

DEMOCRATIC RECORD ON THE TRUST QUESTION.

Every Line of Legislation Now on Our Statute Books Was Placed There by the Republicans, and the Democrats Voted Against a Constitutional Amendment to Regulate Them Only Four Months Ago.

How the Democratic National Chairman Tried to Help the Sugar Trust—Facts from the Congressional Record.

Every line of legislation now on the statute books of the United States directed against trusts and unlawful trade combinations was placed there by the Republicans. That there is not more stringent law against them is the fault of the Democratic party. The last occasion on which the parties, as represented in Congress, went on record on the trust question was on June 1, 1900. On that day a final vote was taken on a constitutional amendment to grant Congress power to "define, regulate, prohibit and dissolve trusts, monopolies and combinations, whether existing in the form of corporations or otherwise." It requires a two-thirds vote of Congress to submit a constitutional amendment to the State Legislatures for ratification. The question to so submit it was lost by a vote of 154 yeas to 132 nays. OF THE YEAS 149 WERE REPUBLICANS AND ONLY 5 WERE DEMOCRATS. The five were Campbell of Montana, Napden and Taylor of Massachusetts, Scudder of New York and Sibley of Pennsylvania. OF THE 132 NAYS, ONLY TWO WERE REPUBLICANS, Lout and McCall. Richardson, Lentz, Sulzer, Ruppert, Salmon and all the other professional "trust killers" voted NAY. They declined to give Congress the power to grapple with the Trusts. The Democrats indulged in spasms of virtue for two days, denouncing the trusts, and then voted to continue them. In one of Mr. Bryan's recent speeches he gave the Republican remedy as the final one he would adopt, in case he was elected and all other means failed. In other words, Mr. Bryan admits the value of the Republican idea, but wants to try other measures first. He has not said what those measures are to be. Some trusts operate all over the country; others, like the New York Ice Trust, operate in a single city. The requisite power to reach each and all and bring them within the Federal law, WAS DENIED BY A MARGIN OF 36 VOTES, ALL DEMOCRATIC. Denouncing is one thing. Doing is another. Mr. Bryan's trust denunciations, in view of his party's record, promise no better than the prophecies he made four years ago; and as a prophet Mr. Bryan has not succeeded.

Senator Jones and the Sugar Trust.

The Democrats made another brilliant pro-trust record during the same session of Congress. Representative Richardson of Tennessee, Democrat, tried to assist the Sugar Trust by offering a joint resolution to admit Cuban and Porto Rican sugar free of duty. The remission of that duty would have amounted to about \$25,000,000 a year, and the Sugar Trust would have benefited to the amount of at least \$15,000,000 per year. The controller of the Sugar Trust is Mr. Henry O. Havemeyer, Democrat. Mr. Richardson's proposed gift to his friend Mr. Havemeyer was smothered in the Ways and Means Committee of the House. This was done by the Republican members of the committee. It was also proposed by Senator Jones, Democratic national chairman and Mr. Bryan's manager, to return the duties paid on Porto Rican sugar and molasses, not to the Porto Ricans, but to the persons who paid these duties. This amounted at the time to \$1,857,866. Had the scheme succeeded, the American Sugar Refining Company and A. S. Laskalles & Co., a part of the same concern, would have benefited by a direct gift of \$1,250,774. This is the first instance on record where a direct gift was intended to be made to a trust, and the Democratic manager, Senator James K. Jones, wished to make it. This was also prevented by the Republicans. The money was not to be returned to the Porto Ricans, as the duties paid now are, but to the Sugar Trust. All the facts are printed in the Congressional Record and are a part of American history.


"DEAR BOY" LETTERS, NO. 9.

