "stand pat" means that, under Republican auspices, no committee shall investigate, nor house of congress consider, the working of the tariff. On this subject there must be mute obedience as before a diety. If the manufacture of steel and iron be no longer an "infant industry" to be cherished, but a practical monopoly within the American republic, out of whose profits the vastest fortunes in the world have been built up—if it sell its products to foreigners more cheaply than to Americans—nevertheless there must be silence. If its charter of monopoly in the Dingley tariff or any other schedule of that law is found to be unjust, or corrupt or oppressive—still they are never to be revised until those who have made them thus vicious shall choose to revise them. Judge Parker has pointed out that, since the senate must be Republican during the next four years, no tariff reform can be enacted without Republican support; but he promises, if elected, an effort to obtain that support, and, in any event, a presentation of the cause to public opinion from the vantage ground of the presidency of the United States. A vote for Mr. Roosevelt, on the other hand, is a vote that not even an effort at tariff reform—even the slightest measure of it—shall be made, and that every iniquity of the Dingley schedules shall be borne in silence. The Republican platform declares that, while England "agitates a return to protection, the chief protective country should not falter in maintaining it." This praise of Mr. Chamberlain for his policy of defensively economical warfare against the United States finds a fit place in the Republican creed. They applaud the retaliatory blow aimed at ourselves, so much are they in love with any blow given by any nation to another.

Before we Democrats propose any specific measure we ask the American people to remember their own history. We also begin with the marvelous statistics of national growth from the first census in 1790 to the last in 1900, with the increase in population, and in the produce of farm and manufactures and forests and mines, in the achievements of American invention and organized industry. We do not say that these material results have been achieved by laws, however good. We recognize their source in the natural bounties of God, and the hearts and brains and muscle of American freemen. We do add, however, that here between the Atlantic and Pacific, between Canada and the gulf, was first tried on a great scale the new experiment of human and industrial freedom, of equal rights and no special privilege. If the presence of negro slavery, until the civil war, created dismal exceptions—and if the presence together in the south of a great or equal or even outnumbering mass of a colored race with profoundly different characteristics and as yet vastly behind the white race in the faculties of disciplined industry and high-class government, gave, and even now gives rise to anomalies and inconsistencies—they have made only clearer the wisdom and beneficence of our fundamental policy. We Democrats point out that during this period of splendid growth, there was systematic hostility to a large military or naval expenditure, there was systematic preference for simple and inexpensive administration, there was systematic dislike of personal and sumptuary restraints. Democrats do not, like Republicans, forget how vast during our wonderful economic progress has been the American area of free trade between our 45 states, an extent of free trade far beyond anything ever before or now elsewhere known. For that area has included the widest difference of climate and soil and human labor, and also far differing conditions in organized society, ranging from settlements nearly three centuries old to frontiers occupied but a few years. They remember that the internal trade of this truly imperial domain which is free of all tariff is in volume and amount vastly, very many times, more important than its foreign trade which is subject to tariff. They point out that for more than a century the American nation scrupulously refrained from foreign entanglements and made no forcible conquest except as it took from Mexico as a war indemnity the practically uninhabited country on the Pacific slope and the Rio Grande. They point out that, although the conditions of American life have, to a large extent, been those of a new and frontier country, the public men and the official life of our country have been so dominated by love of law as to command the just tribute of every intelligent foreign visitor, and that the very "lynch law" which has now and then in thinly settled parts of this vast domain disgraced portions of our population, has often been mere reaction against technical administration of law—that is to say, against misdirected respect for law on the part of those in authority.

From all these conditions and from these institutions and in spite of their faults—has come—so the Democrats say—the industrial productivity and triumph of the American citizen. After praise to God for His gifts to us of land and water and climate, it is to these deep lying and truly dynamic causes, and above all to the American devotion to liberty and law, that the Democratic party assigns our splendid results in agriculture and mining, our vast treasure houses, our enormous increase in railroad and manufacturing plants, and all other material as well as political glory of our land. Democrats know, nor would they have any American forget, that the most stupendous force the world has known, is the free, self-governing, law-abiding, self-respecting citizen, regardful of the rights of other men and therefore justly insistent upon his own. From the marvelous success of our country summed up in the census of 1900 and its tables of comparisons with the results of other censuses, the Democrats draw the conclusion, not that the general and broad principles of the American people should be reversed, or their sacred traditions undone—but that they should be continued; that only faults and exceptions and inconsistencies should be eliminated. They would not have less respect for law but more respect; not less freedom of trade but more freedom; not less respect for the rights of other countries and races, however, inferior to us, but more respect; not more foreign entanglements but fewer; not increase, but decrease in the proportion of military and naval and general government expenditure to the ability of the people.

Such is the general creed of the Democratic party; and such must and will be its practice when it returns to power.

Eli to Teach Insurance

From the New York World.

THE modern tendency to give young men practical business training in the universities receives a striking illustration in the appointment of Charles Earl Johnson to conduct the new course in underwriting at Yale. The establishment of this course in practical insurance is the outcome of a plan conceived seven years ago by a progressive underwriter of Hartford, Conn., and recommended by him to the Yale faculty. He received but little encouragement.

Prof. Arthur Hadley became interested in the insurance man's proposition. It is said that he promised to aid the project if ever he had power to do so. The plan lay untouched, however, until last year, when Professor Hadley, now president of Yale, took it up and enlisted the aid of several leading insurance men of New York and Hartford, who freely gave their services as instructors. Their lectures at Osborne Hall aroused such widespread interest among faculty and students that the success of the idea was assured. The insurance men soon convinced the faculty of the university that a regular course of instruction in underwriting should be placed upon the curriculum. Then for several months the promoters searched for a man competent to take the new chair.

The choice fell upon Charles Earl Johnston of Hartford. In spite of his youth the committee found that he possessed a wonderful fund of knowledge about the science of insurance. Moreover, he has an excellent address and the art of explaining and imparting what he knows.

Mr. Johnston was born in Whitesboro, N. Y., in 1872 and graduated from Mount Hermon academy in 1895. He then attended Wesleyan, and graduated from that college in the class of 1900, with the degree of P. H. P. For a time Mr. Johnston was an instructor in mathematics at Black Hill academy.

Although his experience has been rather limited, Mr. Johnston has acquired a very complete comprehension of insurance subjects, and enters upon his new duties with the unqualified recommendations of the associate committee.

The present intention is to have the underwriting branch remain a one-year course, open to seniors and juniors, but it is not unlikely that within a few terms the science of insurance will be treated as a two-years' course. Last year's lectures, together with "Insurance," a text book by T. B. Young, will form the basis of study, but where available lectures by prominent insurance writers will be interspersed. When difficult subjects are being dealt with, Johnston will assign the task to one of the college men, and the remainder of the class [illegible]