

PROMISE AND PERFORMANCE.

The Republican and Democratic Parties and their Candidates for President Tried by Their Record of the Past Eight Years on the Silver Question.

Honest voters of the United States, your attention is invited to the record of the two old parties on the silver question during the past eight years. In the past ages of the world, must the future of men and parties be judged by their record. If you find that the republican and democratic parties betrayed the people in the past, if you find that Grover Cleveland and Benjamin Harrison have proven false to the platforms on which they were elected, it is your duty as patriotic citizens to sever your connection with those parties.

Here is the record:

PROMISE.

Plank on which Cleveland was elected in 1884: In honest money, the coinage of the constitution, and circulating medium convertible into silver money without loss.

Plank on which Harrison was elected in 1888: The republican party is in favor of the use of both gold and silver as money, and condemn the policy of the democratic administration in its efforts to demonetize silver.

PERFORMANCE.

At the democratic platform of 1884, the people were given to understand that the democrats proposed to take up the fight for remonetization of silver. The silver should be restored to its former place in the coinage of the country along with gold is the only fair construction that can be given to that plank. The republicans were silent on the silver question in 1884. There can be no reasonable doubt that in the close contest of that year Cleveland owed his election to that silver plank, and the silvery eloquence that flowed from democratic speakers on that question.

But when Grover Cleveland, even before he was inaugurated, declared his uncompromising opposition to free silver, great was the chagrin and indignation of those who had been duped. Cleveland showed himself to be, not only an enemy to silver, but also the most radical gold standard man that ever sat in the presidential chair. In his messages he repeatedly urged congress to coin two million silver dollars per month under the old Bland act. He went further, and recommended the retirement of the rest of the greenbacks. He stood ready with a veto to kill any financial measure in the interests of the people that congress might pass.

"But why," asks some one, "did the money power permit the democrats to take the country with a free silver platform?" The answer is: They knew where Cleveland stood, and that he would not be bound by platform promises.

The republicans ridicule the democrats for following along a few years behind them and adopting their platform. But in 1888 the position was reversed. The republicans concluded to try the same trick that enabled their opponents to elect Cleveland. The democrats held their convention first and were silent on the silver question. The republicans followed with the declaration of "gold and silver money" and condemned Cleveland's "efforts to demonetize silver." Harrison was nominated and again the silvery eloquence flowed, but this time from republican orators. As a result Harrison was elected.

The money power permitted his election because they knew he would prove as good a fool as Cleveland, and they were not disappointed. Harrison, like Cleveland, succeeded in preventing the passage of a free coinage law by congress. It has been an open secret that if such a law should pass, he would have vetoed it. His administration has discriminated against silver in every way possible.

As they were defeated, the democrats began howling for free silver.

In the republican congress of '89-'90, they forced that issue to the front with great skill and vehemence, and used the republican money plank on which Cleveland was elected as a club with which to pound the republicans. They very nearly succeeded. But the republicans in the house stood almost solid against the measure and finally defeated it. The democrats in the senate, assisted by a few traitors from the silver states did pass a free coinage bill, but it was vetoed by the house, and a compromise bill was passed known as the Sherman law.

The Sherman law purported to be a step toward the restoration of silver. But it was every way originated by that arch-schemer, it turned out to be the exact opposite. By the provisions of this law the secretary is required to buy four and a half million ounces of silver bullion per month. He pays for it—not with gold, as many persons believe—but with treasury notes redeemable in gold. The declared policy of the administration is to redeem these notes in gold as they are presented.

Another feature of the Sherman law—and a most damnable one—is that the treasury notes contain an "exception clause." They are "legal tender only for the payment of the infamous gold contracts which were made by money loaners.

The feature of the Sherman law is that by its terms the secretary of the treasury is empowered to cease coining silver dollars on July 1st, 1891,

if he saw fit. Of course he saw fit, and to-day no silver dollar is being coined in the United States.

Harrison of course signed this bill. Thus he succeeded in doing what his platform condemned the democrats for trying to do.

In 1890 another turn in the political wheel of fortune came. The democrats in twenty-nine states declared plainly for the free coinage of silver. On the stump they assailed the republicans for their course in defeating the free coinage measure in 1889. They were victorious, electing about three-fourths of the lower house. More than two-thirds of these representatives were outspokenly pledged free coinage men. Then the people said: "We are going to get something at last." But to their deep disgust and disappointment the Bland bill was killed, and all hopes of financial relief from this congress were blasted. During all this time Grover Cleveland has been using all his influence and prestige as an ex-president and prospective candidate, to prevent any silver legislation.

