

says the original title deeds to lands and waters on this continent are the right of discovery and occupation. Russia held exclusive jurisdiction, unquestioned, over Alaska and the Aleutian Islands for more than a hundred years. These possessions with rights pertaining thereto were transferred to the United States for a consideration. For many years after the transfer this country exercised unquestioned the same jurisdiction as Russia did. At this late day England comes forward to claim privileges which she has no earthly right to.

The drift of the doughty veteran's argument is that England is impertinent, insolent, arrogating and domineering; and that she should "be whipped like a dog," if possible, and whether or not, it is due to manhood and self-respect to try the threshing process. The redoubtable Benjamin's article will be perused with displeasure by John Bull, for it contains many uncomplimentary allusions to Britannia on subjects on which she is very sensitive.

The Marquis of Lorne suggests that the ladies of the United States and of Great Britain forego the luxury of wearing sealskin garments for two years and the question will be effectually settled. However, he justly concludes that this suggestion will not be acted on, hence he proceeds to discuss the situation from the British standpoint. He contends that ships of all nations have a right to enter Bering sea, and through it the Arctic ocean. He says:

"Nobody doubts that seals landing on islands or mainland shores, or swimming in water within the three mile limit of the coast, are the property of the landowners, but away at sea there can be no more property in them than in the salmon which come regularly to certain rivers then become landowner's property, but are anybody's game when on their way to the rivers and out at sea."

The Marquis then quotes from Mr. Adams, who wrote in 1822, to say that Russia claimed jurisdiction in these northern latitudes which she was not entitled to by international jurisprudence. The Marquis also asserts that British seamen hunted and fished in Bering Sea in the last century; and that the right was insisted on by Great Britain at the convention with Russia in 1825. Great Britain contends now, and did always, that Bering Sea is embraced in the Pacific Ocean.

The drift of the Lorne article is that the seal should not be exterminated, but that no one nation nor any corporation should have an exclusive monopoly of the seals of Bering Sea; and that it is the duty of all civilized nations to regard the question in this light.

"DON'T RUN WILD."

"THE above head line appeared in your paper of yesterday, Mr. Editor, and in the remarks which follow, I observe that you deprecate the extensive agitation of the silver question by the advocates of the white metal.

Well, from your non partizan standpoint it may be all right for you to caution the people not to run wild on the subject, but being myself a Democrat and one who is opposed to revolutionary measures, I beg to be allowed to make a

few remarks as to the duty of members of my party.

It is a duty devolving on them of maintaining inviolate the principles upon which their party was founded, and in addition thereto, they must, if a Constitution-loving people stand by and support the United States Constitution.

The tariff question and the money question are both equally political and constitutional questions.

The Democratic party has always favored a tariff for revenue only. It has always believed in gold and silver as the money of the country.

The Constitution gives to Congress (and Congress is merely the representative of the people) the power to "lay and collect taxes, duties, imports and excises;" "to coin money, regulate the value thereof, and of foreign coin."

I hold that the Constitution, as well as the Democratic party, has committed itself to silver as money from the beginning.

That venerable instrument denies the right to any State, to "coin money" or "to make anything but gold and silver coin a tender in payment of debts."

Until 1873 the government, by virtue of the provisions of the Constitution, did "coin money and regulate the value thereof," and when, in the above year a Republican Congress demonetized the white metal by refusing to coin and regulate its value, it initiated a movement toward a revolution in our form of government, which, in my opinion, ought to be resisted by all Constitution-loving citizens, whether Democrats, Republicans or Mugwumps.

The duty therefore of the two great national parties, in my mind, is clear: They should not only support the Constitution, but should announce at the coming conventions the views held by each. If either party shall oppose the coinage of silver, it should be defeated at the polls. If both of them oppose it, they ought both to be relegated to a state of "innocuous desuetude," and a constitutional party should assume control of the government. It is time that the people should take such steps in the affairs of government as will conduce to its being run in accordance with the principles upon which it was established, and not leave to professional politicians and the money power all the control of affairs.

DEMOCRAT.

We give place to the foregoing because it represents in the main the views of a good many men of both parties. But careful readers of the article on which he comments will perceive that "Democrat" has totally mistaken its purport. He says:

"I observe that you deprecate the extensive agitation of the silver question by the advocates of the white metal."

To show how greatly he is mistaken on that point, we quote from the article referred to, as follows:

"It is all right for the silver men to press their cause upon the attention of the country in the national conventions and do their utmost to obtain recognition of the claim of the precious white metal."

Further. While we advised patience on the part of the silver men, and deprecated their attempt to force the issue by extreme and unwise measures that are sure to fail in their purpose, we said:

"Light should be their means to the end they seek. They need not become supine or discouraged. They can still battle for their cause."

Thus, it is not "an extensive agitation of the silver question" that we

oppose, but merely the course taken by its extreme advocates in resolving to support no candidate for the presidency who does not view the grave subject exactly as they do. This is meant for silver men in both parties.

"Democrat" claims the advocacy of silver money as peculiarly belonging to his party. But what are the facts? Does not everybody know that there are as strong champions of silver in the Republican party as in the Democratic party? Was it not in the power of the latter to pass the silver bill in the House quite recently? And does not the failure of the bill show that one party is about as much divided on the question as the other?

As to the coinage of silver, we think "Democrat" is a little mistaken in stating that Congress has "refused to coin and regulate its value." It is complained by the goldites that too much silver is being coined already. No party, however, "opposes the coinage of silver." But in both parties there are strong advocates of limitation in its coinage. As we understand it, both Cleveland and Harrison are among them. They offer what many people consider potent arguments on that side of the question, and we are of the opinion that the majority of voters favor waiting for an international agreement before placing silver in its former position by the side of gold.

We will say, frankly, we believe the demonetization of silver was wrong, also that the agitation to restore it should go on until success is achieved. But we do not believe that the action of small bodies of silver men, whether Democrats or Republicans, is wise in trying to force action on the matter by refusing to support the candidates which the majority of their party put forward, simply because those candidates may take the ground that the immediate restoration of silver money is not advisable.

The Constitution says all that "Democrat" quotes. But many of the best judicial minds of the country consider that no violence was done to that instrument by the demonetization of the white metal. Congress can "coin money and regulate the value thereof," and no State can make anything but "gold and silver coin a tender in payment of debts." That is all true. But Congress is not required to coin silver, nor is it limited to silver and gold for legal tender as the States are. Silver coinage, however, has been and is carried on by the Government, but while it is not put in its proper place, as we view it, the Constitution is not defied in the refusal to reinstate it there.

So with the tariff. Duties for revenue are constitutional. But are duties for protection unconstitutional? They are not so considered, as far as we are aware, by jurists of either party. The tariff question, like the silver question, is a matter of public policy on which great minds differ, and both of which are largely affected by local circumstances and issues. And while the public mind is so divided concerning them, we think it is the height of folly for extremists on either question to take such a stand as that assumed by some of the silver men, who are moving for a bolt from the main body of their party because their views are