My Dear Boy: You say that you are tired of working for old man Skinner, and are thinking of going West this fall, where wages are higher. You ask what I think about it. Well, I have no objection to your going West, but I don't want you to go till after the election. This is the first time in your life that you ever had an opportunity to exercise your right as an American citizen in voting for a President of the United States. I don't want you to lose your vote for the following reasons: 1. The only possible chance of the election of Bryan comes from the over-confidence of Republicans. It makes me sad to hear a man say, "Oh, McKinley is going to be elected, anyhow. There is no danger. I have arrangements made to be in California in November, but you won't need my vote." Especially do I regret to hear talk of this kind among some of the railroad men. If any class of men ought to come up unanimously to the support of McKinley and the Republican party, that class is composed of the railroad men of this country. Four years ago there were thousands of cars sidetracked, no building and but little repairing going on, and general stagnation in the railroad business. Now new roads, new roadbeds, new cars, the roads crowded with trains, full time and better pay bless the railroad men of this country. And it vexes me to hear a railroad man say, "I would have to lay off a day to vote, and I guess I'll not do that. There will be plenty to elect McKinley without me." Well, if by any possibility McKinley should be defeated, just such men as that will have themselves to blame. 2. No American voter has any right to stay away from the polls or to lose his vote if it can possibly be avoided. My son, you are one of the sovereigns of the United States, and you have no more right to neglect the duties pertaining to your high calling than the Emperor of Germany has to neglect the government of that mighty empire. To vote is a matter of inestimable privilege, and also a matter of earnest, conscientious duty. Two years ago you enlisted to fight for your country as a soldier, but the surgeon turned you down and would not let you go. I sympathized with you in the bitterness of your disappointment. I knew that love of country led you to enlist, and I was proud because you wanted to go. And I think that the surgeon was a little over-particular. You would have made a good soldier. But I want you to realize that you serve your country as truly when you cast an honest ballot as if you were a soldier in the

field. Perhaps you can do more good with the ballot than you could with the gun. Your country did not seem to need you as a soldier, but your country does need you in the realm of citizenship. 3. No matter how long you may live, you will never have an opportunity to vote for better men than this year. We have a magnificent ticket. McKinley and Roosevelt! What a superb combination! They are both statesmen and both heroes, one of the great Civil War and one of the war for the deliverance of Cuba. McKinley, steady, earnest, thoughtful, calm, kind and faithful; Roosevelt, impetuous but efficient, brave and dashing, with both moral and physical courage. Was there ever a better ticket or one which more thoroughly commands the respect, the confidence and the affection of the American people? If you don't stay and vote you will be sorry for it twenty years from now. Make some sacrifice for your country's sake. Oh, my boy, you must not go until the election is over. And when in November the ballots fall: "As snowflakes fall upon the sod, And excite the freeman's will, As lightning does the will of God," Cast your vote and then sleep sweetly that night, with a sense of duty faithfully done. YOUR FATHER.

The Foolish Calf. When Senator Hanna spoke at Youngstown, Ohio, recently, he told a story of a calf that left its mother to run after a steer. Secretary Heath has taken up this idea and developed it into a campaign poster which very artistically depicts Senator Hanna's idea. The calf is seen chasing the steer in the distance; the cow is in the foreground sauntering quietly home, while the boy stands with uplifted fist shaking it at the calf, saying, "You little fool, you little fool, you d-d fool, you'll be sorry when supper time comes." The picture is entitled "The Foolish Calf, or a Lesson to Labor," and standing by a fence in front of a cottage are a farmer and a woman, the man with a full dinner pail in his hand. This poster is sure to catch on and is likely to be a good vote getter. When Senator Hanna arrived in Chicago this week it was shown to him and surprised him. He had no idea that Mr. Heath had been developing his story.

Germany's Need of Expansion. The vital need of Germany is the extension of its market. Bismarck saw that the surest way of accomplishing this was through "expansion." Hence Germany's aggressive "colonial policy," which has already given it New Guinea, several slices of Africa, part of Samoa, the Solomon group, Kiau Chan in China; made it eager to get the Philippines, if it could; and caused it to pay Spain a big price for the Caroline Islands, which the United States left to that country by the treaty of Paris.



AGRICULTURAL EXPORTS

In 1895 \$553,210,026

In 1900 \$835,912,952

EXPORTS OF MANUFACTURES

In 1895 \$183,595,743

In 1900 \$432,284,366

"It Sort o' Looks as if I'd Have to Expand."

PERKINS.

CALIFORNIA SENATOR ON OUR EXPANSION.

Astounding Growth of the Trans-Pacific Trade.

Reasons Why the Pacific Coast Will Cast Its Electoral Votes for McKinley and Roosevelt.

(By George C. Perkins, United States Senator from California.)