The history of the two great conventions just held is too fresh to need comment. In each the money power scored a signal triumph. The question that was uppermost in the minds of the people was tabooed in both conventions. A stranger to our politics, if he had attended both conventions, would hardly have known their was a silver question.

Now let us compare the silver planks on which the two old parties proposed to stand in the coming campaign:

Silver plank on which Harrison was re-nominated at Minneapolis:

"The American people from tradition and interest favor bi-metalism and the republican party demands the use of both gold and silver as a standard money, with such restrictions to be determined by legislation as will secure the maintenance of a parity of values of the two metals, so that the purchasing and debt paying power of a dollar, whether gold, silver or paper, shall at all times be equal. The interests of the producers of the country, its farmers and its workingmen, demand that every dollar—paper or coin—issued by the government, shall be as good as any other.

"We commend the wise and patriotic steps already taken by our government to secure an international conference to adopt such measures as will insure the parity of value between gold and silver for use for money throughout the world."

Silver plank on which Cleveland was nominated at Chicago:

"We denounce the republican platform known as the Sherman law of 1890 as a cowardly makeshift, with possibilities of danger in its nature which should make all of us, for its repeal. We held to the principle both gold and silver as the standard money of the country, and to the principle of discrimination against either metal on charge for mintage, but the dollar unit of coinage of both metals must be of equal intrinsic and unchangeable value, or be adjusted by international agreement or by such safeguards of legislation as shall insure the maintenance of the parity of the two metals, and the equal power of any dollar at all times in the market and in the payment of debts, and we demand that all paper currency shall be kept at par with and redeemable in such coin. We insist upon this policy as especially necessary for the protection of the farmers and laboring classes, the first and most defenseless victims of unstable money and a fluctuating currency."

"Look on this picture and then on that!" Never was the hand of the money power more plainly shown. There's no room for a disagreement this time. Even the old party papers confess that there is no difference.

The republicans condemn the Sherman law by silence as effectually as the democrats do by words.

- Both "favor gold and silver as a standard money."
Both "favor a dollar of equal intrinsic value with every other dollar."
Both "favor such restrictions (safe-guards) of legislation as will insure (secure) the maintenance of the parity of values (of the two metals)."
Both "favor an international conference (agreement)."

Both proclaim that they are working in the interest of "the farmers and working men (laboring classes)."

Both platforms really mean this: We are unalterably opposed to the remonetization of the standard silver dollar of 412 1/2 grains; but if we can secure an international agreement with the gold-standard nations of Europe, we will arrange to continue a limited use of silver as money.

Now compare these planks with those of '84 and '88 already quoted. Do they promise anything more? Do they promise as much? On the contrary, the planks of '92 are unfriendly to the free coinage of silver. The same candidates stand on these platforms as they stood on the former ones. We know what each did when elected before.

If the people got nothing out of platforms that promised much, how much are they likely to get out of platforms that promise nothing with the same candidates that betrayed the people before?

WHEN your republican friend here in Nebraska tells you scornfully that this independent movement is simply a sideshow gotten up to aid the democratic party just quietly tell him the news from Texas, where the independent candidate has downed the democratic nominee for Roger Q. Mills' seat in the house. According to tradition Texas has been overwhelmingly democratic ever since the days of Abraham Lincoln but here comes this so-called democratic sideshow and wrests a congressional district from the grasp of democracy with no difficulty whatever. The papers of the north don't say anything about it, but they are doing some awfully hard thinking.

WHEN you are telling things don't forget to tell about Texas.

THE managers of the national prohibition convention at Cincinnati have agreed upon E. F. Stevens, the baseball editor of the Boston Herald, as secretary of the convention. I thought that he can keep a good record of the heavy batting that is to take place.

THE Journal announces that the race for representative in the Third ward is between Joe Burns, Bud Lindsey, and Fritz Westerman. While we propose to run a man of our own choice who could easily down all three of these chumps, yet we are constrained to suggest that as between Bud Lindsey and Joe Burns we would certainly take Bud. One always knows where to find him.