No portion of the country is more immediately concerned in sustaining the expansion policy of President McKinley than the States of the Pacific coast. While the South produces the cotton which is being shipped in such enormous quantities to the orient, while other sections are sending manufactures of every description, the coast is sending across the Pacific its own flour, fruits and manufactures. Besides this, we are handling the ships in which the exporting is done. Our own manufactures have ranged from mining and other machinery to a completed five thousand ton steel man-of-war for the Japanese government. Every line of industry has benefited and we expect by the establishment of closer commercial relations to increase both our population and prosperity.

The Pacific coast has long been on the edge of the country. To-day it is the center of the American trans-Pacific trade. We have reached out beyond for business. We can control the trade of the Pacific. That is why we are all expansionists.

The growth of the trans-Pacific trade is a matter of very recent years. Not more than ten years ago the Canadian Pacific Company established its first line of trans-Pacific steamships. Prior to that there were six steamers plying from San Francisco in the Japan and China line. They brought from the orient tea, matting, silk, rice and the endless line of articles that are imported from Japan and China. They carried back silver in the form of Mexican dollars and bullion, some provisions, and flour which was taken along for ballast as well as to fill up the cargoes. The establishment of the Canadian line—primarily for military purposes and secondarily for traffic, threw a good many San Franciscans into mourning. To them, they thought, the end had come. San Francisco was to lose its Asiatic business. Then followed in rapid succession the establishment of new lines from Portland, the Puget sound ports and San Diego.

Our merchants awoke. Instead of six steamers plying from San Francisco the number has been added to. The demand is for larger boats and better boats, and the trade from the Pacific slope is many times what it once was.

The incoming cargoes are much what they formerly were, but the exports include every conceivable article of American produce and manufacture—cotton goods, electrical goods, bicycles, cotton literally by the trainload, alcohol for the railroad for use in the manufacture of smokeless powder in Japan, agricultural implements, canned fruits, canned vegetables, canned meats, almost everything that the mind can conceive. And the demand on the steamship companies is always for room and then for more room.

What is true of the Asiatic trade is equally true of the Australian. The Oceanic Steamship Company is about to add three 6000-ton vessels to its fleet and to begin steamer connection with Tahiti. I am assured that the available freight carrying facilities of the Australian steamers are engaged for months ahead.

These are the material evidences of trade expansion. The sentiment of this Pacific coast is overwhelmingly in favor of closer business relations with the orient. We do not favor giving up the Hawaiian Islands, which have been developed by California capital; we do not favor Mr. Bryan's policy of surrendering the Philippines.

GEORGE C. PERKINS, San Francisco, Cal.

Poll on the Illinois Central. On an Illinois Central train a few days ago a poll of voters was taken before the train reached Chicago, with the following result:

For McKinley..... 215

For Bryan..... 20

Total voters on the train..... 235

BLUM.

GERMAN-AMERICAN FOR GOLD STANDARD.

Is the Paramount Issue of the Present Campaign.

Bryan's Bogies, Imperialism and Militarism Cut No Figure with the German-Born Voters.

(An Interview with August Blum.)

Mr. August Blum, cashier of the First National Bank of Chicago, intends to vote for the re-election of President McKinley.

Mr. Blum is one of the best representatives in Chicago of the type of Germans who have gained, in this country, the respect of fellow American citizens, for integrity, industry and ability. He was cashier of the Union National Bank; but after the recent absorption of that institution by the First National, he was made cashier of the First National. He is generally recognized throughout the West as a leading banking authority, one whose judgment in connection with the various complex questions that come before every banker is almost infallibly correct.

In politics he is a Democrat, and was always a prominent supporter of Grover Cleveland.

The following are questions put to Mr. Blum, and the replies he gave:

Q. Would the election of Bryan benefit the business interests of Chicago, of the whole United States, and the German-American citizens particularly?

A. The election of Mr. Bryan would, in my opinion, be a great misfortune to this country, and therefore to Chicago, and therefore to German-Americans and to every other kind of Americans. American citizens of German birth are not a class by themselves.

Q. What, in your opinion, is the paramount issue of this campaign?

A. The paramount issue is that which is in the people's minds, not in the party platform nor in the speeches of leaders necessarily. There is one thing in which we are all vitally concerned, and that is the inviolability of the country's standard of value. For a quarter of a century we have battled for it. At the last moment to surrender to the enemy would be the height of folly. I know of no other issue comparable to this one in importance. Talk of imperialism is disingenuous. Much as we may differ about the desirability of the Philippines as a colony, we occupy them now and largely through the help of Mr. Bryan. The thing is done.

Q. What do you think of Bryan's statement about the recent German loan?

A. It is very difficult to follow the tortuous road of Mr. Bryan's utterances. Four years ago I tried persistently to understand his utterances about the standard of value, but I gave it up at last in despair. To construe our ability to absorb a foreign loan, as evidence of bad times, is decidedly Bryanesque. We could not loan money to foreign governments if we were not in a prosperous condition. When Mr. Bryan undertakes to prove the contrary it may give him pleasure, but it will not convince any one.

Q. Do you think that this country has prospered during the last four years as a result of Republican policies?

A. Yes; the country has prospered during the last four years. The best, in my opinion, that can be legitimately said of the policy of any party is that it does not stand in the way of normal business development which would mean prosperity.

That can be said of the Republican party. During the last four years free play has been given to industry, frugality and to the natural productiveness of the country. There has been no attempt at interference by tampering with the standard of value, which would have meant destruction of prosperity.

Q. Do you think Bryan is a safe, solid, wise enough man to be President?

A. I answer this with a most emphatic NO.

Q. How do you think German-Americans, as a class, will vote in the presidential election this fall?

A. They will vote according to the dictates of their conscience. I have too much confidence in the good sense of my countrymen to be doubtful as to the outcome.

REMEMBER!

The Party (Democratic) stands where it did in 1896 in the Main Question.—W. J. Bryan, Zan'sville, O., Sept. 4.

HOW SHALL I VOTE THIS FALL?

Am I a Republican, Democrat or Populist? Let me reason with myself and you.

Suppose for a moment I am a farmer and I own or rent land. Five years ago I farmed 160 acres out west. Times were bad, crops were poor, my wheat brought only 40 cents a bushel at the farm and my corn only 18 cents. It was cheaper to burn corn in the stove than to buy wood or coal. I saved enough wheat for seed and sold the rest, but didn't get enough to pay the storekeeper what I owed him, and could get no more credit. I owed a big payment on my farm machinery. Thank heaven, the agent of the Harvester Company extended the time on my note for another year. That saved my home and the lives of myself and family.

That was under Cleveland's Democratic Administration.

Four years ago McKinley was nominated for President. It was a happy omen for the tillers of the soil all over the country.

In 1900 my crops were good. My wheat and corn, cattle and hogs brought good prices.

I paid off the storekeeper, settled with the Harvester Company, took up the mortgage on the homestead and commenced to live.

Another year and three more years have gone by, and I am still prosperous. So prosperous, in fact, that I have almost forgotten the hard times before William McKinley came to be President of the greatest Republic in the world. But I have not forgotten that I have a piano in the house, that two boys have been fitted for college, that my wife and daughters are well dressed, and that the old man himself is taking life mighty easy.

Prosperity has increased the size of my waistband, and I guess I am just good enough Republican to vote once more for Major McKinley.

WHAT SAY YOU?

SHOUP.

MOUNTAIN STATES TURN TO M'KINLEY.

Prosperity the Cause of the Welcome Change.

No One Fears "Imperialism," While All Are Proud of the Records Made by the Army and Navy.

(By George L. Shoup, United States Senator from Idaho.)

There are many reasons which impel the voters of the mountain States to support the nominees and the policy of the Republican Party this fall. One word more than any other explains the position of our people in this support and that word is confidence.

The record of the Republican party is a record of fulfilled promises.

The first act of the party after its return to power was the enactment of the Dingley tariff law, which again placed us on a protection basis.

Take for example the benefits which have accrued to my own State, Idaho. Among our principal industries are mining, cattle and sheep growing and farming.

The great lead mines of the State are working every man possible at wages of \$3.50 per day of eight hours. During the three years of President McKinley's administration the value of the lead produced in the State was \$14,114,005, while during the last three years of President Cleveland's administration the total value was only \$7,800,151.

Our sheep have advanced in price from \$1.15 to \$2.50 per head, a gain to the people of the State of over three million dollars in the value of the sheep alone. In the year 1896 the wool clip of Idaho was valued at \$442,685, while for the year 1900 it is estimated that it will bring to the wool growers of the State \$2,326,000.

A very conservative estimate of the number of cattle in the State is 500,000. They have increased in value on an average of \$15 per head, making the cattlemen at least seven and one-half million dollars richer than they were three years ago. The increase in the price of horses of \$10 per head has also added between one and two million dollars to the wealth of the State.

The voters of this State and of the other mountain States are not blind to these facts, and on election day they will give earnest evidence of their confidence in the party whose policy has so enriched and prospered them.

We of the West are proud of the achievements of our army and navy in the war with Spain. The patriotic position of the Republican party in declaring for the retention of the territory so gallantly won from Spain appeals to our people.

They do not fear "imperialism," for we have never met an American who was an imperialist. I am in receipt of letters from many men who have never voted anything but a Democratic ticket, but who will vote for McKinley and Roosevelt on this issue alone.

You can count on the electoral vote of Washington, Oregon, Idaho, Utah, Wyoming and perhaps Montana and Colorado for McKinley and prosperity.

GEO. L. SHOUP, Boise, Idaho, Sept. 23, 1900.

PACIFIC COAST PROSPERITY

The Pacific coast has had a full measure of prosperity in the past four years and the calamity cry raised by the Bryanites only excites ridicule.

The leading Bryan paper of the coast is the San Francisco Examiner, which is under the same control as the New York Journal and the Chicago American. Its "Want" columns show that the wage-earners there have plenty of call for their services. On Sept. 1, the Examiner's "Help Wanted" columns had advertisements for the following:

HELP WANTED.

Male..... 2,554

Female..... 231

Total..... 2,785

On Sept. 21 the same paper had advertisements calling for the following:

Male help..... 2,983

Female help..... 306

Total..... 3,289

Prosperity has visited the coast in earnest.

HEWITT.

EX-MAYOR SQUARELY FOR REPUBLICANS.

Supreme Court Would Nullify Any Imperialistic Ideas.

Every True Democrat Can Take No Other Course Except to Vote the Republican Ticket.

(By Abram S. Hewitt of New York, formerly Mayor and Member of Congress.)

The political situation at this time is of a very different character from that which presented itself four years ago. At that time it seemed possible to maintain a distinct Democratic organization, based upon the fundamental principles enunciated by Jefferson, and which had continued to govern the party in all previous presidential elections. The recent convention held at Kansas City has, however, rendered all such expectations hopeless. The party which calls itself Democratic is in reality Populist, and based upon doctrines which, if carried into effect, would produce political anarchy.

You ask whether I believe in the coinage of silver at the ratio of 16 to 1. You might as well ask me whether I believe that an ounce should be made to pass for a pound in the ordinary transactions of commerce. The ratio is a false ratio. The value of silver measured by gold is, as every one knows, not 16 to 1, but 32 to 1. The proposition of the platform therefore is to declare that fifty cents shall by law be made equal to one dollar.

You ask me whether the present administration is likely to establish an imperialistic form of government over this country or in its new possessions.

I answer that the Constitution of the United States is too strongly entrenched in the affections of the people to permit its possible violation by the administration, and that if such an attempt were made, the Supreme Court of the United States will surely interpret the Constitution in the spirit of its founders and for the preservation of the constitutional government, to which we owe our stability and our prosperity.

You ask whether a Democrat, by voting for McKinley and Roosevelt, could be considered false to the interests of Democracy. I answer that I do not see how a Democrat who is true to the interests of Democracy can in the present exigency take any other course than to vote for the Republican ticket. I propose myself to vote, and I do this because I am a Democrat who feels that Bryanism and all that it stands for is diametrically opposed to the principles of the Democratic party, as they were enunciated by Jefferson and as they have been construed by all the great men who have led the Democratic party up to the time of the holding of the unhappy convention of 1896, when the old organization was broken up.

It is certainly a lesser evil to continue the government in the hands of the Republican party for the next four years than to encounter the perils which would confront us in case Bryan and his followers should have the opportunity of putting in practice the insane policy to which they are committed.

ABRAM S. HEWITT.

EUROPE FOR BRYAN.

Americans will be pleased to learn that the French press has followed the lead of London Truth, and is solid for Bryan. Henri Rochefort, editor of L'Intransigeant, declared editorially on September 26th that if Mr. Bryan be elected the expansion policy of Mr. McKinley will be struck from American politics for years to come. Libre Parole goes further, saying: "The results in the elections in the United States on the 6th of November interest our future destiny. It is for us that Bryan is working. Make a criminal by imperialism, McKinley conspires against France." All true Americans should note that Bryan is working for the interests of Europe—not of the United States.